1 Introduction

Fieldwork (a form of work integrated learning [WIL]) is an integral component of many courses and provides students with an opportunity to build their graduate employability and consolidate their professional skills and confidence as well as develop positive professional attitudes and qualities (Bonello 2001; Chapman and Orb 2000, 2001; Nash et al 2009). Fieldwork experiences require a coordinated effort by both university and industry staff to ensure both parties gain optimum benefits. Sophisticated leadership skills are required to manage fieldwork education programs in order to maximise benefits for students, the university and external partner organisations (Coll & Eames, 2004). These skills include a pedagogical, industrial and legal knowledge base with advanced communication and negotiation skills along with considerable credibility outside the university (Cooper and Orrell, 1999). Academic programs with fieldwork components are increasingly in need of strategies to ensure quality learning environments, preparation and support mechanisms for supervisory staff, and appropriate risk management and minimisation processes (Cooper and Orrell 1999).

2 Rationale and Aims

Academic programs with fieldwork components involve a complex web of partnerships with diverse groups. Effective partnerships involve employers, students, academics, higher education managers, professional bodies and broker agencies such as career offices and external placement groups (Orrell 2004). The management of such programs requires both transactional and transformative leadership skills which emphasise learning and optimal outcomes for all parties involved.

The requirement of leadership for fieldwork coordinators (FC) is strongly supported by Patrick et al (2009) in a national scoping study of work integrated learning. They identified that effective fieldwork practices are critical to ensure worthwhile learning experiences for students and a ‘stakeholder integrated approach’ to the planning and conduct of fieldwork. Further, effective practices are based on formalised, sustainable relations and a common understanding of the procedures and commitment required by all parties involved in high quality fieldwork placements. This outcome stems from strong WIL design as an integral part of the curriculum. Patrick et al also note that good fieldwork education programs are underpinned by sound pedagogy, the use of valid and reliable assessment methods and processes, and evaluation of and management for quality fieldwork experiences. It is clear that effective FCs must communicate and coordinate effectively with industry partners to support and develop models of industry engagement that produce efficient fieldwork processes for students.

Fieldwork coordinators require a diverse set of leadership capabilities (for example, interpersonal and communication skills; pedagogy and curriculum design in relation to fieldwork; problem-solving; conflict-resolution and negotiation; entrepreneurial and relationship management skills; understanding of legal and ethical issues in relation to fieldwork; coaching (through providing professional development programs for supervisors in the field and supporting students facing fieldwork performance issues), and change management skills. FCs are often not formally recognised with a role description. An ill-prepared FC can jeopardise the quality of a course and industry relationships, thereby having a detrimental effect on institutional teaching and learning effectiveness (Wolverton et al 2005). Considerable risk is involved for the student as a learner and a person, for the agency as...
provider of fieldwork education, goods and services, and for the institution, legally and ethically, if fieldwork education is handled poorly (Gronewald 2004, Cooper and Orrell 1999).

Although the FC role is fundamental to quality fieldwork programs and the core business of teaching and learning, FCs remain largely invisible in their roles within universities. FC roles are not formally recognised and academic staff who occupy these positions are often appointed at lower levels or are appointed directly from industry. Hence, they often have little experience of universities or of teaching in an academic context and undertake considerable administrative responsibilities. In addition, Cooper and Orrell (1999) found there is little induction into this leadership role which requires complex pedagogical, managerial, entrepreneurial, industry relationship management, legal and ethical expertise and support for their development. In spite of this, most of the responsibility for ensuring that fieldwork experiences are of high quality and relevant to industry and disciplines is carried by FCs. Additionally, FCs may be marginalised within their own academic team, being largely left with the responsibility for fieldwork with limited formal academic and Head of School/Department support. Hence, the rationale for this project is to provide an experiential academic leadership program for FCs. This initiative will enable universities to meet their strategic priorities for improving the quality of teaching and learning in fieldwork education and ensure that these key academic staff have the opportunity to develop their leadership capabilities.

The current fieldwork environment is under enormous pressure as identified in recent reports (Hicks 2009; National Health Workforce Taskforce 2009). With increased university enrolments across the sector, pressure for increasing the number of fieldwork placements is on the rise (Currens 2003; Kline and Hodges 2006). Unfortunately, the sectors that accept these students are increasingly resource constrained. Hence, the need for creative solutions, new models of fieldwork and relationship management is more important than ever.

The aim of this project, therefore, is to design and implement an academic leadership development program for FCs from a wide variety of disciplines across the three partner universities in this proposal. The purpose will be to enhance FCs leadership capabilities, enabling them to provide high quality fieldwork learning experiences through appropriate pedagogy and management. An expected outcome of the program is to strengthen peer and industry relationships, reduce risks for all parties and ultimately improve student learning. In doing so, the project would address some of the priority actions identified by Patrick et al (2009) in enhancing work integrated learning through: (i) creating a professional development approach to WIL; and (ii) developing and implementing a WIL leadership program at the institutional level to build staff capacity and capability in WIL.

3 How this project integrates with and complements other projects

This project integrates with and builds on a range of other projects as outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Learnings applicable to this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building Academic Leadership Capability at the Course Level Developing Course Coordinators as Academic Leaders (Sue Jones, Bev Oliver, Rick Ladyshewsky, Helen Flavell))</td>
<td>Builds upon the expertise gained in delivering a well received and successful leadership program. Many of the modules developed around leadership competencies can be applied to FCs. Clarification of the roles of Course Coordinators,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the leadership capability of academic coordinators in postgraduate and undergraduate programs in business (Project Leader Tricia Vilkinas, UniSA)</td>
<td>Builds upon the outcomes achieved in this project by including action learning methodologies to promote transfer of training of leadership concepts to the sector, thus impacting on learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic leadership development within the university sector by dissemination of a web-based 360° feedback process and related professional</td>
<td>Builds upon the expertise developed in this joint collaboration to develop the ICVF for the higher education sector. The model and tool, accessible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
development workshops (Project Leader Tricia Vilkinas, UniSA) online as a result of this collaboration, is available for use in this FC program.

| Work Integrated Learning (WIL): A national framework for initiatives to support best practice | Key issues in leadership for WIL identified and will be addressed through professional development to ensure worthwhile high quality learning experiences for students |
| Building course team capacity to identify, model and assess graduate employability skills (Project Leader Beverley Oliver, Curtin) | Need to improve academic staff capability to support work integrated learning to enhance graduate employability |
| Learning leaders in times of change (Project Leader Geoff Scott, UWS) | Applies the project’s capability/competency framework to this FC program by blending it with the ICVF to promote an integrated framework for leadership development in the higher education sector |
| Teaching Quality Indicators (Project Leader Denise Chalmers, UWA) | Indicators include those related to student engagement. Research shows correlation between student engagement and learning. |
| Enhancing the Student Educational Experience through School-based Curriculum Improvement Leaders (Project Leader Jan Thomas, Murdoch) | Concept of informal leadership developed and recognition of the difficulty in effecting change due to lack of role clarity and authority (as FCs). |

4 **Theoretical Framework**

The project utilises a very similar model to that utilised successfully by Jones et al (2009) for the Academic Leadership Program for Course Coordinators. It will use a distributed leadership model in which FCs are the focus of academic leadership development. Some of the unique features of the proposed program are: the clarification of the concept, roles and responsibilities of the FC by linking and applying them to the conceptual framework developed by Scott et al (2008); use of 360 degree feedback modelling using the Integrated Competing Values Framework (Vilkinas & Cartan 2001, 2006) to inform FCs about their leadership strengths and gaps, the incorporation of peer coaching to support individual implementation initiatives; a focus on experiential learning through action learning projects; use of a blended learning model (incorporating e-learning with face-to-face sessions) to enhance FC knowledge and skills; and goal setting and reflective journaling to extend learning and increase transference into the academic setting (Ladyshewsky 2005). Social learning theories such as situated learning (Billett 1994), reflective practice (Schön 1987), communities of practice (Wenger 2000), and peer learning (Boud et al 2001) complement the proposed academic leadership model.

The academic leadership development model will be based on an adaptation of the models of education developed by Wolverton et al (2005), Ramsden (1998), and from the broader leadership field (Antonakis and House 2002) which are supported by the leadership framework developed by Scott et al (2008). The Integrated Competing Values (ICVF) Framework (Vilkinas & Cartan 2001, 2006) will be applied to a fieldwork context as it covers the key leadership foci of the FC role as well as providing a tool for measuring leadership. The developmental needs of fieldwork leaders will be targeted at five levels using the ICVF as a vehicle to assist FCs to recognise their important leadership role including: personal, interpersonal and cognitive capabilities, and generic and role-specific competencies

**Personal** capabilities will include: the importance of self regulation, decisiveness, commitment; learning to lead through understanding leadership theory and development; encouraging participants to learn from past experiences through reflective journaling of leadership experiences; observations and reflections of effective and ineffective practice; and use of a peer-coaching approach to implement performance targets (Ladyshewsky and Varey 2005, Ladyshewsky 2006).
**Interpersonal** capabilities includes skills for influencing others; empathising; emotional intelligence (enabling, inspiring and motivating others); personal management; group academic leadership skills at a department/school level necessary to achieve the desired results when working with staff, students, external stakeholders, and other managers, for example, communication, team building, conflict-resolution and negotiation.

**Cognitive** capabilities includes the skills necessary to: diagnose causes of complex problems and develop solutions; development of strategies to manage complex problems; creating vision and focusing on strategic action; and the importance of flexibility and responsiveness.

**Generic and role specific** competence will include: teaching and learning issues such as current work integrated learning theory and practice in higher education; understanding and application of pedagogical concepts in work integrated learning curriculum design, implementation, assessment and evaluation; and the roles and responsibilities of fieldwork education leaders within a local (university) system and the national higher education context; planning and managing resources; recognising, developing and assessing fieldwork performance; quality enhancement; and change management; university operations and the implications for fieldwork.

The ICVF is shown in Figure 1 below and illustrates the behavioural complexity of the FC role. A people versus task focus is always present in the FC role as is an internal or external focus. As a result of these pressures, five operational roles emerge which are necessary for effective leadership (developer, innovator, broker, deliverer, and monitor) and the leader needs to determine how and when to use a given role and the extent to which each of the roles is used and competes with other roles (this is the behavioural complexity of the model). Central to the model is the integrator role, which involves critical thinking and reflective practice in order to monitor movement and application of the five operational roles. For example FCs need to manage the competing priorities of caring for and dealing with students with personal difficulties (developer role) whilst trying to ensure that students complete their fieldwork placements in a timely manner as there is a shortage of fieldwork places and delay in placement completion will create significant pressure on subsequent placements (deliverer role) because they must be made up when the next cohort of students needs placements. The ICVF will be contextualised to the role of a FC through the use of a series of case studies designed to explore the leadership responsibilities of this role. Participants will have an opportunity to assess their leadership profile using the ICVF and develop further their strengths and reduce weaknesses.

![Figure 1: The Integrated Competing Values Framework](image)
useful for building case studies to engage participants in an exploration of their role, thereby contextualising the model to the FC role. For example:

- **The Developer Role**: will include issues such as providing training and support for educators in the field around coaching, supervision and fair and equitable assessment of students, alignment of assessment practices of student learning on placements between university and industry;
- **The Innovator Role**: will focus on considering changes to professional practice and how this influences fieldwork education. These changes, along with increasing enrolments and competition for placements require innovative and new approaches to models of fieldwork education;
- **The Broker Role**: requires development of strategic partnerships with agencies, accreditation and professional bodies, fieldwork educators, and Head of School/Department. The interplay of these key stakeholders requires negotiation and networking skills to build and sustain the fieldwork program;
- **The Deliverer Role**: requires the development of a system to manage student fieldwork placements, managing paperwork and compliance issues, unit outlines, and communication strategies to ensure the program runs efficiently. It also requires initiatives to manage the risk and legal issues associated with a fieldwork program;
- **The Monitor Role**: involves collecting and collating relevant fieldwork data to continuously improve the quality of work integrated learning eg. placement numbers, monitoring trends in numbers, placement availability, collecting feedback on students, educators, placement quality, evaluating the fieldwork program and models of education, moderation of fieldwork assessment and ensuring inter-rater reliability and understanding competency based evaluation;
- **The Integrator Role**: involves reflecting on practice, taking a critical perspective on one's own leadership role and one’s movement between the operational roles, and involving others such as peer coaches, critical friends or colleagues in one's ongoing development as a fieldwork coordinator.

Some of the underlying concepts that will be needed in the program to support these operational roles include:

1. The ICVF as a leadership model to inform practice
2. Communicating with emotional intelligence
3. Managing performance and coaching
4. Understanding individuals and teams and managing change
5. Conflict management and negotiation
6. Understanding key relationships and networking
7. Pedagogy of WIL

The competence and capabilities framework of Scott et al (2008) complements the theoretical framework further. This model is illustrated below in Table 1.

Table 1 (Scott et al 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Capability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevant skills &amp; knowledge that are delivered to a set standard in a specific context</td>
<td>Ability to figure out when and when not to deploy these competencies, and a capacity to refine, update and develop them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deliver/perform</td>
<td>Ability to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to deliver set tasks in specific and relatively predictable situations</td>
<td>Ability to deliver new approaches in complex, uncertain situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A focus on the present</td>
<td>A focus on the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working productively and efficiently in situation</td>
<td>Working productively with instability and change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The competencies represent those transactional or managerial skills FCs will develop further in the
program. These competencies can be encapsulated into the various operational roles of the ICVF. The
capabilities, in contrast, are more transformational and related to leadership attributes, which will also
be developed further for FCs in the program and will be aligned to the operational roles of the ICVF.

The strength of this project is its use of a distributed leadership model. Leadership of this type builds
FC capacity to improve the quality of teaching and learning outcomes in fieldwork. The program will
build on models used in two successful ALTC projects, namely, the Academic Leadership for Course
Coordinators project (Jones et al 2009) and the Improving the Leadership Capability of Academic
Coordinators in Postgraduate and Undergraduate Programs in Business (Vilkinas et al 2009). Both
leadership projects employed practical, applied and experiential learning approaches based on the
theory of leadership. The design and outcomes of this FC Leadership project will be transferable to all
Australian universities.

This project will facilitate the development of communities of practice for FCs. This project will build
on the experience at Charles Sturt University where a Professional Experience Network (PEN) has
been established. PEN is an interdisciplinary cross-campus and cross-faculty community of practice
around fieldwork education which has played a key grassroots role supporting FCs and administrators
through advice and networking opportunities.

The fieldwork leadership program, will contain a series of modules which will enable participants to
embed their learning within current practices, engage in a rich dialogue, and form a community of
practice with their peers as they transfer concepts into practice. Exploration of a delivery model that
best suits this cohort of individuals will be developed in consultation with FCs.

5 Scope of Project

The project will be targeted at FCs from all disciplines across both partner universities. Curtin has
Fieldwork Coordinators in each of its four faculties (including courses such as Engineering, Education,
Geology, Journalism, all Health Sciences courses, Marketing, Accounting etc). At CSU, there are FCs
in each of the four faculties with many similar courses such as accounting, human resource
management, social work, communication-commercial radio, psychology, education, and all health
sciences courses offering a fieldwork education program. Both universities have rural and regional
campuses, and therefore the project will consider both face-to-face and flexible delivery methods so
that it can be readily adapted to meet the needs of a diverse group of FCs in different contexts,
geographical locations and disciplines.

The project has the capacity to influence large numbers of FCs given that there are more than 200 FCs
at Curtin and 160 at CSU.

It is anticipated that the project will raise the profile of fieldwork education as a form of WIL and the
important academic leadership roles and responsibilities of FCs within the partner universities, as well
as through the External Reference Group and the sector through publications, conference and ALTC
presentations and a project website.

6 Approach of the Project

The proposed FC leadership program will be developed over a two year period to provide sufficient
opportunities for dialogue, debate, reflection and the development of communities of practice in areas
across the two partner universities. A series of professional development resources and tools applicable
to FCs, in a broad range of cross discipline contexts will be developed, which will provide support for
current and future FCs.
The features of the proposed program are: clarification of the important academic leadership role for FCs; professional development modules which are contextualised to the role of FCs; strong development of pedagogy of WIL and implementation of quality learning experiences; peer coaching to support implementation and transfer of training (Ladyshewsky 2005); experiential learning and use of flexible delivery to support fieldwork learning and functions such as moderation of fieldwork assessments (promoting FCs as change agents to support flexible, efficient and affordable learning for students, staff and educators in the field) and establishing a community of practice for FC’s.

In order to increase transference of training into the academic and fieldwork setting, program participants will be required (if they wish to pursue credit for the program) to establish an action learning initiative centred around a leadership development target which will impact on fieldwork education in their program. They will also need to keep a reflective journal and report on the outcomes of their project.

Key learning outcomes of the program for participants will include:

- Understanding fieldwork academic leadership in a higher education institution (leadership capabilities required, what best practice looks like, the nature and level of commitment required, extending views of leadership)
- Knowledge of contemporary work integrated learning theory in higher education, how it differs from learning in other contexts, and the implications for practice
- Identification of participants’ leadership skills against those required for academic leadership and implementation of a personal development action learning program which builds life long learning skills to enhance leadership
- Review of curricula, learning experiences, principles of fair and equitable fieldwork assessment
- Development of key leadership skills to achieve the desired results when working with staff, students, external stakeholders and other managers, for example: communication; team building (in the context of external partnerships); conflict-resolution and negotiation; planning and managing resources; recognising, developing and assessing fieldwork education; continuous quality improvement issues (such as risk management and supervisor development); change management; and ethico-legal issues.
- Knowledge of fieldwork management and administrative requirements within the context of university policies and procedures
- Entrepreneurship and management of industry partner relationships

The methodology will include participant involvement in: pre-program activities (to establish the group’s understanding of leadership); the academic leadership program; and post-program activities including the development of a community of practice. Pre-program activities will include self assessment of strengths and developmental needs and identification of leadership issues within their FC roles.

The program will be developed as a series of modules using the ICVF and competency/capability framework discussed earlier to develop conceptual understandings of academic leadership in fieldwork and the pedagogical and other knowledge required, skill development and personal leadership development. A blended learning approach will be used which incorporates flexible delivery methods to enable staff in regional and international locations to participate in the program as this has been found to be a successful learning mode for adult learners in leadership development (Ladyshewsky 2003) and meets the needs of the partner university FC profiles.
Each module will include a series of learning activities and resources which will be developed as learning objects and situated within a learning management system (Blackboard at Curtin, and CSUInteract at CSU). The design and development of the program will be based on the successful model used by Jones et al (2009) for developing academic leadership in course coordinators. Each module will include:

- An overview - program notes and supporting information, leadership and management lectures which can be podcast or videostreamed;
- Readings and internet links - suggested readings, links to scholarly databases, links to websites, information eg policies/procedures;
- Practical activities for self assessment - quizzes, web-based exercises, questionnaires, personal journals, case studies, group projects etc (including lesson plans for conducting any activities); and
- Discussion board activity - questions, case-studies and problem scenarios for face to face sessions and available through asynchronous web discussion (if delivered fully online), moderated by the program convenor and designed to integrate material from the program.

To ensure the resources can be utilised across the Australian higher education sector, learning objects will be prepared in a format which is readily adaptable to any learning management system.

The program will be developed as a series of modules with associated learning objects enabling it to be packaged in different ways depending upon the needs of individual universities. The delivery method will depend upon Internal Reference Group preferences and may vary from fortnightly face-to-face sessions, fewer combined module sessions, a one day workshop with follow-up sessions or fully online delivery. Given the experience of the team in developing a program for course coordinators, the partner universities will pilot the program in both face-to-face (Curtin) and flexible delivery (CSU) modes at the same time.

The post-course phase will include participant reflection on their experiences and the learning outcomes, a review of their personal development plans and preparation of next steps of their academic leadership responsibilities which will be developed through an action learning project.

Program design, implementation and outcomes will be undertaken with a view to enabling its articulation with a Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Education or other qualification depending on the host institution. Appropriate action learning assessment activities using the approach adopted by the University of South Australia (Vilkinas 2008) will be developed for participants to complete if they wish to apply for credit for their participation in this academic leaders program.

The project utilises an approach which has a strong theoretical framework using academic leadership literature and theory to guide and structure the program and includes the use of the ICVF and capability/competency framework as a proven tool to support leadership development in higher education staff.

### 6.1 Project Management

The project will be led by the Project Team who will meet regularly via video and teleconference. They will be supported by a 0.5 FTE Project Manager who will be responsible for overseeing all phases of the project and supporting the Project Team with additional support provided by a site administrative manager at CSU to coordinate implementation of the program.

The project will be managed in a series of 4 phases (details shown in Attachment 1):
• Phase 1 – recruitment of a Project Manager, establishment of Project Management Group; application of appropriate literature and determining fieldwork coordinator development needs along with key modules
• Phase 2 – design and development of the academic leadership program in conjunction with the Project Reference Groups and preparation of course materials for new modules
• Phase 3 – piloting of the program in both institutions and initial evaluation of participant perceptions of the program
• Phase 4 – review and refinement of the program; development and preparation of resources for dissemination, embedding of the program within staff development organisational units, external review of the project and preparation of the final report for ALTC

A project manager with responsibility to oversee all phases of the project will be required as well as dedicated flexible delivery instructional designers in each institution to develop the Blackboard/Sakai programs. The leadership modules and peer coaching approach to develop transformational and transactional leadership will be utilised from the ALPCC (Jones et al 2009). The Project Management Team (project leaders and project manager) will develop additional modules and will have time release from their duties to develop these materials further. Additional program content will be sourced from staff in the Teaching Development Unit at Curtin, and through the Project Reference Group. The Project Team will liaise with: Reference Groups; will develop and implement the program to determine which aspects were successful and changes which need to be made; and work with the flexible delivery instructional designer.

Communication between the project team will be through a variety of mechanisms including teleconference/video-conference and Confluence wiki software as a shared repository for information for discussion and editing purposes. This will enable easy downloading of learning materials will for both universities and uploading onto their local learning management system.

Financial and staff management of the project will be coordinated through the Office of Teaching and Learning at Curtin.

6.2 Institutional Linkages

A series of institutional linkages will be developed through the partner universities involvement in the project and the internal and external reference groups. Partner universities will form strong cross-institutional linkages through the development, implementation and management of the project.

Each university will have an Internal Reference Group (IRG) to facilitate widespread university support and embedding of the project outcomes. Representatives will include a FC from each Faculty, Project Leaders from the University, a key representative from the Office of Teaching and Learning, Head of School representative, Human Resources representative, Risk Management representative, university expert on work integrated learning, Organisation Development Unit representative.

An External Reference Group (ERG) of key people who have expertise in leadership and work integrated learning is proposed to include: A/Prof Tricia Vilkinas (one of the developers of the ICVF and involvement in two ALTC projects); Professor Joy Higgs, Strategic Research Professor in Professional Practice in Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning & Education and Director of The Education for Practice Institute at Charles Sturt University (confirmed), a representative from the WIL project, A/Prof Richard Coll, Director of the Cooperative Education Unit, University of Waikato, New Zealand (confirmed), Directors of Teaching and Learning at both universities to build support and promote the project in other for a (confirmed). Additional members will be invited as they are able to contribute to the project outcomes.
6.3 Project Evaluation

The project evaluation will consider project: processes; implementation; outcomes; and impact. An evaluation plan will be developed based on the ALTC resource developed by Chesterton and Cummings (2007). In order to maximise value for money, an external evaluator will be selected from one of the states in which the project is conducted, given that experience with consultants in Western Australia for Jones et al (2009) was very positive. Formative evaluation in relation to the project and which supports the final evaluation report will be undertaken internally under the guidance of the external evaluator.

It is envisaged that the external evaluator will conduct the following:

- Initial meetings to refine the evaluation audiences (eg program participants, universities, ALTC, other); key evaluation questions (in relation to processes, individual and systemic outcomes); data to be collected and the method of analysis; criteria for making judgments about the extent of the achievements; the balance of internal versus external and formative versus summative evaluation; involvement of stakeholders in the project and the dissemination process for the evaluation.
- Meet with the project team at regular intervals to review progress and guide further evaluation requirements including formative evaluation such as a review of the project progress, issues identified, FC leadership program implementation and outcomes
- Review project progress and outcomes
- Prepare interim and final independent evaluation reports as required for submissions to ALTC.

As part of the dissemination plan, interim evaluation findings will be presented to the IRG and ERG to obtain their feedback and suggestions for improvement.

6.4 Dissemination

Building cross disciplinary academic leadership capacity at the fieldwork coordinator level to improve the quality of WIL and enhance the learning experiences of students in a fieldwork setting is the key outcome of this project. The program provides an opportunity for wide-scale reform in ensuring quality programs for students and given that most students undertake fieldwork in the final year(s) of their program, is likely to have a strong impact on Australian Graduate Survey data (through improved teaching and learning, and graduate employability if fieldwork is effective).

The project will be implemented across two universities (one an ATN university and the other a member of the New Generation Universities group). The External Reference Group (ERG) will include membership from a range of universities and will provide a vehicle for developing a program and resources which will meet the needs of a diverse group of stakeholders. It is intended that the final package can be readily adapted to meet each university’s needs in the same manner that has been done by Jones et al (2009). Upscaling of the WIL leadership program for all fieldwork coordinators (both current and future) provides a mechanism for embedding change and second generation innovation through adaptation to a variety of university contexts (Southwell et al 2005).

This project utilises a distributed leadership model through targeting crucial middle-level leaders, who are often ignored within the context of academic leadership and, therefore has the capacity to distribute academic leadership across a large number of FCs in a wide variety of disciplines, thereby facilitating wide-scale reform. Addressing the development of WIL leadership capacity in this group of academics supports a culture of high quality teaching and learning, ultimately improving student learning outcomes.

The final program will be available as a flexible delivery package, downloadable from a website, and which can then be adapted for each institution, enabling upscaling across the higher education sector.
The program will be piloted in the partner universities in the first instance, however, it is envisaged the final “package” will be able to be implemented at any university. Involvement of the ERG throughout each stage is designed to facilitate embedding of the program through review of policies and procedures to accommodate the program.

Information provision forms of dissemination of the project outcomes will occur through the final report being available on the ALTC exchange website, and distribution to senior leaders within the partner institutions, members of reference groups, and the person who has most senior academic leadership for fieldwork in each university, national conference presentations eg HERDSA, AUQF, WACE and through publication in national and international peer-reviewed journals. A website will also provide information to the wider higher education community at a national and international level and will contain information about the project, regular updates on progress, newsletters and upon conclusion of the project, all resources, learning objects and comprehensive implementation guide developed for the project will be readily available for downloading and use/adaptation by any institution, and all project publications and conference presentations.

The following strategies will be utilised by this project to ensure engaged consultation, collaboration and support for the program (ALTC 2008), both during the project and following project completion.

- There are significant numbers of stakeholders in this project including ll higher education institutions that incorporate WIL within curricula in Australia, students, academic staff, university management to ensure appropriate risk management and high quality learning, industry partners supporting and providing WIL, graduates and employers.
- Internal (IRG) and External (ERG) Reference Groups will meet regularly and be invited to provide input to the project and will include representatives from different types of universities ie ATN, Go8, etc as well as being selected on the basis of their expertise and capacity to influence other stakeholders; and will ensure the program design and materials to ensure their relevance for a variety of institutional contexts to enhance upscaling the project;
- Project evaluator will be involved at an early stage of the project to provide additional advice on strategies to increase support and stakeholder engagement for the project.
- A face-to-face meeting with at least one member from each partner institution will assist to ensure each university is sufficiently prepared to conduct the program.
- Application of national and international academic leadership research in the context of fieldwork education and current best practice thereby providing a useful resource for all HE providers which have WIL;
- Linkages with other ALTC projects which have an impact on fieldwork education (eg Creedy and Henderson 2008, Nash 2008) will ensure that work which has already been conducted is enhanced and the effects of the work cascaded;
- Clearly defined roles and responsibilities for FC’s to ensure they have the right capabilities to deliver excellent learning outcomes for students in partnership with and for industry;
- “Fieldwork Coordinator Leadership Development Program” will provide a framework and a package of flexible learning resources, adapted for implementation in wide ranging university contexts for current and prospective FC’s; and
- identification of systems level issues which have implications for FC academic career pathway, promotion processes and ongoing organisational development for current and prospective FC’s will provide a mechanism to consider how the role is explicitly valued and recognised more broadly across the higher education sector;
- Participant feedback on sessions will ensure the program meets their needs and changes will be made in response to feedback.
7 **Anticipated Deliverables and Outcomes of the Project**

The anticipated project outcomes are:

1) application of national and international academic leadership research in the context of fieldwork education and current best practice;

2) linkages with other ALTC projects which have an impact on fieldwork education (eg Creedy and Henderson 2008, Nash 2008);

3) clearly defined roles and responsibilities for FCs recognising their critical role in achieving high quality work-integrated learning in the workplace setting;

4) a “Fieldwork Coordinator Leadership Development Program” which utilises some modules of the Academic Leadership Program for Course Coordinators (Jones et al 2009), the ICVF (Vilkinas and Cartans, 2001; 2006) and a package of flexible learning resources, adapted for implementation in wide ranging university contexts for current and prospective FCs;

5) identification of systems level issues which have implications for FC academic career pathway, promotion processes and ongoing organisational development for current and prospective FCs;

6) upscaling of the project through a national network of users involved in the development of the program through the Project Reference Group, and more broadly across the Australian University sector as a whole through the ALTC network to achieve cross-sectoral impact;

7) dissemination of project findings through conference presentations, publications and a website; and

8) valuing and recognition of the FC role in partner institutions and more broadly across the higher education sector.
References


## Timeline (Attachment 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• employ project manager&lt;br&gt;• establish project management group&lt;br&gt;• consult with Project Internal and External Reference Groups&lt;br&gt;• contract external evaluator to work with Project Management group to design the evaluation framework for the project&lt;br&gt;• obtain ethics approval&lt;br&gt;• survey fieldwork coordinators to determine their development needs (including academic management, current pedagogy in WIL; curriculum design, implementation and evaluation; leading and managing teams; communication, managing conflict; change management)&lt;br&gt;• develop evaluation framework with project evaluator</td>
<td>Dec 09– Jun 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- prepare and submit final report to ALTC
- disseminate FC academic leadership package and resources through partner universities, ATN and then through the ALTC exchange. This program will also be presented through State Teaching & Learning Networks (eg. WA Teaching & Learning Forum; ? CSU Annual Teaching & Learning Conference, AUQF, ATN Assessment Conference). It is anticipated that the final leadership program package will be up-scaled enabling implementation for all FC leaders across the Australian university sector.
Project Leaders (Attachment 2)

**Sue Jones** [BAppSc(Physio), GDipPubSectMgmt] is the Dean of Teaching and Learning in the Faculty of Health Sciences, and a joint-leader of a university wide curriculum reform project (Curriculum 2010) at Curtin University of Technology. She chairs the University’s Courses Committee, is a member of the University Academic Board and Leadership Development Reference Group. She is responsible for ensuring interprofessional education is embedded within health sciences curricula as part of the Faculty of Health Sciences Strategic Plan and chairs the faculty’s Interprofessional Education Reference Group. Sue was a Fieldwork Coordinator in the School of Physiotherapy for 15 years and has successfully led an ALTC leadership grant entitled Building Academic Leadership Capability at the Course Level: Developing Course Coordinators as Academic Leaders (Project Leader). She is currently a project team member on another ALTC grant: Clarifying, developing and valuing the roles of unit coordinators as informal leaders of learning in higher education and a reference group member for Embedding and sustaining leadership development for course coordinators through tailored support during curriculum review (Trivett and Lines 2008). Sue would commit the equivalent of 1 day per week to the project recognising that there are peaks and troughs in the workload.

**Dr Rose Chapman** [PhD, MSc (Nursing), Grad Dip Sexology, BAppSc (Nursing)] is a lecturer and was Fieldwork Coordinator for 8 years in the School of Nursing and Midwifery. She was very successful in building partnerships with the clinical community to increase capacity for clinical education placements whilst maintaining placement quality. She has expertise in fieldwork management and has developed and implemented professional development modules for clinical supervisors and preceptors. Rose has been involved in a Nursing Assessment ALTC project aimed at developing a nationally agreed competency assessment tool, to be used in assessing undergraduate nursing students across Australia. Rose would commit one day per week to the project recognising that there are variations in the workload.

**A/Prof Richard Ladyshewsky** [MedRehab, MHSc, PhD, AFAIM, FHERDSA] teaches in the area of leadership and management in the Graduate School of Business at Curtin University of Technology in both the Master of Business Administration and Master of Leadership and Management Courses. Richard is a Fellow of the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australia, an Associate Fellow of the Australian Institute of Management as well as a member of the Australian New Zealand Academy of Management and the International Positive Psychology Association. He was a Fieldwork Coordinator in Canada for four years and in Western Australia for 4 years. He has been running professional development programs for fieldworks supervisors in clinical settings locally, Nationally and Internationally for many years. He has experience in several ALTC leadership grants: Building Academic Leadership Capability at the Course Level: Developing Course Coordinators as Academic Leaders (Project Team); Academic Leadership Development within the University Sector by Dissemination of a web-based 360 degree feedback process and related professional development workshops (Co-leader); and Improving the Leadership Capability of Academic Coordinators in Postgraduate and Undergraduate Programs in Business (Vilkinas et al 2009) (Support person). This latter project, in which Richard is a support person, is currently underway and scheduled to be completed by mid 2010. This project would thus be ramping down while the project in this proposal is just starting. Richard would commit the equivalent of 0.5 day per week to the project recognising that there are peaks and troughs in the workload.

**Dr Megan Smith** [PhD, MAAppSc, GCUTL, BAppSc(Physio)] is the Sub Dean of Professional Placements in the Faculty of Science at Charles Sturt University. She chairs the University Clinical Excellence Committee and Faculty of Science Professional placements committee. She was the inaugural fieldwork placement coordinator for the Bachelor of Physiotherapy at CSU and held this role for 7
years before taking on the role of course coordinator. She has been a key member of the project team preparing the CSU AUQA portfolio with the theme of professional education and practice-based learning. She has been involved in developing and providing professional development for fieldwork educators working in clinical settings. She is a member of the University Teaching and Learning Committee. Megan would commit on average 1 day per fortnight to this project.

Dr Franziska Trede [PhD, MHPEd] has extensive experience as a clinical educator, academic fieldwork coordinator (University of Sydney) and is currently Senior Lecturer at the Education for Practice Institute at Charles Sturt University. She coordinates the research portfolio of this institute and a grant scheme to enhance the scholarship of fieldwork education at CSU. Franziska conducted a project to profile fieldwork education programs at CSU, is a strategic member of the CSU AUQA taskforce, and is currently facilitating a university-wide online education for practice debate which provides fieldwork coordinators with an opportunity to share and critically reflect on what is working in fieldwork education and what isn’t and to further their understanding of self, their workplace, and what interests and motivations influence this understanding to improve practices. Franziska would commit on average 1 day per fortnight to this project.

Institutional project sponsor

Professor Robyn Quin, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), Curtin University of Technology

Professor Ross Chambers, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Charles Sturt University
# Budget (Attachment 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Budget Year 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALTC</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>ALTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL (incl 28% oncosts)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager (0.5 ALB6 @ $84 132 + oncosts)</td>
<td>53845</td>
<td>53845</td>
<td>53845</td>
<td>53845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin support for organising/conducting workshops CSU</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leader time release (Jones 0.2 ALC6)</td>
<td>25617</td>
<td>25617</td>
<td>25617</td>
<td>25617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leader time release (Chapman 0.1 ALC6)</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leader time release (Ladyshewsky 0.1 ALD2)</td>
<td>15450</td>
<td>15450</td>
<td>15450</td>
<td>15450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leader time release (Smith 0.1 ALC6)</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
<td>12809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leader time release (Trede 0.1 ALB6)</td>
<td>10769</td>
<td>10769</td>
<td>10769</td>
<td>10769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant to develop modules</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>7000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Evaluation Consultant</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>3500</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>6500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>80345</td>
<td>77454</td>
<td>154799</td>
<td>79345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project team management meeting travel</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project team teleconferences</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reference Group teleconferences</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager consumables, office costs</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Leaders consumables/office costs</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>5700</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>8700</td>
<td>5700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Ladyshewsky travel to support CSU workshops</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (room hire, meeting support, refreshments)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9000</td>
<td>9000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External evaluator travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10500</td>
<td>10500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTENDANCE AT ALTC EVENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONAL OVERHEAD LEVY @ 10%</strong></td>
<td>9105</td>
<td>8805</td>
<td>9855</td>
<td>9255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub total</strong></td>
<td>9105</td>
<td>8805</td>
<td>9855</td>
<td>9255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100150</td>
<td>80454</td>
<td>180604</td>
<td>108400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALTC</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>208550</td>
<td>160908</td>
<td>369458</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 July 2009

A/Prof Peter Hutchings
Programs Director
Australian Learning and Teaching Council
PO Box 2375
STRAWBERRY HILLS NSW 2012

Dear Associate Professor Hutchings

RE: Leadership Grant Full Proposal: LE9-1234 – Building Leadership Capacity for Work Integrated Learning: Developing Fieldwork Coordinators as Academic Leaders

The aim of this project, which will be conducted collaboratively with partners at Charles Sturt University, is to design and implement an academic leadership development program for Fieldwork Coordinators from a wide variety of disciplines which enhances their leadership capabilities. This will enable them to improve fieldwork quality through appropriate pedagogy and management. By doing so, an expected outcome is to strengthen peer and industry relationships, reduce risks for all parties and ultimately improve the students’ experience of learning. The project will address some of the priority actions identified in a recent ALTC Grant by Patrick et al (2009) in enhancing work integrated learning through: (i) creating a professional development approach to WIL; and (ii) developing and implementing a WIL leadership program at the institutional level to build staff capacity and capability in WIL.

The project has strong alignment with Curtin’s Teaching and Learning Enabling Plan 2009-2013 where strengthening fieldwork and the role of the Fieldwork Coordinator has been identified as being very important. The project supports the capacity to provide high quality learning experiences for students in a large proportion of Curtin’s courses which include fieldwork, many of which lead to professional qualifications.

The project outcomes are likely to have a significant impact on the sector given the national focus on work integrated learning. Maintaining and enhancing industry partnerships to deliver successful fieldwork is critical to the success and quality of courses, and Fieldwork Coordinators fulfil a key leadership role in this regard.

I am very pleased to endorse Curtin’s involvement in this project and look forward to the outcome of the project and the collaboration.

Yours sincerely

Robyn Quin
Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education)
24 June 2009

Dr Elizabeth MacDonald
ALTC Programs Director
The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education
PO Box 2375
Strawberry Hills NSW 2012

Dear Dr MacDonald

ALTC Full Proposal Building Leadership Capacity for Work Integrated Learning: Developing Fieldwork Coordinators as Academic Leaders
Sue Jones, Dr Rose Chapman, A/Prof Richard Ladyshewsky, Dr Megan Smith, and Dr Franziska Trede.

This project aims to develop and implement an academic leadership program for fieldwork coordinators. This project will be undertaken as a collaborative project between Charles Sturt University and Curtin University.

Charles Sturt University has as its vision to be a national university for excellence in education for the professions. In its strategic planning the university aims to provide distinctive educational programs for the professions that are recognised by, and developed in collaboration with, the professions particularly through fieldwork placements. In 2007 CSU established the Education for Practice Institute to strategically progress its goals in this area. The proposed project is well aligned with the priorities at CSU through its ability to result in quality learning environments, partnerships with professions and to build institutional strength through developing and supporting staff.

The outcomes of this project can be expected to have a positive impact on the sector. Fieldwork education is an integral component of professional education. Industry partnerships are dependent on relationships with key personnel in universities and providing consistent levels of leadership across the sector is important.

The collaboration between Charles Sturt University and Curtin University has the potential to be very positive. The project team have a demonstrated commitment to fieldwork and substantial experience in this area.

I am pleased to endorse Charles Sturt University’s involvement in this project.

Yours sincerely,

(Professor) Ross Chambers
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Leadership Project Planning Checklist

Leadership projects in the context of the Leadership Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program focus on the development of leadership capacity. The ALTC favours approaches that are distributed and multi-level. The ALTC sees a need to recognise that leadership in learning and teaching takes many forms. In some forms leadership is defined formally and is encapsulated in the position title and description. At the same time, many people have roles which are critical to quality learning and teaching, and within which leadership is more context-dependent and may not be formally defined. The ALTC also sees a need to recognise that, within this multi-level concept, there must be cross-level teamwork and integration of the levels in order to get the best out of all.

Have you read the two occasional papers: *Ideas of leadership underpinning proposals to the Carrick Institute and Issues in the development of leadership for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education* found on the ALTC website?

Have you checked the leadership projects already commissioned and identified how your project complements or builds on these—see *Grants Scheme Project Summaries* on the website?

Have you clearly articulated your understanding of ‘leadership’ and its relationship to the learning and teaching aspects of your proposal in your theoretical framework?

Have you the expertise in the type of research methodology that underpins your project?

If the project team does not have expertise in this research methodology, have you determined where you could gain support from within your university or elsewhere to ensure a robust methodological design and approach?

If your team does not have expertise in the research methodology underpinning your project, have you planned to include someone on your Project Reference Group/Steering Committee with that expertise?

Have you considered whether ethics approval will be necessary and for what components and at what stages?

Is there a carefully thought through project management strategy in your proposal?

If your project involves collaboration, is there a plan for how the collaboration will be managed?

Have you demonstrated in your proposal how you have addressed the above points?