

1 Introduction

This paper outlines progress made by Moore Theological College (the College) in addressing matters raised in [Report of an Audit of Moore Theological College](#) by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) (Sep, 2008).

2 Background

1. AUQA conducted its audit of the College on 30th and 31st July 2008 and its Audit Report was published on 24th September 2008.
2. In a [letter dated 23rd October 2008](#) the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) requested 'advice as to how MTC proposes to address the affirmations and recommendations (of the AUQA Audit Report of September 2008), particularly those designated urgent, by Wednesday 17 December 2008'.
3. On 8th December 2008 the College's Board of Studies approved a [Plan to Address AUQA Audit Report Affirmations and Recommendations](#) and submitted it to DEEWR on 10th December 2008.
4. DEEWR's [letter of 22nd December 2008](#) in response to the foregoing plan included the following:

'Because of the overall positive tone of the original audit report and because of the prompt action taken by Moore in addressing the report's affirmations and recommendations, the Minister will not be imposing an additional requirement on Moore to implement specified recommendations from the audit report. This is on the understanding that the actions outlined in the Response Plan take place as planned.'

5. The report which follows details actions taken to address each recommendation and affirmation separately. These actions have been taken in the context of MTC's overall program of quality improvement in preparation for an application in 2010 for self-accrediting authority.
6. The Governing Board (GB) of the College approved the report on 29th September 2009 for submission to DEEWR with copy to AUQA in terms of the guidelines in Section 10.2 (p.55) of *AUQA Audit Manual v6.0* (March 2009).¹ That report has been updated with a note on further progress set out below under each *recommendation and affirmation*.

3 Recommendation 1

(urgent) AUQA recommends that the College review and strengthen its approach to strategic planning to ensure effective penetration, clearer accountability and better commitment at the operational level and to provide clearer linkages between its Mission, Values and Objectives and the strategies and KPIs for realising the Mission.

1. Initial response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. *The discipline of an annual update of a rolling three-year Strategic Plan has now been in place since 2004. That plan sets out strategies and targets for each of nine formal College objectives. The College Objectives provide the link between the strategic Plan and operational plans and budgets for each department set out in the Annual Plan.*
 - 1.2. *The time is now right to move from a centrally developed Strategic Plan to an annual strategic planning workshop, involving the Principal and all Department Heads, to drive a 'down-up-down' process of consultation and empowerment. The first such workshop is set down for February 2009. Learning from benchmarking will be incorporated and the Strategic Plan will be confined to top level objectives and directional strategies. Accountability for strategies and targets will be allocated within a modified Annual Plan organised according to the structural units of the College.*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Recommendation (as reported on 29th September 2009):

A revised approach has been taken to strategic planning culminating in adoption of the *Strategic Plan 2010 – 2012* by the Governing Board on 18th August 2009. A 'down-up-down' approach is employed involving:

 - 2.1. Formal consultation (during November 2008 to January 2009) with a range of stakeholders

¹ 'Approximately one year after receiving the audit report (or such other time as advised by DEEWR), the auditee writes a post-audit progress report ...'

(including graduates, employers, faculty, staff and students).

- 2.2. Strategic Planning Workshop on 13th February 2009 (involving Department Heads and key external stakeholders) – to identify strategic challenges.
- 2.3. Circulation among Department Heads of 'Options' papers for responses to identified strategic challenges.
- 2.4. Faculty consultation on 13th March 2009 to explore responses to strategic challenges.
- 2.5. Formulation, in consultation with Department Heads, of revised 'Long Term Goals' and identification of the accountable person for each goal, to replace previous 'College Objectives'. In the course of formulation of these goals a gap in the College planning framework was identified. As a result a new *Community Engagement Plan 2009 – 2011* was prepared and approved by the GB on 19th May 2009.
- 2.6. Formulation of strategic initiatives to address identified strategic challenges.
- 2.7. Development of three-year business plan to support the strategic initiatives.
- 2.8. Review of draft Strategic Plan by Department Heads prior to endorsement by Board of Studies on 24th July 2009 and adoption by GB on 18th August 2009.
- 2.9. Update of *Learning and Teaching Plan* and *Faculty Research and Scholarship Development Plan* to reflect revised long term goals and benchmark-based learning and to complement the above-mentioned strategic initiatives.
- 2.10. Next steps include the following for adoption of the GB in November 2009:
 - 2.10.1. Preparation of Annual Plan (and budget) 2010 within the parameters of the approved *Strategic Plan 2010 – 2012* by those accountable for each Long Term Goal in consultation with Department Heads.
 - 2.10.2. A review of the *Risk Management Plan* by the Compliance Committee of the GB.

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

- 3.1. Action has been taken as per plan (see Section 3.2.10, above);
- 3.2. Review of Risk Management Plan adjusted priorities for risk treatment plans and commenced adaptation of plan to incorporate ISO31000:2009.

4 Recommendation 2:

AUQA recommends that MTC review the Key Performance Indicators it uses, possibly increase their number and assign them to individuals, and also more explicitly use these indicators to measure and review performance.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. *The current Strategic Plan identifies nine Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) from a total of 43 performance indicators spread across the nine College Objectives. Outcomes are formally analysed at the end of each year using all 43 performance indicators. This analysis is documented in the Annual Performance Review which is examined by the Board of Studies at its meeting at the start of Term 1 in the following year. Where appropriate improvement projects are commissioned and adjustments to strategies recommended to the Governing Board. The changes are then reflected in the ensuing version of the rolling three-year Strategic Plan which is adopted by the Governing Board at its August meeting.*
 - 1.2. *As part of the planned revised approach to strategic planning (see par. 3.1.2, above) the choice and number of KPIs will be reviewed. They will be mapped against AUQA's suggested 'key items of concern',² linked to individual accountabilities and the frequency of review will be revisited to ensure fitness for purpose.*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Recommendation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
 - 2.1. A revised set of 30 KPIs was approved by the GB on 18th August 2009 as part of adoption of the *Strategic Plan 2010 – 2012* (see Section 10). In addition, where appropriate, benchmarks based on Australian university averages have been identified. Sources considered in the development of the revised set included:

² The five areas are: teaching and learning, research and scholarship, community engagement, support services and finances - see *Report of an Audit of Moore Theological College*, Melbourne: AUQA, September 2008, p. 8.
MTC – AUQA Audit Progress Report Approved 29th September 2009/Updated 15th February 2011 Page 2

- 2.1.1. Approaches in use by Benchmarking partners (see Affirmation 4, below);
 - 2.1.2. The 67 indicators set out in *Benchmarking: A Manual for Australian Universities* (DEST, 2000);
 - 2.1.3. The five 'key items of concern ... (which) do not vary greatly from institution to institution' (AUQA Report, Sep 2008, p. 8);
 - 2.1.4. The DEST list of 'Outcome Performance Indicators' as reviewed by Access Economics in 2005; and
 - 2.1.5. The Quality Audit Factors (QAFs) set out in DEEWR's *Audit Handbook for Non Self-Accrediting Higher Education Providers* (March 2008).
- 2.2. The resultant KPIs are grouped under the (nine) Long Term Goals within the Strategic Plan. In the light of the small size of the College, and to avoid fragmentation and consequent lack of focus, accountability has been allocated at the Long Term Goal level, rather than at the individual KPI level. As part of ongoing governance development plans it is intended to implement a schedule for *monitoring* performance (as distinct from *reviewing* performance) whereby a frequency of reporting (each month, semester or year) will be allocated to each KPI.
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
- 3.1. A revised schedule for monitoring performance against KPIs grouped under long-term goals (as per Section 4.2.2, above) is now in use by the Governing Board.

5 Recommendation 3:

AUQA recommends that MTC pay particular attention to improving turnaround time and the quality of feedback to students on the work they submit, in particular at first year level.

- 1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. Student concerns re quality and quantity of feedback have been identified through SCEQ responses in past years. In response to the 2007 SCEQ results, work was undertaken to upgrade standard templates for each subject area for use in setting out feedback to students. The 'broad agreement' responses to the relevant SCEQ questions for Year 1 students (those highlighted by AUQA) are:

SCEQ Question	2007	2008
The lecturers normally give me helpful feedback on how I am going	41	54
Feedback on my work is usually provided only in the form of marks or grades	83	57
The lecturers put a lot of time into commenting on my work	28	58

- 1.1. Improvements to quality of feedback on assessments planned for 2009 include:
 - 1.1.1. Further development of feedback templates aligned with assessment criteria;
 - 1.1.2. Use of on-screen comments in connection with the roll-out of electronic submission of assessments; and
 - 1.1.3. Greater use of self-assessment as part of on-line formative assessments.
- 1.2. Hitherto the College has aimed at six weeks from the date of submission as a normal time for return of feedback on assessments to students. In response to the AUQA comment, and with a view to maintaining a balance between quality and timeliness of feedback, work is underway to develop mechanisms for increased productivity in marking of assessments in order to move to a four-week guideline by mid-2009.
- 2. Action taken to address AUQA Recommendation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
 - 2.1. So far in the 2009 academic year 41 different assignment items, involving some 1613 individual pieces of student work, have been marked and returned to students. For those items the average time to mark and prepare feedback for students has been 23.9 days (i.e. three weeks and three days). Innovations to improve productivity in marking and quality of feedback include on-screen marking of electronically submitted items.
 - 2.2. In excess of half of all assessment items may now be submitted electronically. For each of these, standard templates for examiners' comments (aligned with published grade-guides)

are in use with markers' reports (a written report in a prescribed format by the marker(s) of each assessment item) normally available on-line.

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

- 3.1. Most assessment items (except examinations) are now submitted electronically and marked 'on-screen';
- 3.2. Unit-specific feedback templates based on grade-guides are in use for most assessments;
- 3.3. Grade guides are available to all students via Learning Support System (LSS);
- 3.4. Completed feedback forms and annotated assessment scripts are now provided to students electronically;
- 3.5. Prior year examiners' comments for all units are available to students via LSS; and
- 3.6. Improvements in average turnaround time for feedback achieved in 2009 have not been maintained in 2010. However, turnaround time for four (out of a total of 52) assessment items in 2010 was more than twice the overall average turnaround time. When those four assessments are excluded from figures the average turnaround time for 2010 was the same as for the improved 2009 average. Work is continuing to diagnose and remedy the causes of delays beyond the four week turnaround target.

6 Affirmation 1:

AUQA affirms MTC's consideration of alternative, more flexible modes of teaching and learning with attention to class size and appropriate use of technology.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:

1.1. Delivery methods currently in use include:

- 1.1.1. Lectures (with audiovisual and printed materials);
- 1.1.2. Class discussion and debates (involving a range of student and teacher roles);
- 1.1.3. Video presentations followed by discussion;
- 1.1.4. A range of intensives over 3-12 days during lecture-free periods, especially in languages and pastoral ministry areas;
- 1.1.5. Tutorials (small group work guided by a tutor);
- 1.1.6. Case studies (a specific problem and its treatment—as displayed in the history of the discipline concerned—worked through by the class);
- 1.1.7. Seminars (smaller group work including the presentation of student papers and discussion guided by the seminar leader/s);
- 1.1.8. Student-run workshops and skills training groups; and
- 1.1.9. On-line moderated forums, self-paced formative assessment items.

1.2. In 2008 some 75 separate coursework classes were offered during the course of the academic year. Of these approx 20% involved class sizes of 75 or more, 40% involved classes less than 30 and 40% involved class sizes of between 30 and 75. Of the total of 75 classes about 20% were by intensive with the remainder involving weekly face-to-face contact for either one or two semesters.

1.3. Improvements planned in 2009 include:

- 1.3.1. Conduct of trials and investigation of viability of offering part-time study in undergraduate courses;
- 1.3.2. Continued roll-out of learning functions using the College's internet-based Learning Support System (LSS); and
- 1.3.3. Investment in additional resources to facilitate exploitation by lecturers of the LSS – see response to Affirmation 2 (below).

2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):

- 2.1.1. Introduction of part-time study (with a choice between day and evening lectures) for all diploma courses and Year 1 of degree courses commencing in Semester 1, 2010 announced on 1st September 2009.

- 2.1.2. On-line submission of assessments available for over 50% of the (79) coursework units offered in 2009.
- 2.1.3. On-line access provided (within copyright limitations) to set reading for all coursework units offered.
- 2.1.4. For the 79 coursework units on offer in 2009 average class size is 32, with the following distribution

Class Size	Frequency
1-10	26
11-20	9
21-30	12
31-40	11
41-50	2
51-60	2
61-70	1
71-80	11
81-90	5

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

- 3.1. Part-time study has been offered in 2010 as per Section 6.2.1.1 (above);
- 3.2. On-line submission of assessments is now required for all assessments;
- 3.3. Use of self-assessment as part of the use of on-line formative assessments has been trialed for some units of study in 2010; and
- 3.4. Forums, essay wikis and other on-line learning aids were introduced in some units in 2010.

7 Affirmation 2:

AUQA affirms MTC's support of faculty in the use of technology to improve teaching and learning, for example through the electronic submission of student work.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
- 1.1. *The LSS has been in use for two years with currently a full-time equivalent (FTE) of approximately one person supporting faculty and student exploitation of its facilities. A pilot of electronic submission of student work and on-screen marking is nearing completion.*
- 1.2. *Plans for improvements in 2009 include:*
- 1.2.1. *A doubling of resources to support student and faculty exploitation of LSS;*
- 1.2.2. *Further review of cost-benefits of electronic plagiarism detection;*
- 1.2.3. *Roll-out of electronic submission of student work; and*
- 1.2.4. *Continued roll-out of learning functions based on LSS (see Affirmation 1, above).*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
- 2.1. Resources supporting student and faculty exploitation of LSS increased to FTE of 1.6 commencing 1st May 2009;
- 2.2. On-screen marking of electronically submitted items introduced at start of 2009 academic year;
- 2.3. On-screen preparation of chaplains' feedback to ordination candidates;
- 2.4. Provision of all timetable and calendar information via LSS;
- 2.5. LSS-based forums, discussion groups and bulletin boards etc. for pastoral care groups; and
- 2.6. As per par. 6.2.1.2 & 3 (above).
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
- 3.1. All assessments are now submitted electronically;
- 3.2. On-screen marking of electronically submitted assessments is normal practice;

- 3.3. The effectiveness of *Turn-It-In* for automatic plagiarism detection continues to be monitored. However, theology is still not strongly supported in its bibliographic database. Accordingly it remains an unattractive solution to an infrequently occurring problem.

8 Affirmation 3:

AUQA affirms MTC's continued vigilance in ensuring that overall workloads for students and for faculty remain manageable.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. Student workload has been under regular review since 1992 when the main undergraduate degree, the BD, was first accredited. Prior to each accreditation review (1992, 1996, 2001 & 2006) benchmarking has been undertaken. As part of this student demand hours were reduced by 30% and contact hours reduced by 25% in 2006. The resultant change in SCEQ Appropriate Workload Scale (AWS) was from 18% to 43% 'broad agreement'. At present demand hours for the four-year BD total just on 4,600 which compares favourably with practice among university and other relevant peer institutions of 4,800 hours. Despite an SCEQ Overall Satisfaction Indicator (OSI) of at least 95% 'broad agreement' for each of the last three years and progressive adjustment of assessment loads the AWS result for 2007 was 36% and in 2008 was 25% 'broad agreement'.
 - 1.2. Improvements planned during 2009 include:
 - 1.2.1. Introduction, based on benchmarking, of an upgraded faculty workload policy involving a normal load of 1,800 hours per year and factoring in a study leave policy allowing for six months study leave to be taken in the calendar year after three calendar years of full-time teaching;
 - 1.2.2. Consideration, within the context of a review of the BD, of semesterisation for years one to three of all undergraduate courses with a maximum of five units per semester for all courses;
 - 1.2.3. Consideration of a credit point system for all courses to facilitate easier comparison of workload in other courses;
 - 1.2.4. Reduction for first year students of the number of units in which they are required to enroll in one semester;
 - 1.2.5. Implementation of the results of a shortly-to-conclude review of assessment policies with a view to further adjustment of student workload.
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
 - 2.1. A new faculty workload policy was approved by Board of Studies on 8th May 2009.
 - 2.2. A credit point system, based on one credit point per 24 demand hours, was approved for all undergraduate courses by Board of Studies on 24th July 2009. Within this system unit workloads presently vary between three and 10 credit points (with Year 4 Research Project worth 12 credit points). Total workload for (four-year) BD is 198 credit points spread as follows:
 - 2.2.1. Year 1 – 52 credit points;
 - 2.2.2. Year 2 – 50 credit points;
 - 2.2.3. Year 3 – 48 credit points; and
 - 2.2.4. Year 4 – 48 credit points.
 - 2.3. Semesterisation of Year 1 units approved by Board of Studies on 24th July 2009. Year 4 units (with the exception of New Testament 4 and Old Testament 4 Hebrew) have been semesterised since 1995. The Board of Studies does not presently accept that semesterisation of Old Testament 2, 3 & 4, New Testament 2, 3 & 4, Doctrine 2 & 3, Church History 2 or Ethics 3 will improve achievement of desired graduate attributes. However, in Years 2 & 3 assessments for some units are 'semesterised' in that outcomes are assessed in the semester in which learning occurs.
 - 2.4. On 24th July 2009 the Board of Studies agreed that, commencing in 2010, the number of units per semester in which students are required to enrol is to be six in each of Years 1 & 2, five in Year 3 and four in Year 4. Given the priority of the study of the Bible and its original languages in the (four-year) course the Board of Studies presently believes that it is

pedagogically inappropriate to seek to achieve the course outcomes with less units being studied at a time.

2.5. A revised assessment policy was approved by the Board of Studies on 24th July 2009. It is being introduced at the start of 2010. It limits the total number of assessments within the (four-year) course of 35 units to an average of two per unit.

2.6. A revised approach to set reading requirements for all coursework units (aimed at containing student workload) was approved by the Board of Studies on 24th July 2009.

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

3.1. All of the foregoing decisions have been implemented in 2010 including a reduction by approximately 20% in the number and length of assessments for undergraduate courses;

3.2. 'Broad Agreement' figure for SCEQ AWS improved in 2010 to 57% (from 33% in 2009);

3.3. Combined 'Broad Agreement' figure for the Unit of Study Evaluation question 'The workload in this unit of study was too high' (inverted) for the 11 units evaluated in 2010 was 94.5%; and

3.4. Following successful trials for the past two years the hitherto separate processes for annual reviews of faculty workload and faculty annual personal and ministry (performance) reviews are to be merged in 2011.

9 Affirmation 4:

(urgent) AUQA affirms that MTC pursue the finalisation of arrangements for and implementation of benchmarking for selected relevant College processes and activities.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:

1.1. *The College has implemented benchmarking memoranda of understanding (MoU) with one HEP and a member of a consortium which is a HEP. Negotiations are near final for another HEP and have started with another member of a consortium which is a HEP. The planned next step is to approach a consortium which is a HEP. The foregoing arrangements have produced meaningful outcomes in the areas of governance, approval and review of courses, teaching and learning outcomes, level of scholarly activity, community engagement, support services and finances.*

1.2. *Improvements planned during 2009 include:*

1.2.1. *To accept an invitation to join the Council of Deans of Theology (formerly the Committee of Deans of Theological Consortia and University Departments). Its purpose statement includes: 'to promote and disseminate best practice within member institutions and provide support in matters relating to staffing practice' and 'to develop and maintain commonality of standards across the theological education sector'. The body involves both public and private sector providers, self-accrediting and non self-accrediting providers and large and small providers. The College anticipates significant opportunities within this body to identify meaningful benchmarking projects.*

1.2.2. *To reach agreement with benchmarking partners on and commence action on specific projects in the area of processes (including departmental review and course review) and functions (including admissions, staff recruitment and staff development).*

2. Actions taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):

2.1. On 27th May 2009, the Council of Deans of Theology approved the membership of the Principal.

2.2. The current status of memoranda of understanding with benchmarking partners is as follows:

2.2.1. Avondale College – agreed 18th May 2008;

2.2.2. Australian Lutheran College – agreed 17th December 2008;

2.2.3. Ridley College Melbourne – agreed 1st July 2009;

2.2.4. Sydney College of Divinity – under negotiation.

2.3. Processes benchmarked against other relevant providers include:

2.3.1. Faculty and staff grievance resolution policy;

2.3.2. Faculty workload policy;

- 2.3.3. Academic promotions policy;
- 2.3.4. Student code of practice;
- 2.3.5. Faculty code of practice;
- 2.3.6. Faculty development policy; and
- 2.3.7. Staff Development and Contribution Acknowledgement Policy.

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

- 3.1. A benchmarking MoU has been signed with Sydney College of Divinity;
- 3.2. Benchmarks have been adopted for most KPIs;
- 3.3. Processes as per Section 9.2.3 (above) have been finalised; and
- 3.4. The College participated in the 2010 ALTC-funded project (a partnership between Curtin University, RMIT University, University of Southern Queensland and Victoria University) which benchmarked Graduate Employability Indicators.

10 Affirmation 5:

AUQA affirms MTC's plans to review committees and functions that are part of and support the quality framework.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:

- 1.1. *Completion of reviews of assessment policies and practices and of the Finance Department is imminent.*
- 1.2. *A process and a program are in place for the review of the effectiveness of each academic department. This program has been held in abeyance to allow concentration on establishing a best practice course review process given that that is perceived to be a critical success factor in the College's planned application for self-accrediting status. With a review of the BD course set down for 2009 it is planned to re-activate the academic department review program in 2010.*
- 1.3. *The composition and mandate of the Board of Studies and of Academic Departments is presently undergoing revision.*
- 1.4. *The Governing Board agreed at its October meeting to undertake a review of its functioning and effectiveness. This review is scheduled to take place in first calendar quarter 2009.*
- 1.5. *A review of the functioning and effectiveness of the Board of Studies is planned for second calendar half 2009.*

2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):

- 2.1. A revision of the constitution of the College (known as the Moore Theological College Council Ordinance – an ordinance of the Diocese of Sydney under the Anglican Church Bodies Corporate Act (1938)) was approved by the GB on 15th September 2009 for submission to the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney for consideration at its October 2009 session. The revision includes amended objects to more appropriately express the essential higher education purpose of the College, clarification of the duties of GB members and a reduction in size of the GB.
- 2.2. On 23rd June 2009 the Board of Studies adopted a revised brief for itself and Academic Departments aimed at devolution of appropriate functions to Academic Departments and asked Acting Academic Dean to bring recommendations for improving the efficiency of the Board.
- 2.3. Course review process has been updated (to incorporate all factors included in Section 18 of the *National Guidelines for Higher Education Approval Processes*) and is in use in current review of the BD course.
- 2.4. GB members have completed an on-line self-assessment of performance prepared by the Australian Centre for Philanthropy and Non-profit Studies, Queensland University of Technology. The findings of that survey are to be reported with recommendations to the GB in November 2009 by its Compliance Committee.
- 2.5. Assessment of the performance of the Board of Studies has been postponed until 2010 on account of the recent adoption of a revised brief.

- 2.6. The findings of a review of the functioning of the Finance and Administration Department were reported to the GB on 16th September 2009 with the Bursar accountable for implementation of recommendations
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
- 3.1. Governing Board committees have been restructured arising from self-review (see Section 10.2.4, above);
- 3.2. Governing Board processes and policies have been upgraded to be fully compliant with National Governance Protocols;
- 3.3. A Board of Studies self-review was undertaken in 2010; and
- 3.4. A review of New Testament Department is planned for 2011.

11 Affirmation 6:

AUQA affirms that MTC give consideration to formalising some of the currently relatively informal approaches to several aspects of human resource management, such as: performance management of faculty and staff; study leave applications and reports; appointment processes of faculty and staff; professional development provisions; induction and continuing support for visiting lecturers; and the development of an Academic Promotions Policy.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
- 1.1. *At its meeting on 26th July 2008 the Board of Studies asked the Quality Improvement Steering Committee (QISC) to facilitate development and presentation to the Board of Studies meeting of 8th December 2008 of revisions of a number of policies, briefs and position descriptions including:*
- 1.1.1. *Guidelines for study leave applications; and*
- 1.1.2. *Guidelines for study leave reports.*
- 1.2. *A project was approved by the Board of Studies at its meeting on 26th September 2008 to upgrade a range of non-academic staff policies and practices including appointment processes, performance management practices and professional development provisions. That project is due to commence early 2009 with an organisational assessment aimed at identifying HR management issues warranting highest priority.*
- 1.3. *A proposal for a formal performance management policy and academic promotions policy has been prepared and is planned for consideration by the Board of studies at its February 2009 meeting.*
- 1.4. *A faculty recruitment and development policy is in place. In the light of AUQA's comments this is planned to be reviewed during 2009.*
- 1.5. *Faculty professional development provisions are in place. In the light of AUQA's comments they are planned to be reviewed during 2009.*
- 1.6. *Of the 12 visiting lecturers listed in the Student Handbook only seven are active in 2008 and all teach under the direct supervision of a course coordinator who is responsible for their induction and ongoing support. All except one are in full-time positions with other organisations which cater appropriately for professional development. Three teach modules within units lasting for up to a semester. All others teach modules within units which are typically two hours in length. In the light of AUQA's comments a policy in this area is planned to be developed in 2010.*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
- 2.1. The following improved processes were approved by the Board of Studies 23rd June 2009:
- 2.1.1. Position description of Academic Dean;
- 2.1.2. Position description for International Student Advisor;
- 2.1.3. Brief for Academic Departments;
- 2.1.4. Brief for Academic Department Heads;
- 2.1.5. Brief of Board of Examiners;
- 2.1.6. Brief of Course Coordinators;
- 2.1.7. Brief of Teaching & Learning Advisor(s);

- 2.1.8. Position description for Dean of Quality & Planning;
 - 2.1.9. Guidelines for study leave applications;
 - 2.1.10. Guidelines for study leave reports; and
 - 2.1.11. Staff employment policy.
- 2.2. In April 2009 an organisation assessment survey was conducted among all staff and faculty. In part the results are being used to prioritise greater formalisation of HR policies and processes.
- 2.3. Improved processes and policies currently in consultation phase of development include:
- 2.3.1. Faculty appointment and promotion process;
 - 2.3.2. Faculty development and review policy;
 - 2.3.3. Student code of practice;
 - 2.3.4. Faculty code of practice; and
 - 2.3.5. Staff Development and Contribution Acknowledgement Policy.
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
- 3.1. All improved policies and processes set out Section 11.2 (above) have been in use in 2010;
 - 3.2. All HR management processes were brought into compliance with Modern Awards legislation as at 1 January 2010; and
 - 3.3. Briefs of Academic Department and Department Heads were updated as a result of BoS Self-Review (see Section 10.3.3, above).

12 Affirmation 7:

AUQA affirms MTC's commitment to professional development in teaching and learning by supporting as many faculty and visiting lecturers as possible to undertake the Graduate Certificate in Teaching & Learning, or parts thereof.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
- 1.1. Provisions for professional development are detailed in the Faculty Handbook and overseen by the Vice Principal.
 - 1.2. Of the current seven visiting lecturers who are active (see par. 11.1.6, above) one functions as a half-time faculty member and is afforded the same professional development opportunities as full-time faculty members. Consistent with the College's philosophy of learning in community the other six account for just under 4% of the teaching capacity of the College. Accordingly, the College's reliance on this resource is not as significant as implied by the AUQA report.
 - 1.3. The College plans to continue to encourage faculty members to enrol in Sydney University's Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning by offering to pay tuition fees and to factor such enrolments into the workload plans of those concerned. The College does not accept that this kind of incentive is appropriate to visiting lecturers given the situation outlined in par. 11.1.6 and par. 12.1.2 (above).
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
- 2.1. On 23rd June 2009 the Board of Studies agreed to ask the Academic Dean to ensure that a goal of three faculty members with the Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) offered by the Institute of Teaching and Learning at the University of Sydney or an equivalent course is reached within five years.
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
- 3.1. One (of the current 22 FT faculty members holds a Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning). Two hold other tertiary qualifications in education.
 - 3.2. Two more full-time faculty members are to be enrolled in a Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning in 2012 (earlier enrolment was precluded by logistics of long service leave and study leave etc.).

13 Affirmation 8:

AUQA affirms MTC's plans and encourages its efforts to actively pursue better gender representation
MTC – AUQA Audit Progress Report Approved 29th September 2009/Updated 15th February 2011 Page 10

amongst faculty and visiting lecturers.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. *At present one full-time member of faculty is female, one visiting lecturer teaching 40% of a full-time load is female and six part-time visiting chaplains are female.*
 - 1.2. *In 2009 a second full-time female person will join the College faculty to head up the Centre for Women's Ministries. As well the number of part-time female visiting chaplains will rise to 18.*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):
 - 2.1. Commencing at the start of Semester 1, 2009, 14 part-time women chaplains spend half a day per week on campus.
 - 2.2. Effective 1st August 2009, the FTE of women lecturers is 2.6.
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
 - 3.1. *In 2010, of the 582 students enrolled 20.3% were female. Female faculty and tutors etc in 2010 have been 18.3% of full-time equivalent faculty.*

14 Affirmation 9:

AUQA affirms MTC's plans to increase IT support and encourages the College in its efforts to plan for IT governance and management.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. *At present IT support for teaching and learning (including Library services) amounts to a full-time equivalent of three (of whom two are professionals and one administrative). IT governance and management is the responsibility of the Bursar.*
 - 1.2. *Plans for 2009 include:*
 - 1.2.1. *A doubling of resources to support student and faculty exploitation of LSS (see Affirmation 2, above);*
 - 1.2.2. *An addition of one person to support the student information administration system; and*
 - 1.2.3. *Establishment of an IT steering committee to oversee investment in IT resources across the College.*
2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation
 - 2.1. See par. 7.2.1 (above)
 - 2.2. Resources supporting student administration system amount to FTE of 0.5.
 - 2.3. Proposal for formalisation of IT governance was considered by Quality Improvement Steering Committee on 23rd September 2009 and is now in consultation phase.
3. Update as at 30th November 2010:
 - 3.1. *The General Manager (additional position in 2nd quarter 2010) is now accountable for IT governance and planning;*
 - 3.2. *An on-line learning unit (introduction to learning New Testament Greek) involving additional IT resources is currently under development with pilot completed and evaluated;*
 - 3.3. *An automated records management system is under installation, also involving additional IT resources; and*
 - 3.4. *A corporate-wide approach is being taken to deployment of IT resources in accordance with overall corporate strategies (rather than department by department).*

15 Affirmation 10:

AUQA affirms MTC's view that the quality improvement framework is being inculcated across the institution through the activities of the Quality Improvement Steering Committee under the direction of the Board of Studies and Senior Management.

1. Initial Response to DEEWR on 10th December 2008:
 - 1.1. *The College's Quality Improvement Steering Committee (QISC) exists to ensure that, in the context of higher education, evidence-based, continuous quality improvement processes are*

intrinsic to the work of all faculty and staff and contribute tangible benefits to the core activity of the College (of preparing, through its academic, pastoral and service delivery activities, people to be mature, knowledgeable and faithful ministers of the gospel) consistent with its aims and values.

1.2. Plans to improve the extent to which the 'quality improvement framework is being inculcated across the institution ...' include:

1.2.1. At its meeting on 26th July 2008 the Board of Studies asked the Quality Improvement Steering Committee (QISC) to facilitate development and presentation to the Board of Studies meeting of 8th December 2008 of revisions of a number of policies, briefs and position descriptions. These revisions will have the effect of devolving significant authority from the Board of Studies to Academic Departments. As part of this, explicit responsibilities with respect to the quality improvement framework are being detailed within the briefs of all relevant entities. The entities involved include:

1.2.1.1. The Board of Studies;

1.2.1.2. The Academic Dean;

1.2.1.3. Academic Departments;

1.2.1.4. Heads of Academic Departments;

1.2.1.5. Course Coordinators;

1.2.1.6. The Registrar;

1.2.1.7. The Teaching & Learning Advisor(s);

1.2.1.8. The Dean of Quality & Planning;

1.2.2. At this stage it is planned to develop a plan in first half 2010 to phase out the roles of both the QISC and the Dean of Quality & Planning. This is part of embedding quality improvement in the responsibilities of faculty and staff and 'ensuring that quality is not seen as the responsibility of a small sub-group'.

2. Action taken to address AUQA Affirmation (as reported on 29th September 2009):

2.1. The foregoing plans are currently on track.

2.2. On 22nd September 2009 the QISC commenced a review of progress in its brief (see par. 15.1.1, above).

3. Update as at 30th November 2010:

3.1. In the light of progress in making evidence-driven continuous quality improvement intrinsic to the core activities of the College, plans are on track to phase out the transitional role of the Dean of Quality and Planning in 2011 and to revise the role of the Quality Improvement Steering Committee to focus on monitoring of quality improvement risk management, achievement of tangible benefits and quality improvement 'loop-closing' performance.

16 Conclusion

The GB believes that the AUQA Audit has been successful in that:

1. It reached significant conclusions;
2. It was based on solid evidence;
3. It has resulted in subsequent action; and
4. It received general agreement across the constituencies of the College that its conclusions were appropriate.

Alan N. Hohne

Dean of Quality & Planning

Moore Theological College, Tel.: 02 9577 9935, Email: Alan.Hohne@moore.edu.au