

Curriculum Architecture Town Hall

17 July 2018

Your Questions Answered

By Sean Brawley and Mariella Herberstein

We received 92 responses through POLLEV during the Curriculum Architecture Town Hall Meeting. Below are our responses to the considered questions provided by colleagues. We've de-identified the questions in the interests of privacy, and on occasion we received questions that were similar enough to be answered once, so we've combined those questions.

Question Topics

1. Conceptual	Q1-7	2
2. Course Design	Q8-34	4
3. Microcredentialing	Q35-36	8
4. Nomenclature	Q37	8
5. Procedural	Q38-54	8
6. Systems	Q54-59	11
7. Timing/Deadlines	Q60-71	11
8. Workload	Q72-73	13
9. Student Experience	Q74-78	13
10. Volume of Learning	Q79-80	14

1. Conceptual

1. Q. Will this actually address the challenges of declining student numbers in the short term? Aren't there more immediate factors like the closing train station, building sites, difficulty enrolling etc.? And what evidence have you gained in terms of the new structure being easier to follow and more attractive to new students, both international and domestic, and therefore will it mean more students coming to MQ just because of this change?

A. The University at this time faces a range of challenges including those raised above. As well as being driven by acute needs we do believe that the new Curriculum Architecture, through its provision of new course opportunities, will help address the challenges that we face. It should be noted that as part of the consultation process we held a number of consultations with current students representing their Faculties and the Student Representative Committee. The feedback from these meetings was very encouraging. Feedback from Macquarie International and Future Students has also been encouraging.

2. Q. The university needs to have products/courses that are responsive to what the market needs. This curriculum renewal only appears to rearrange the structure of what we have now (zones/majors/specialisation/concentrations), but have the fundamental issues been addressed? I.e. Whether we are offering courses/teaching content students actually want?

A. To provide the best opportunity to create new and attractive courses we had to do this foundational work around our curriculum architecture and supporting processes. Using this structure and designing new courses is a matter for Faculties through their usual collegial processes. We are aware that conversations of this nature have already begun.

3. Q. Framing the Futures notes the need to empower students as partners and co-creators in their formal learning. How exactly have students been partnered with and empowered in this work?

A. As noted above, we held a number of student consultations. Student representatives to Senate also participated in the various workshops. We are strong advocates of the notion of students as co-creators. We were unable to land our desired principle relating to students as co-creators through the creation of minors in the flexible zone. The interesting note about the feedback of colleagues relating to this principle was many colleagues were very supportive. It is an opportunity that we should continue to explore. We do think that the opportunities for students in the Flexible Zone and the new flexibility around double degrees do speak to our commitment to students as co-creators in their learning.

4. Q. This is a chance to do real program/course design. What ways would you suggest new courses really look at course learning outcomes and flow between units? Of course, workload and motivation are factors...

A. We believe that the curriculum architecture provides plenty of scope for the wisdom and imagination of academic staff to take flight. Further, we think there has been a lot of work undertaken across the campus in the last few years by colleagues in a range of courses that offer some best-practice ideas that can be shared. Cathy Rytmeister (Quality Assurance and Professional Development Lead, Learning Innovation Hub) is leading a project associated with the CA work to produce a document that will speak to L&T best practice. Further, we direct colleagues to the [Learning and Teaching White Paper, Learning for the Future](#). We advocate that colleagues think about programmatic approaches to course design discussed in the White Paper. We look forward to the collegial conversations that drive new and exciting courses at MQ.

5. Q. Have you had discussions with any employers? I am wondering about the maturity level of the generalist graduates if they have fewer senior units.

A. In the finalisation of the principles we did not speak specifically to employers. This said, we did engage with a range of materials related to employability and the current thinking of employers about what they want in graduates. The extant literature in this space is far from agreed. There is a wide variety of opinions expressed — the distinction between generalist and specialist degrees is but one example. Further, we do know that employers are very interested in generic capabilities like teamwork and communication. Of course, the success of our PACE program remains a core point of difference in our courses. Regarding “senior units”, we feel the minimum requirement allows us to maintain some flexibility in our courses but still allows students to undertake more senior units especially through their use of the flexible zone if they so desired.

6. Q. Generalist degree = 16 core units plus 8 flexible units. This new structure compared to the current set up of a Bachelor of Arts provides much less flexibility for our students. Have we engaged students on this change and do they prefer the less flexibility? And why are the generalist degrees less flexible than we currently offer?

A. We would challenge this interpretation of the structure of generalist degrees. It is up to colleagues in Faculties to decide how the core zone is structured in a generalist degree. The only mandated requirement is a major and that is the current situation. Further we argue that with the end of the People and Planet requirement and the creation of the 8 unit flexible zone that allows a student to explore across the university, we have provided greater opportunities for students. This said, we have left it for students to decide. We would also note that student representatives were VERY happy with the end of the P&P requirement and liked the new structure. We accept that we can't vouch that these student representatives represent all student opinion.

7. Q. Will student feedback on the proposed curriculum be disseminated alongside feedback from staff? This is arguably the bigger piece of the puzzle needed if we are being authentic in our examination of how to best develop and deliver a student-centred, student-engaged, and student-empowered curriculum.

As noted we asked student representatives for their opinions at the start of the process. A member of the governance team took notes at these meetings as an aide memoir and they were mainly to assist us with redrafting, and we recorded simple process questions from the student reps rather than it being a statement of record. Students also took the opportunity to complain about a number of current issues. We can observe the following from these notes:

1. Students liked the flexible zone student generated minor idea. As noted, staff did not and we have placed the idea in abeyance for the moment
2. Students liked the terminology especially the difference between majors and specialisations
3. Students liked the idea of the vertical double
4. Students liked that they could choose how they used their flexible zone, though some were concerned that without some level of direction/suggestion a student could be frozen by choice
5. Students liked the idea of blocking out incompatible units and this led to a general discussion on the need for a better eStudent system
6. Students believed a detailed communications plan would be required to inform students about the change. This feedback has helped with the preparatory work in this space.
7. Students liked the idea of self-selecting double degrees, calling it “fantastic”
8. Students were strong supporters of a conversion to a Weighted Average Mark-based system and were clearly well informed from their contact with students at other institutions, regarding its advantages over our current 7-point Grade Point Average.
9. Students were very supportive of end of P&P, calling it “a waste of money”

10. How can students help to drive these changes? Some lecturers seem more interested in their research.
11. How could new feedback approaches in FBE be used to help assist the change?
12. Mixed response from very positive to very negative on co-curricular modules. One student asked if there would be a conscientious objection option
13. Students liked that the flexible zone still allowed a double major
14. Concern that some current majors may be “padded”
15. Strong opposition to trimesters. Some support for the notion of a 6x6 model for micro-units (later withdrawn from principles).

Student representatives were actively encouraged to share the proposed architecture principles with their networks.

2. Course Design

8. Q. Are there still plans to allow interdisciplinary minors?

A. While we have put the original flexible zone idea in abeyance for the time being, the principles continue to permit colleagues to gain Senate approval for a dedicated minor that is not simply drawn from a major or specialisation. This would allow for the creation of transdisciplinary minors in the flexible zone.

9. Q. Could a second major be from any Major (not necessarily from the qualifying majors)?

A. A second major can only come from a major contained in the major schedule of the course. In the flexible zone a student can complete a minor from the units of any major or specialisation for which they are eligible to enrol.

10. Q. For a specialist degree will there be a recommended minimum number of flexible units, assuming there are no external requirements e.g. accreditation?

A. This is a decision for colleagues designing specialist courses. The principles do acknowledge that for reasons of accreditation or meeting learning outcomes, a course may have no flexible zone. This of course removes the attractiveness of this course for combining as a double because the discount is lost.

11. Q. How will the new structures accommodate undergrad 5000 level units that currently exist for Honours degrees?

A. The principles have been amended to acknowledge 5000 units. They simply now use the term “3000 level or above”.

12. Q. Are there any limits set on the number of specialist degrees a Faculty can offer? (I ask because in 'new curriculum' launched in 2010 there was a decisive shift away from specialist/named degrees.)

A. This is not a task of this project. We assume Faculties will have discussions about their course suite and the balance of specialist to generalist courses they may choose to offer.

13. Q. The overlap in the new double degrees is much smaller than currently allowed. Doesn't this reduce flexibility and options for students? Or would this just create problems for academic staff in deciding which units can be added to degrees at 2000 and 3000 level?

A. We feel the new principle around unit sharing when it comes to double degrees is a fair one and ensures that students choose double combinations that enhance the breadth of their experience.

14. Q. The university currently has an existing program for students who wish to create their own degree combination (Concurrent Degrees). Management of this program is extremely labour intensive; staff have to work out each student's change and restrict eStudent capabilities to manage a group of 50 students. With more flexibility for students to create their own combination, how are all the combinations/overlaps etc worked out?

A. The new curriculum management system will help us manage the double degree combinations. Because the double degree is simply bringing together the two core zones we believe this will be a much easier system to administer. Further, it provides the opportunity for greater student choice. And as we noted in the meeting, students only enrol in that concurrent option because they have no other choice.

15. Q. A specialised degree is already specialised content. Is there a need for concentrations and also to allow minors in a specialised degree? What value do you perceive this to add?

A. In our original proposal we did not include minors in specialist degrees. We did however receive responses from a number of colleagues that this may be a useful sequence of study component for this degree type, so they have been included. Concentrations are currently used in a number of courses across the sector. It is really for colleagues to decide if they see value in their utilisation.

16. Q. Why did the university abandon People and Planet units and how will students be encouraged to undertake study outside their field in the new structure?

A. We would refer colleagues back to the [L&T White Paper, Learning for the Future](#), which found P&P no longer fit for purpose. The problem was the university was unable to agree on an alternative. In the interim we have exempted an increasing number of programs and been compelled to save an increasing number of students who fell afoul of the requirement. We have witnessed overwhelming support from students and staff regarding the end of P&P. At the student workshops there were cheers at the possibility! Whether students decide to use their flexible zone to explore beyond the immediate discipline areas of the course will be a matter for them to decide. We will certainly be showing them how to take advantage of this opportunity if they so desire.

17. Q. As well as embedding indigenous connected curriculum, was there consideration given to embedding career education curriculum? E.g. practice-based curriculum principles.

A. Senate has recently been discussing practice-based learning. We would suggest that the CA is agnostic to pedagogical approaches within units/courses and that the CA is certainly robust enough to allow us to further explore such approaches.

18. Q. Can you explain how degrees have been simplified with this new structure? It appears that the learning outcomes have been reduced/simplified instead. I.e. Students need to undertake less to achieve the award.

A. We disagree with this characterisation. Indeed, for the first time all courses are required to have course level learning outcomes. We believe that a breadth and/or maturity requirement is an essential element in an MQ award. Of course, in a double degree the other degree's core zone performs that role.

19. Q. Will there be common themes across units, particularly capstone, addressing issues such as Employability?

A. This will be a matter for course authorities to decide. We will be providing some best practice examples that colleagues may consider. There is already an existing definition of the requirement of a capstone unit with a [guidance document on how to design a capstone unit](#).

20. Q. Some of the feedback we receive is not just about the structure but about the content, what is the plan with regards to reviewing unit content?

A. This is rightly a matter for course authorities. As previously discussed in other fora, the curriculum management system will support a new course lifecycle system and within that will be a dashboard system that will provide opportunities for such issues to be considered both within and outside course review. We believe that the new curriculum architecture provides an excellent opportunity for Departments and Faculties to review course and unit content.

21. Q. In generalist degrees, will there be specific level requirements? For instance, X units at 1000 level, X at 2000, etc.

A. Yes, there are - see the Principles (linked above) for discussion of the requirements for a course at 1000 and 3000 level.

22. Q. One rationale for the urgent Curriculum renewal was to address the fact that students and the University don't know when a student will qualify or what is outstanding, how have the principles addressed this issue?

A. We feel that the new structure does set clearer expectations around what students need to do to meet the requirements of their course. Confusing and complex rules (e.g. P&P) have been removed. Further, a new curriculum management system and student management system will allow us to better assist both our processes and students as they navigate their course.

23. Q. It seems BSc is going to be a specialist degree, given that this change is to ensure flexibility, wouldn't it be better to leave BSc and BA to be generalist degrees?

A. These are discussions for colleagues in the relevant Faculties who have the expertise to deliver the appropriate degree type for their students.

24. Q. Curriculum needs to be unambiguous. The main issues we face are with grey areas, exceptions to rules! Wasn't the purpose of this renewal to make it clearer and easier to follow?

A. We believe the new structure achieves this goal and this is supported by many discussions we had with colleagues.

25. Q. With the new introduction of the new indigenous material, is this a stand-alone unit or embedded in every unit or at some stage in each course?

A. In the near future Senate will discuss this matter. At this time, it is our belief that either approach will be appropriate.

26. Q. Is there any decision on how much overlap in units is permissible between different majors and specializations?

A. Within a course we have not sought to be prescriptive. We have noted that a unit may meet the requirements of two sequences of study, but this will not lead to a discount (i.e. the student will still need to complete the requisite number of units for both sequences of study). We feel this is a simple approach from both a student navigation and a course administration perspective.

27. Q. Please explain the vertical double degree principles again

A. [These can be found at in this guidance document.](#)

28. Q. Will students receive proper academic advice? Removing proper face to face academic advice has contributed to so much previous confusion.

A. We are certainly of the belief that much of the “busy work” around academic advising will be removed with the arrival of a new curriculum management system and later student management system. This will hopefully free up colleagues to deal with issues of substance when they are advising students rather than answering navigation/compliance questions, which, we’re afraid, many of our colleagues often get wrong to the detriment of students.

29. Q. What will happen to co-teaching of 300-800 units?

A. The principles permit the continuation of co-teaching, though ASQC has resolved to examine the issue in the near future to ensure the approach is still meeting our needs.

30. Q. Where can we download templates (excel or otherwise) for new structure so that we can fill them in?

A. Work is being finalised into a curriculum policy which will be conveyed to colleagues after it has been approved by Senate.

31. Q. When will the course learning outcomes for generalist degrees (e.g. Bachelor of Arts) be provided so majors (and minors) can be constructively aligned?

A. That is a matter for course authorities.

32. Q. Will the re-naming of 900 level units as 8000 level units necessitate changes to volumes of learning, outcomes and assessment tasks for all these units?

A. No change other than coding is required.

33. Q. Allowing different admission points for PG courses – this is an attractive idea for prospective students, however, how is this achievable when credit points are linked to the course which is in turn linked to the student's course they will qualify with, along with AHEGS? Will this be misleading that the student has undertaken a 120cp program when in fact they completed 80cp?

A. We feel the admission point approach will remove much of the confusion around our postgraduate offerings for potential students and, in some cases, will allow colleagues to concentrate their activities where they make the most impact. If the vast majority of students enrolling in my master's course only need to complete 80cp, why not set this as the only admission point and advertise it as such (noting the admission requirement)?

34. Q. What will be the process of proposing "designated minors", will there be any rules/restrictions in content of these minors?

A. ASQC will finalise a process and what requirements will be involved.

3. Microcredentialing

35. Q. Does micro-credentialing happen only at PG level?

A. At this stage, yes, though we are very conscious of the interest in extending this to the UG space. We will start doing more exploratory work in this space soon.

36. Q. How about "Lighthouse Masters" for the micro master course?

A. Nice, but remember that we can't use 'Masters' as a single word or we'll fall foul of the AQF. If anyone thinks they can do better, they can enter our 'Name our Microcredentials' competition (details above)!

4. Nomenclature

37. Q. Why not refer to "flexible" or "free choice" simply as "electives"? This terminology would be more meaningful for students coming straight from high school.

A. The term 'Electives' has been utilised in the Core Zone.

5. Procedural

a. Cost

38. Q. What is the cost implication for these changes?

A. Obviously, this renewal of our curriculum architecture is a major undertaking and is supported by further expenditure such as the new curriculum management system and eventually a new student management system. Implications are being dealt with through the normal budget process.

39. Q. With the intensive work involved for implementing this project, will the University abandon its 'recruitment freeze' that is putting pressure on managers seeking to replace established vacant positions quickly, and without extensive delays?

A. Sorry, but this is outside the project's remit.

40. Q. Is additional money going to be allocated to 2018/2019 budgets to allow business units to handle the impact of rolling out the new curriculum?

A. As above, implications are being dealt with through the normal budget process.

b. General

41. Q. What is a cognate degree?

A. A cognate degree is a degree in a similar discipline area. TEQSA has recently dispensed with this language and now uses the term related and non-related.

42. Q. Can we also have specific WAMs such as WAM Science for Science designated units, WAM for Maths?

A. We are not aware of such a use of WAM (Weighted Average Mark)s in the Australian HE sector and are not proposing such a specific use for WAMs.

43. Q. Were any professional staff at the ASQC discussions of the revised principles? Were their voice/concerns heard?

A. Professional Staff have been engaged with this project from its very beginnings and at all stages. Their input and feedback has been crucial. A large number of professional staff also completed the surveys. And many professional staff were directly involved in the ASQC discussions and workshops.

44. Q. What updates will be made to the general coursework rules in response to the new curriculum?

A. The principles speak to such rules and we will ensure the curriculum policy and general coursework rules align.

45. Q. Will the Majors have Directors?

A. This is a matter for colleagues to decide. We would assume that if majors continue to exist some oversight by a colleague will be required.

46. Q. The Postgraduate Curriculum Architecture lacks a principle, similar to the Undergraduate curriculum architecture, on embedding the institutional values in MQ courses. I don't know if there were

certain reasons why these were included in the Undergraduate and not in the Postgraduate versions? Will this still be included in the Postgraduate curriculum?

A. This is a fair point. We would expect that such modules would be made a requirement of Postgraduate coursework students if they have not already completed such modules.

47. Q. What if Senate says no?

A. Obviously we very much hope that Senate will say yes! Senate has endorsed the curriculum architecture project in May and members of Senate have been part of the workshops and have provided feedback throughout the process.

c. Student Administration/Information

48. Q. What is a student's transcript going to look like when they have move from a 4cpGPA to a 7cpGPA to WAM?

A. Such work has yet to commence.

50. Q. Question around implementation and 'significant disadvantage' for students - if students are required to study more units under the new structure does this = significant disadvantage?

A. This work is only in its very early stages. At this stage it is too early to comment.

51. Q. When, and how, will the 'student-facing' communication take place? What methods will be deployed in 2019 to explain changes to our current and prospective students?

A. This work is only in its very early stages. At this stage it is too early to comment. A range of methods will be deployed. We are keenly aware that the communication with students on these matters is critical and are planning the strategy as we speak.

52. Q. How do you propose all students will be moved to the new architecture? We had previously calculated 8 weeks of full time work for 80 workers (not including training and QA) for staff.

A. Again we only in the early stages of this work. If the policy is approved, we will move into the operational phase with greater emphasis on such issues.

53. Q. Who will be assessing/administering students on a case by case basis with regards to moving current students across? And how will the University move all students into the new curriculum?

A. As noted this work is only just beginning. More details will be provided in the coming weeks/months.

54. Q. What about advising current students on the need to complete People and Planet units at present? If we know they will move to new curriculum in 2020, then our advice might be wrong.

A. This is an important point and one we are exploring. If you'd like to chat this through, please feel free to contact Mariella Herberstein at x6276 or at chair.senate@mq.edu.au.

6. Systems

55. Q. The success of the Curriculum renewal will be reliant on its implementation. Our student management system struggles now, how is it going to manage with the new principles? And do we know if the archaic student management system can deal with these changes?

A. It's not going to be easy, but our colleagues are creating a range of processes and workflows to help. The new curriculum management system will be of great help in this regard and a new student management system will be the final piece in the jigsaw.

56. Q. Is the student management system being updated to support these curriculum changes? And Is there going to be a similar policy redesign to go with the student management and learning management systems?

A. Short answer is yes. Obviously, we want to ensure seamless integration across these functions. One of the reasons we chose Factor5 was because of its abilities in this space.

57. Q. I'm still worried about how hard it is going to be to explain the new curriculum to students when I'm doing academic advising. Can you create some sort of 1- or 2-page graphic representation of the new curriculum rules that we can share?

A. We will be creating a range of diagrammatics to assist colleagues in this regard.

58. Q. Will the new program mapping tool work with accreditation schemas to track student attainment of competencies? Will it allow the matching of resources and assessment tasks to particular outcomes?

A. This is a broader ambition outside the immediate scope of the CA project. Work in this space has been going on.

59. Q. Connected doubles; creation may be simpler but administration of these becomes increasingly more difficult. The existing student management system can't cope with many of the processes we have now, when will we be getting the new student management system in time to enable the operationalisation of the new curriculum?

A. We are unable to advise an operational date around a new student management system, yet. Key features of the curriculum management system will be operational in 2019.

7. Timing/Deadlines

60. Q. I think UNSW has been working with Factor5 on a curriculum management system for about 3 years - why will the MQ one be ready before 2020? IT projects take time (unfortunately!)

A. In seeking out a curriculum management system, Sean visited or talked to a number of institutions from around the country who are using a variety of curriculum management system providers. We did visit UNSW. It is not our understanding that Factor 5 have been engaged for that period of time on that

specific project. It is also the case that UNSW asked Factor5 to bolt their system onto an existing internal bespoke system, which did create some difficulties. That is not our approach. As part of the tender process all tenderers advised us what could be achieved in a specified time frame that included the delivery of our new curriculum architecture in 2020.

61. Q. What impact will the November deadline have on our ability to meet UAC and course guide deadlines for vital promotion, ahead of 2020 recruitment?

A. If we meet the proposed deadlines we will meet our external deadlines.

A number of questions were also received regarding timelines and deadlines for various aspects of the project (listed below). The timelines that we have to hand were outlined at the end of the presentation and can be revisited in the slide set from the presentation (linked above).

62. Q. Once the curriculum architecture is rolled out, will there be an adjustment period to revise and finetune some of the practical decisions made at department level?

A. We must expect that some finetuning may be required.

63. Q. Why are we doing it so quickly? Why implementation in 2020 rather than giving academics a chance to think more carefully about content?

A. As noted in the presentation, aspects of the work related to this project have been going on for over a year. Given the engagement from colleagues that the curriculum architecture project has enjoyed we believe colleagues have considered the proposed principles carefully and provided invaluable feedback. We are aiming for a 2020 implementation to deliver what we believe is a superior curriculum to our students as quickly as possible, and (as noted in response to an earlier question) to enable us to become more agile in renewing existing courses and introducing new courses as quickly as possible.

64. Q. Can you tell the meeting something about the proposed governance process for implementation and timelines for submitting new/translated course for approval?

A series of roadshow workshops will commence with Faculties from 24 July, which will outline the workflow for course submission and approval.

65. Q. Are we going to look back in 5 years and think that we should have taken an extra year to get the curriculum architecture, right?

A. Perhaps but given the landscape as outlined by the VC, we feel we really did not have an extra year at our disposal.

66. Q. Start date?

A. 2020

67. Q. What is the plan and timeline for telling students about this? We need to know what to tell them when doing academic advising. e.g. if People and Planet units are dropped we need to know this ASAP as

students are currently juggling their programs to fit them in. It is particularly critical for mid-year entry students as well as those who started at the beginning of the year.

A. As noted we are working around communications for both student and staff in this regard. If you would like to speak to Mariella about this directly, please email chair.senate@mq.edu.au.

68. Q. Is there enough time (and resources)? It seems too short a timeframe to untangle all the current systems and make such a dramatic transition.

A. We believe so.

69. Q. If the new architecture does not address the uni issues (attracting students etc.), when will the architecture be next reviewed?

A. The review process and timeline for the new curriculum architecture will need to be determined by Senate.

70. Q. What is the timeline for getting a new Student Management System?

A. We are unable to advise an operational date around a new student management system, yet. Key features of the curriculum management system will be operational in 2019.

71. Q. What will the deadline be on course submission to ensure sufficient time for future students, MI and marketing insights? Or will this be required prior to submission? What support will be available for these teams to deliver this insight?

A. This is built into the approval process.

8. Workload

72. Q. How will these changes impact on learning and teaching administration workload in Faculties and Departments, especially in transitioning to full operationalisation and delivery of the new curriculum? Many universities have been revamping their curricula (especially in the undergraduate arena), and through this significant undertaking are learning key lessons about how inflexible their systems and processes are. How will our University be managing this?

A. We continue to work with Faculties to finalise our approach. If you have concerns about workload implications, please speak to your [Faculty Associate Deans, Learning and Teaching](#).

73. Q. Workload can't be ignored, therefore faculties and departments might need extra funding, could this be considered?

A. This has been a matter for discussion with Executive Deans

9. Student Experience

74. Q. Brilliant changes - clear and open for individual choices. However, how does this guarantee a transformative learning and teaching experience for our students?

A. The curriculum architecture goes some way to achieving this goal, but in reality it will be colleagues who design and teach courses within the new architecture who transform the student experience.

75. Q. What are the options available to students who are in a double degree, or specialist degree with no flexible units, but still wish to do an exchange semester or mobility experience overseas? Can they choose to add flexible units and therefore extend their degree length, if they choose to do so? Some other universities allow this and will award an International Studies Minor for any four courses done overseas, therefore allowing the flexibility for exchange in a more structured degree and awarding a minor for the effort, so the units are not 'wasted'.

A. We have been conscious of this issue of international mobility and believe the flexible zone does go some way to helping students in stand-alone degrees. We will be sharing some further insights about how international mobility could be better accommodated in the core zone.

76. Q. If students can choose degree combinations for double degrees, how will we inform them of degree length for new combinations?

A. The length of the double degree is simply the length of the successful completion of the two core zones. For most combinations this will be four years.

77. Q. When will we move away from iLearn?

A. This question is outside the scope of the curriculum architecture project. Not in the immediate future. In January 2019 there will be some significant upgrades to iLearn, so the student experience here will be improved.

78. Q. Are OUA units out of scope of the CA?

A. Not as such. And indeed, the integration of OUA into existing MQ units in Arts continues.

10. Volume of Learning

79. Q. Do you mean we can't have a PG course which is 1-year for students with related Bachelor's degree and 1.5 or 2 years for students with unrelated Bachelor degree?

A. No, we are recommending that course authorities can decide at which admission points they want to run and market their postgraduate coursework programs. They might just want one admission point. They might want two because their cohort is equally drawn from students meeting the admission requirements at the two different points.

80. Q. Sean was talking about empowering the faculties to decide the length of the Master's degrees they wish to offer. However, can we offer 1-year Master degrees but still be AQF compliant?

A. Yes. As long as admission requirements are aligned with requirements for that volume of learning and course outcomes can be achieved.