

**Concurrent Session G**  
**Tuesday 13 September 2016**  
**1:50pm – 2:40pm**



**Session 2**  
**SCUP Perry Chapman Prize - Aligning Strategic Plan with**  
**Campus Masterplan - Forecasting Campus 2026**  
**Dr Kenn Fisher, Norton Summit**  
*Woods Bagot, University of Melbourne*

*Presented by Jo Dane*

*Jo Dane is a principal with Woods Bagot working within the Education Sector with a specific focus on Education Consulting. Jo's passion is finding ways to improve the student experience, through the combined pillars of pedagogy, design and technology. Jo is an active researcher having consistently published papers and presented at conferences for over 10 years. On the Flinders University Student Hub project Jo was actively involved in consulting with a variety of stakeholder groups and building upon the Fuller engagement outcomes to develop the Return Design Brief and schematic design.*

The Chapman project (from which this Abstract summarises) seeks to forecast possible future developments brought about by rapid online learning modalities (Course ra, 2015) and their impact on the campus-based face-to-face experience. Using 'experts' in the fields of learning sciences, teacher professional development, educational technologies, learning environment / campus designers and others, the study will use an evidence-based, Delphi lead, expert elicitation methodology (in part based on the annual NMR/Educause Horizon Report model Johnstone et al, 2014 & 2015) to forecast how campuses might evolve over the next decade. Several theoretical models will be used to frame the research including the 'flipped classroom/campus' concept (Strayer, 2007) the 'sticky campus' (Lefebvre, 2014), expert elicitation (Meyer & Booker, 1991; Sullivan & Payne, 2011), Delphi modelling (Rand, 2015), and cognitive mapping (Jameson, 1996).

Hashimshony & Haina (2006) note that in 'identify(ing) transforming trends in society that are affecting the mission of universities, [they] analyse the impact of those trends on the institutional and spatial structure of universities, and then summarize the factors that planners should be paying attention to in the future design of their institutions'. This statement - in a nutshell - suggests the use of cognitive mapping (Jameson, 1996) as a means of understanding the impact of transformation and change in pedagogy on the design of future campuses. Unless we critically analyse and understand the dynamic forces acting on universities in the 21stC, we can never expect to design built infrastructure to effectively support learner needs our digital world.

This is a highly complex area with the default position on many campuses being predominantly a process of incremental change. The industrial age classroom model of didactic teaching is still prevalent despite the inroads being made by online learning modalities. The evidence to date (Keppell et al, 2012, Fisher & Newton, 2014) points towards a more blended active-learning, digitally supported model. This involves a mix of didactic, self-directed, collaborative, problem-based, immersive, active, integrated workplace and other forms of authentic learning in varying proportions, depending on the discipline, year level and subject complexity.

Such issues are impacting on the future of the campus both as a whole and also as a series of interconnected learning and research environments. These are being considered in professional and academic forums such as at recent conference (ARC, 2015). Indeed the whole concept of flipped

learning is in the early stages of a rigorous, scholarly evaluation (Freeman et al 2014; Duke University, 2015).

This study will focus on the views of eminent researchers in both industry and academe to forecast how university campuses may change in the near future using the well-tested practice of expert elicitation.

We advocate an approach which Norman (2010) calls 'Translational Design'. This draws its influence from translational clinical medicine wherein research and practice are intertwined. In leveraging this concept to campus planning and design, translational design seeks greater funding of research in the design of learning environments in an age of transformation and uncertainty. This approach also links academe to industry, with each discipline informing the other through empirical research studies.

An alternative way of unpacking this complexity in a systematic manner is to frame the analysis within a student-learning trajectory, as advocated by Boys et al (2014) but filter this through the work of Kolb & Kolb's (2005) four learning elements. Kolb & Kolb suggest that four topologically nested sub-systems - the micro; meso; exo; and macro - inscribe the principal domains in which students learn.

The micro is represented by the student's immediate classroom, the meso is mediated by student residences, family and perhaps parallel online courses, the exo covers the policies and structures impacting on the student via campus culture and, finally, the macro is shaped by society's values and aspirations (such as valuing education over training, for example).

These issues are covered in part by a just started ARC Discovery research project Modelling of Complex Learning Environments (Ellis, Goodyer, Fisher & Marmot, 2014). That study will synchronously map the digital/virtual behaviours of students over the physical to understand better how campus learning spaces will provide an improved student learning experience and engagement. It is a study that evaluates the recent past to predict what might emerge in the future.

This proposed Chapman Award study takes a very different approach in that it taps into expert opinion as to what works, how and why, and which strategies are likely to dominate in the future to influence campus planning and design.

