Highlights of May Board Meeting

1. Senior Leadership and Academy Organisational Structure

The Board discussed the scenarios that might eventuate as the other colleges join the reforms. Having both mixed and separate campuses in the different regions of the state remains a possibility, especially in the two major urban areas. Some campuses will remain shared and the nature of a ‘shared campus’ that houses both Polytechnic and Academy students requires different leadership responses and organisation to address all students’ needs.

The Board affirmed the campus-based leadership model with a smaller state-wide executive providing support. It was felt that having the leadership as close to the learner as possible would lead to better outcomes.

The Board also approved the number and type of positions in the structure and this will be formally communicated to all teachers by the beginning of Term 2.

2. Libraries and E-Learning

Both are unresolved transition issues in terms of who has leadership responsibility for libraries, and how we will separate the two flexible learning models we have inherited. A project group of both Polytechnic and Academy staff will be asked to investigate student use of the libraries on shared campuses to gauge patterns of use. This will be used to inform the policy decisions about libraries. The college flexible learning consortium will need to continue until all colleges are in and the Board endorsed this view. How we separate the very different flexible learning cohorts without disadvantaging potential students was discussed. Having an eighteen month lead time to ensure a smooth transition was felt to be an advantage.

3. Marketing Approaches

The Board received an evaluation of the TV campaign run in the summer. The broad conclusion of the evaluation was that it had an impact on the target demographic in terms of:

- Knowing about the changes
- Recognising the different organisations
- Knowing what each organisation has to offer.

It is unlikely that the Academy Board will approve running the campaign again given the cost. The Board also asked if they could have an evaluation of the UTAS ‘Red Door’ campaign for the next meeting. There was a view that there might be good synergies in working with the University as part of the overall campaign.

The Board discussed the fine line between advertising for competitive advantage and presenting accurate information to potential students. It was agreed that we did not want to compete for enrolments with the Polytechnic but rather work collaboratively to counsel students on appropriate pathways.