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# Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALTC</td>
<td>Australian Learning and Teaching Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN</td>
<td>Australian Technology Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTC</td>
<td>Australian Universities Teaching Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADAD</td>
<td>Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEST</td>
<td>Department of Education, Science and Training - now renamed Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go8</td>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDSA</td>
<td>Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRUA</td>
<td>Innovative Research Universities Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEI</td>
<td>Promoting Excellence Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEN</td>
<td>Promoting Excellence Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A glossary of key terms can also be found on page 87.
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Executive summary

Introduction to the project

The project titled, ‘A review of the dissemination strategies used by projects funded by the ALTC Grants Scheme’ (referred to hereafter as The D-Cubed Project) has explored the effectiveness of dissemination for ALTC Grants Scheme projects in the period 2006 to 2009 and has developed a range of resources to support future applicants. ALTC-funded projects have disseminated their findings in a rich variety of ways. From this, D-Cubed has developed a new approach to dissemination that would increase opportunities for achieving productive change in learning and teaching. The new approach, and its grounding in both the literature and the empirical research undertaken, is outlined in this final report.

The investigation used an illuminative evaluation strategy (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972) to identify how effective ‘in practice’ project dissemination strategies are in embedding and consolidating outcomes from projects funded under the ALTC grant schemes and completed between January 2006 and December 2009. Illuminative evaluation is by its nature participatory, iterative and open-ended. It invites the construction of meaning through a multi-pronged investigation that draws upon the feedback of external participants and observers. This methodology allowed for the development of resources informed by a strong evidence base for future grant applicants and support staff applicants.

Dissemination is crucial if learning and teaching research is to inform decision-making and to affect change. The ultimate purpose of dissemination is for the intended audience to take up or adopt an innovation, information or resources (Fincher, 2000). The effectiveness of dissemination has long been a concern in the Australian higher education sector. The Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) and, beforehand, the Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC) had a mandate from the federal government to be more successful in dissemination; a report noted that ‘the most significant criticism of the AUTC’s predecessors has been that they did not achieve wide dissemination of good practice generated by the teaching and learning developments funded by grants programmes’ (DEST, 2002 as cited in Dow, 2008). To inform the ALTC’s approach, two projects were commissioned in 2004 to identify dissemination strategies that would increase the likelihood of achieving change in teaching and learning practices. The projects resulted in ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’ (McKenzie, Alexander, Harper, & Anderson, 2005) and ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2005). These reports were the basis for the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006), which has guided grant proposals since its introduction.

This study investigated whether the Dissemination Framework was achieving the desired outcomes, and proposed refinements to the Framework in response to changing needs of the sector. It investigated dissemination practice by exploring project leader understandings of dissemination and how those understandings are enacted in sharing project outcomes beyond the project team.
Summary of findings

The study drew upon the various data collection activities and synthesised them in accordance with the relevant investigation aims. The project findings are:

Finding 1: Clearer definition of key terms is required if the sector is to move forward in the quality and effectiveness of dissemination.

Finding 2: The ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) is not a sufficient mechanism for supporting an understanding of effective dissemination.

Finding 3: The most popular method of communication of project outcomes remains traditional academic modes such as conference presentations, book publications and publication in academic journals and conferences.

Finding 4: A web presence is a common dissemination activity, but its potential impact is limited due to maintenance issues after the project concludes.

Finding 5: There is an espoused understanding amongst grant recipients that dissemination activities occur during the life of the project, rather than after the project concludes.

Finding 6: Dissemination is commonly described as a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose.

Finding 7: ALTC grant holders tend to equate the end of the grant with an end of their involvement in that topic, possibly as a result of ALTC project work being viewed as an additional workload.

Finding 8: It is not possible to accurately measure or determine evidence of long-term changes that may have occurred as a result of the project based on the current reporting mechanisms.

Finding 9: Projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset.

Finding 10: Project leaders grapple with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing a climate of readiness for change.

Finding 11: The ALTC is perceived as having an obligation to support the dissemination of project outcomes through providing a searchable repository for project deliverables and facilitating opportunities for making links between projects.

Finding 12: Successful dissemination strategies have multiple layers of change enablers who facilitate dissemination.

Summary of deliverables

In addition to the final report, there are four major project deliverables that emerged from the study. The project deliverables are:

1. Sector-wide workshops

D-Cubed facilitated workshops for prospective applicants, support staff, and
ALTC Fellows throughout the project. These workshops provided professional development for over 150 colleagues and informed the development and refinement of the other project deliverables.

2. Dissemination framework and definition

The project found that the provision of a dissemination framework is valuable, and that there is a compelling case for a new framework that reflects the understandings of dissemination that have emerged through the project. In response to these findings, the D-Cubed team proposes a new definition and framework for dissemination.

The proposed new definition is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

The framework consists of three interlocking elements—assess climate, engage, and transfer – and indicates that dissemination is most effective when all three elements are in place.

Assess climate of readiness for change: The climate of readiness for change is the existence of “a fertile environment [which] nurtures a climate of risk taking and systematic change […] essential conditions for successful innovation and dissemination” (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2005, p. 53). To be most effective, assessing the climate occurs at the planning stage, and is revisited frequently throughout the project. The considerations for assessing climate of readiness for change are listed within the framework.

Engage: Engaging with targeted potential adopters throughout the project invites authentic involvement of targeted potential adopters and includes them in the evolution of the project findings to have “mind changing encounter[s] [not] to articulate your own point of view but rather to engage the psyche of the other person” (Gardner, 2004, p. 163). To be most effective, engagement is planned for and takes place throughout the life of the project, not merely at the project’s end. The considerations for engaging throughout the project are listed within the framework.

Transfer: Transfer describes the processes undertaken to maintain momentum and impact beyond the funded life of the project and beyond the project team. It is concerned with sustaining the influence of the project in the long-term. The considerations for enabling transfer of project outcomes are listed within the framework.

The framework is designed to be non-linear and cyclical, as during the life of a project there are shifts within and between each element. It is intended to be used as a project planning framework, as a project reflection framework, and as a visual scaffold that can be used to build familiarity and to enable a consistent approach.

3. Dissemination resources

Resources for prospective ALTC Grants Scheme applicants are designed to support the planning and undertaking of effective dissemination and are collated in the booklet: ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’. This booklet is a practitioner-focused guide for prospective
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applicants and those who support them. It provides a brief overview of the project, explores the nature and purpose of dissemination, argues the importance of planning projects with sustained change in mind, and presents a range of effective dissemination activities. Examples of good practice are included to illustrate the range of ways that project teams have successfully approached dissemination. This guide also includes a number of dissemination resources. The dissemination resources are:

- **‘Thinking about planning a dissemination strategy’**
  This resource supports prospective applicants to design a dissemination strategy that facilitates engagement with potential adopters across the life of the project.

- **‘Thinking about identifying your target group’**
  This resource encourages consideration of who comprises the project’s potential target groups. It classifies the target group in terms of end-users, potential adopters, enablers, and the wider sector; and it provides guiding questions to identify each of these groups.

- **‘Thinking about assessing the climate of readiness for change’**
  This resource provides a series of questions to ascertain the degree to which there is a climate of readiness for change. Based on the climate considerations from the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework, it also provides advice for responding to situations where the climate is not yet ready for change.

- **‘Thinking about dissemination budget planning’**
  This resource outlines key considerations of budgeting for dissemination. It achieves this by working through cost factors, offering suggestions for reducing expenditure, and posing questions to prompt project sustainability for a detailed list of dissemination activities.

- **‘Thinking about sustainability of dissemination’**
  This resource prompts applicants’ thinking about the sustainability of their dissemination strategy by raising a series of questions related to effort, costs, and findability. Prompts for environmental sustainability are also included.

- **‘Thinking about dissemination literature’**
  This resource summarises a collection of useful articles about dissemination. It compresses an extensive reference list into a top-ten list of readings, with hyperlinks and summaries for each.

4. Quick Guide series

This series of four one-page guides provides brief summaries of salient points for senior managers, prospective applicants, assessors and evaluators, and support staff. Findings specific to groups of individuals are available in the Quick Guides.

Summary of recommendations

As the study was commissioned by the ALTC to evaluate an aspect of its operations, recommendations have been written expressly for the ALTC. Project leaders, grant applicants and senior managers may benefit from being aware of the recommendations and considering the salience of the recommendations in their own context. The project recommendations are:

**Recommendation 1:** That the ALTC adopts a revised definition of dissemination, specifically that dissemination be taken to mean: the planned
process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

**Recommendation 2:** That the ALTC considers replacing the existing ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) with the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework and adopts the D-Cubed definitions of dissemination, dissemination strategy, and dissemination activities.

**Recommendation 3:** That the ALTC considers introducing standards, with training and support, for the communication of project outcomes using the web.

**Recommendation 4:** That ALTC grants briefings, such as those conducted for assessors, grant applicants and project managers, include the new D-Cubed materials as appropriate.

**Recommendation 5:** That the ALTC considers funding further investigation into the potential impact of workload on undertaking scholarship of learning and teaching projects, including embedding and upscaling project outcomes.

**Recommendation 6:** That the ALTC considers amending project reporting requirements, and funding allocations, to include a post-project Part Three report to be collected one year after conclusion of project. The report should allow project teams to report on: what activities have occurred since the end of the project; how project outcomes are sustained; changes/maintenance to website or resources; and, future plans and opportunities.

**Recommendation 7:** That the ALTC takes responsibility for providing relevant professional development opportunities regarding dissemination, as well as encouraging institutions to deliver such offerings at the local level.

**Recommendation 8:** That an evidence-based review of dissemination activities and effectiveness be commissioned regularly by the ALTC, on a five-year cycle.

**Recommendation 9:** That the ALTC explores further opportunities to address sectoral expectations that it be a broker for project ideas and clearinghouse for project deliverables.

**Recommendation 10:** That the ALTC affirms the importance of involving change enablers in achieving project outcomes by reflecting this in guidelines, relevant professional development, and interactions with senior learning and teaching leaders.

**Recommendation 11:** That the ALTC considers developing induction materials for external evaluators, including information on the ALTC’s approach to dissemination.

**Recommendation 12:** That the ALTC makes available the D-Cubed deliverables through a dedicated space on both the publicly-accessible ALTC website and the password-protected ALTC Grants Portal.

**Summary of the project findings**

In summary, D-Cubed found that an opportunity exists for the ALTC to provide clearer definition of key terms and a new dissemination framework. Both a new definition and a new framework are proposed by D-Cubed. The new framework particularly attends to explaining the concept of climate of readiness for change,
which project leaders grappled with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing in their project contexts.

The most popular method of communication of project outcomes remains traditional academic modes such as conference presentations, book publications and publication in academic journals and conferences. The creation of a web presence for projects is also a common, although problematic, means of communicating with others about the project. There is agreement that the ALTC plays a valuable role in providing a searchable repository for project deliverables and facilitating opportunities for making links between projects.

While grant recipients espouse an approach to dissemination which occurs systematically throughout the project and is highly engaged, practice suggests that often dissemination is in fact a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose. Those projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset. Further, they have benefited from the involvement of change enablers at various levels who facilitate dissemination.

Ongoing involvement with sustaining the momentum of the grant appears to be compromised by a tendency to equate the end of the grant with an end of involvement, possibly as a result of ALTC project work being viewed as an additional workload. This is compounded by the current reporting mechanisms which do not allow the ALTC to gather information about long-term changes that may have occurred as a result of the project.
About the project

This section introduces The D-Cubed Project. It describes the project’s aims and investigation questions and maps how the project deliverables have evolved during the life of the project. The project name and logo are explained and the composition of the broad project team is outlined. The dissemination and evaluation strategies for D-Cubed are summarised and contributions to the sector, and to educational research, are noted. The section ends with an overview of the intended readership and the structure of this report.

Project aims and investigation questions

The purpose of this study was to determine to what extent the promoted dissemination strategies adopted by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) had led to the effective dissemination and consolidation of deliverables of completed ALTC Grants Scheme projects in the period 2006–2009. In this context, promoted dissemination strategies means the approach espoused in the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006), namely engaged and information provision dissemination (see Appendix A for a copy of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006)).

The project aims that were initially proposed were refined in the early stages of the project, with endorsement from the ALTC. The agreed refined aims were:

1. Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood
2. Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination
3. Glean lessons from past projects to inform and guide future project applicants and the ALTC
4. Evaluate the sustainability of project outcomes
5. Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change
6. Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects
7. Produce support materials and professional development activities to support those actors and prospective grant applicants

These aims were translated into the following investigation questions:

1. What is dissemination commonly understood to be?
2. What is effective dissemination?
3. What has been done to disseminate?
4. How sustainable are projects’ outcomes? What happened to projects after the project timeline?
5. What are the features of dissemination strategies used in projects that have lasted beyond the project life?
6. Which projects have been picked up by other institutions?
7. What role do conditions for effective dissemination play in whether dissemination is effective or not?
8. How is the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) perceived and used?
9. What roles are required to facilitate effective dissemination?
10. What support materials and professional development are needed to effectively support planning dissemination activities?
The aims and investigation questions laid the framework for the data collection activities that were undertaken by the project team. The data collection activities were closely mapped against the aims to ensure that the project maintained its agreed focus. In illuminative evaluation, the focus is on \textit{seeking to explain}, through observation and targeted enquiry. For this reason, the project findings are presented in this report in a synthesised form, rather than in direct response to each of the aims and questions.

It is important to note that D-Cubed did not seek to evaluate the \textit{impact} of ALTC-funded projects, nor did the team intend to make judgements about whether individual projects had been successful or otherwise. Instead, the focus was on gleaning knowledge about effective dissemination from all projects, including soliciting reflection from project teams about indicators and achievement of effective dissemination.

**Project deliverables**

The design of D-Cubed has always had a twofold focus; namely, the exploration of dissemination effectiveness of past projects and the support of future grant applicants to address dissemination in an effective, evidence-based way. The deliverables have been refined throughout the project, taking into account emergent findings and extensive input from a range of colleagues. The original intended deliverables, and the shifts which occurred during the project, are presented in Table 1.

**Project name and logo design**

Early in the project, the team created the name D-Cubed and commissioned the development of the D-Cubed logo. The name is a reference to this project being the third project funded to inform the ALTC’s approach to dissemination of grants. The first two projects were ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’ (McKenzie, Alexander, Harper, & Anderson, 2005) and ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ (Southwell, et al., 2005). The logo depicts rows of coloured blocks that symbolise the three projects. The name and logo design also signal the ongoing relevance of the first two projects. ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’ (McKenzie et al., 2005) provides a phenomenographic categorisation of people’s conceptions of dissemination, while ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ (Southwell, et al., 2005) identifies critical conditions for effective dissemination. These contributions and the rich content of each report more broadly make them enduringly relevant in this field.
### Table 1. Intended deliverables compared against the final deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended deliverables (from initial funding proposal)</th>
<th>Final deliverables (January 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| An evidence-based evaluative report on dissemination of ALTC project outcomes, including a critique of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) and recommendations for development of a more explicit dissemination framework. | Maintained  
A proposed new dissemination framework is now a deliverable. It is introduced in this report and referred to in all of the other deliverables. |
| A set of guidelines for ALTC grant assessors and standing committees regarding dissemination activities described in grant applications. | Expanded  
The team has produced four one-page quick guides for assessors, senior managers, applicants, and support people. |
| A data map, or ‘information profile’, showing intended and actual dissemination strategies and the findings of rich interviews with stakeholders and experts. | Maintained, now part of the resources  
In response to feedback, this booklet is now called ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’ and is part of the set of resources. |
| A set of resources on effective dissemination, including best practice case studies for project leaders and teams, from a range of projects, informed by existing knowledge and new insights gleaned from the project. | Maintained  
The resources have been tested with targeted potential adopters throughout Australia and have been developed through extensive feedback. |
| Strategic professional development activities on effective dissemination for key support staff, such as those in the PEI and other personnel involved in supporting applications. | Expanded  
The team has delivered eight professional development workshops to prospective applicants and has accepted invitations to present to ALTC Fellows, the UNSW Grants Roundtable, and the West Australian Networking and Dissemination Forum. |

The project deliverables, and their development, are explored in more detail on page 77.

**Project team**

D-Cubed built a dynamic and engaged project team to meet the needs of the project. It consisted of a core project team and a number of expert individuals who supported, challenged, and improved the project work throughout the life of the project. Interactions of the project team were managed mainly through the online project management resource, BaseCamp, and through a range of face-to-face and virtual meetings.
The component parts of the project team are represented in Figure 1 and described in the text that follows. The names of people involved in each element are provided on the inner cover page and in the Acknowledgements section of this report.

**Figure 1. The D-Cubed Project Team**

**Core Project Team:** The primary focus of the investigation team was to assume the role of illuminative evaluators and “to sharpen discussion, disentangle complexities, isolate the significant from the trivial, and raise the level of sophistication of debate” (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972, p. 32).

**ALTC:** Regular interactions with staff at the ALTC assisted in keeping the project aligned with the ALTC’s needs, and led to highly productive collaborations, such as the involvement of D-Cubed in the national Promoting Excellence Initiative (PEI) Forum which enabled the draft resources to be workshopped with PEI colleagues from across Australia.

**Consultants:** The consultants were lead authors of the initial two dissemination projects: ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’ (McKenzie, et al., 2005) and ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ (Southwell, et al., 2005). They were mentors and provided extensive input on the project approach, the proposed new dissemination framework, the draft resources, and the project final report.

**Critical readers:** The critical readers provided input on draft project deliverables towards the end of the project. The expertise of the readers, and the fresh perspectives they brought to the documents, assisted the core project team to refine the deliverables.

**External evaluator:** The external evaluator took an active, project-long approach to evaluating D-Cubed. This included preparing regular interim reports, surveying the project team about achievements and challenges, and
offering constructive feedback on project activities. This expert critical commentary, at crucial points in the development of the project, provided useful directions, as well as opportunities to reflect and revise as required.

**Graphic designer:** The visual elements of the project (from the logo at the outset to the deliverables at the end of the project) have been the product of a strong collaborative relationship between the core project team and the graphic designer.

**Promoting Excellence Initiative colleagues:** Gatherings of colleagues involved in the ALTC-funded PEI, particularly through the Queensland-based Promoting Excellence Network (PEN), provided opportunities to test project ideas and resources. The expertise of this group in supporting grant applicants made them uniquely qualified to critique the D-Cubed project deliverables.

**Senior Executive Reference Group:** The Senior Executive Reference Group represented the ALTC and senior learning and teaching leaders. They were consulted for guidance and input at key points throughout the project and received periodic reports.

**Workshop participants:** Colleagues who participated in a D-Cubed workshop contributed extensively to the development and refinement of project ideas and resources. These people, who were mainly prospective applicants and current grant holders, were able to give feedback on the materials in terms of their relevance, usefulness, and appropriateness.

**Project dissemination strategy**

The project’s dissemination strategy was designed with an acute awareness of the need to model effective dissemination practice. From the outset, the project outcomes expressed an “engaged-focused approach to dissemination, involving consultation, collaboration and support for ongoing dissemination both during the project and after the project is completed” (ALTC Dissemination Framework, 2006, p. 1). The collaborative nature of the illuminative evaluation methodology engendered a high level of stakeholder engagement.

As the findings of the project began to emerge, the team had an opportunity to reflect on its approach to dissemination in terms of the proposed new dissemination framework and other resources. Table 2 provides an overview of the dissemination strategy and activities undertaken throughout the project. D-Cubed had two primary targeted potential adopters: the ALTC itself and prospective applicants (and those who support them). The dissemination strategy, therefore, has been built primarily for these two groups—to assess readiness, build engagement, and transfer project deliverables.

The project team was able to capitalise on existing connections with staff responsible for supporting grant applicants in universities throughout Australia, including academic developers, those involved in the PEI, and members of the Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development (CADAD), as well as building new connections with prospective applicants.
Table 2. Overview of the D-Cubed dissemination strategy and activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asses the climate of readiness</th>
<th>Interactions with targeted potential adopters were planned and carried out throughout the project, such as a regular project newsletter.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshops were facilitated early in the project, and sought extensive participant feedback on the framework and planning resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invitations were taken up to present the D-Cubed work to colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project team worked to build credibility and familiarity with targeted potential adopters, stakeholders and change enablers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project team worked with the Senior Executive Reference Group, and in PEI and prospective applicant workshops, to foster ownership and engagement with the project and its outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engage throughout the project</th>
<th>Resources are being published in an accessible file format so end-users can adapt them as required.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The deliverables of D-Cubed will be distributed widely in the sector in electronic and hard copy format.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliverables have been developed to stand alone, not requiring particular ongoing support from the project team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The value of the D-Cubed deliverables has been articulated through a range of channels to build ownership and capacity to adopt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations have been made to various stakeholders such as the peak body for academic development units (CADAD) about the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with the ALTC are ongoing regarding the embedding of D-Cubed project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project evaluation strategy

Throughout its life, the project drew extensively from a range of sources for reflection and review. Sources included the external evaluator, the Senior Executive Reference Group, and the project consultants (see Appendix B for a list of the key meetings). The project plan also provided opportunities for reflection and review through the delivery of an interim report to the ALTC and periodic informal updates with ALTC staff. The workshops also generated
extensive formative feedback on the framework and resources. The close tie between the project methodology, the project data collection strategies, and the dissemination strategy ensured that there was consistent engagement with targeted potential adopters and, therefore, ongoing formative evaluation. The evaluation report from the external evaluator is available as Appendix C to this report.

Contributions to the sector and to educational research

This project is of particular significance to the higher education sector as it aimed to investigate the effectiveness of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) in promoting upscaling and embedding of project deliverables, and to determine whether it was necessary to refine the framework to respond to changing needs of the sector.

D-Cubed has made contributions through fostering informed discussions about dissemination among prospective applicants and support staff. D-Cubed is the first broad-scale empirical study of how ALTC-funded projects have addressed dissemination in project planning and execution. This investigation allowed for a deeper understanding and critique of dissemination practice in the sector.

Given the short time frame of the project, scholarly outputs contributing to the educational research literature will follow after project completion.

Report audience

This report is part of a collection of project deliverables that have been designed with various readerships in mind. While the primary audience for the final report is the ALTC, and all of its recommendations are directed to them, it is expected that other readers will find it useful also. The following reading suggestions are made:

Senior managers: It is recommended that senior managers begin with the one-page ‘Quick Guide to Dissemination for Senior Managers’, and then access the resources and report as required.

Support staff: It is recommended that staff who support grant applicants start with the one-page ‘Quick Guide to Dissemination for Support Staff’, and then access the resources and report as required. The resources are available in a file format that will allow them to be updated or amended for particular institutional needs.

Prospective applicants: It is recommended that prospective applicants start with the one-page ‘Quick Guide to Dissemination for Prospective Applicants’, and then read ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’. This will inform the selection of other useful resources, and this report can be a point of reference when more detail is required.

Assessors and evaluators: It is recommended that grants assessors and external evaluators start with the one-page ‘Quick Guide for Assessors and Evaluators’, and then access the resources and report as required.
Structure of this report

The report begins with a discussion of the project’s context. This section considers operational factors, maps the territory against which the D-Cubed Project deliverables and recommendations are made, and reflects upon the establishment of the ALTC and the grant funding it has provided since its establishment in 2004. It considers topical ALTC-commissioned reports, and recent directions of the ALTC are summarised.

Following the discussion of context, a review exploring the literature on dissemination is presented. This literature has been extensively reviewed in the previous two reports in particular; therefore, replicating the work conducted in the previous studies was not the intention. Rather, the objective is to add to the information base by drawing predominantly on literature from work conducted since those reports were published.

The project approach is detailed in the next two sections entitled ‘The approach’ and ‘The methods’. These sections explain the methodology and the related data collection and analysis strategies, while expanding on the project sample.

The project findings are then discussed. This section introduces and discusses results from the data collection, provides recommendations for consideration by the ALTC that address the findings. The next section introduces the four major project deliverables, narrates the process by which they were developed, and, where relevant, makes recommendations regarding the embedding of these project deliverables into the workings of the ALTC.

The final section explores project success factors and lessons learnt and proposes a series of future activities to embed, upscale, and sustain the project deliverables.

Note:

Shortly before the submission of this final report, the federal government announced the closure of the ALTC at the end of 2011. This report was in final draft format. Rather than redrafting the report to accommodate recent changes, the final report is offered as per understandings as at 28 January, 2011.
The context

This section considers operational factors and maps the territory against which the D-Cubed Project deliverables and recommendations are made. It outlines the establishment of the ALTC, identifies its preceding organisations, and describes the history of grants schemes and funding it has provided since its establishment in 2004. It considers topical ALTC-commissioned reports and summarises the recent directions of the ALTC. This section also introduces the reader to the current ALTC definition of dissemination as well as the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006).

The Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC)

As an outcome of the higher education reform package Our Universities: Backing Australia’s Future (2003), and as a result of a proposal from the Australian Universities Teaching Committee (AUTC), the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education was established in August 2004. The institute was renamed the ALTC in May 2008. The organisation was preceded by the following bodies: the National Priority Reserve Fund (1990), the Commonwealth Staff Development Fund (CSDF, 1990), the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching (CAUT, 1992), the Committee for University Teaching and Staff Development (CUTSD, 1997), and the AUTC (2000) (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2010). Three of these organisations (CAUT, CUTSD, AUTC) provided funding and policy initiatives related to higher education learning and teaching. The budget for these initiatives has increased over the years from CAUT’s initial $4 million a year for grants to the ALTC’s investment of more than $39M in grant funding between 2005 and 2009.

Each of the organisations listed above emerged from reviews of their predecessors, where lessons learnt were incorporated into the development of processes and activities designed to influence teaching and learning in Australian higher education. These organisations were funded by the federal government and were therefore accountable for ensuring that the funds dispersed achieved the anticipated outcomes.

The ALTC Grants Scheme

The Grants Scheme was developed to stimulate innovation and enhancement of teaching and learning in higher education. The grants were made available between November 2005 and February 2006. In the early days of funding, the Grants Scheme guidelines were still embryonic and evolving. Furthermore, the ALTC was learning along the way, guided by assessors’ reports and evaluations, such as those prepared by Dow (2008) and Hicks (2004), discussed later in this section. This is important to note, as the majority of projects under investigation in this study are projects funded in these early stages.

1 From here on, this report will refer only to the ALTC, not the Carrick Institute
By 2009, the following programs had been established under the ALTC Grants Scheme:

- **The Competitive Grants Program** supported innovation, research, and development. The topics covered include: (1) research and development focusing on issues of emerging and continuing importance, (2) strategic approaches to learning and teaching that address the increasing diversity of the student body, (3) development of robust methods of identifying and rewarding excellence in teaching; and (4) innovation in learning and teaching, particularly in relation to the role of new technologies.

- **The Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program** was designed to build leadership capacity and support systematic and sustainable models of academic leadership in ways that promote and advance learning and teaching in Australian higher education.

- **The Priority Projects Program** responded to priorities emanating from the ALTC’s designated responsibilities and supported projects addressing: (1) academic standards, assessment practices, and reporting, (2) curriculum renewal, (3) teaching and learning spaces, and (4) peer review for promotion.

- **The Discipline-Based Initiatives (DBI) Funding Scheme** was a separate funding scheme that operated to 2007, before being absorbed into the Grants Scheme. The scheme provided funds for discipline-based leaders to investigate the scope of existing resources, effective practices, and future challenges for graduates of the discipline, and to identify a plan and the infrastructure needed for future development. The intention of the Discipline-Based Initiatives Funding Scheme was to support the exchange and dissemination of good practices within disciplines.

A number of changes were made to the grants scheme between 2005 and 2009. Those changes relevant to dissemination are illustrated in Table 3.

### Table 3. Timeline of key changes to the Grants Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Nature of changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-</td>
<td>Discipline-Based Initiatives</td>
<td>Projects were funded in the following categories:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Investigation and scoping initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Common curriculum issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Higher education enterprise initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>Dissemination requirement appeared in guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Discipline-Based Initiatives</td>
<td>Oversight of the 44 projects funded under the program was transferred to the grants scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>All programs</td>
<td>A more general project management strategy (document) was introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Priority Projects</td>
<td>Curriculum renewal was introduced as new priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant change indicated in the above table was the merging of the Discipline-Based Initiatives Program into the Grants Scheme from September 2007 onwards. It is for this reason that Discipline-Based Initiatives projects are included within the scope of this report.
Recent developments at the ALTC

A new Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Dr Carol Nicoll, was appointed to the ALTC in December 2009. The federal government announced in the May 2010 budget a 20 per cent budget cut (equating to $6M) over 2011–12. In response to the budget cut, the ALTC Board announced changes to the existing activities and the establishment of new programs to take effect from 2011.

The following changes affecting the grants scheme were presented by the ALTC CEO at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) 2010 Conference and elsewhere:

- merging the Competitive Grants Program and Priority Projects Program to become Innovation and Development Grants, in which priority areas will be identified, but scope for “blue sky work” retained
- introducing Strategic Priority Projects, which take the form of commissioned projects identified on an annual basis, calls will be made publicly, and individuals/teams particularly may be encouraged to apply
- reshaping the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program to include professional development for people in leadership roles, such as pro vice-chancellor, (learning and teaching) and associate dean (learning and teaching)
- developing a new Synthesis Project Scheme, in which short synthesis documents of project outcomes will be commissioned in 2010–11
- establishing the Special Initiatives Reserve Fund for emergent opportunities
- introducing Extension Grants of $10,000 to embed and further disseminate completed projects and fellowships.

The nature and perception of dissemination

The definition of dissemination that has consistently been used in ALTC guidelines since 2006 is:

...dissemination is understood to be more than distribution of information or making it available in some way. While embracing this aspect, dissemination also implies that some action has been taken to embed and upscale the innovation within its own context (discipline or institution) and/or to replicate or transform an innovation in a new context and to embed the innovation in that new context. (Southwell, et al., 2005 p 2)

Reviews of the funding schemes in relation to dissemination

Southwell et al. (2010) reported that “external reviews of funded projects prior to 2004 consistently highlighted the need to improve the dissemination of projects and innovations” (p. 56) to encourage uptake of findings. In Dow’s (2008) evaluation of the ALTC programs he noted that concerns around effective dissemination had been a long-standing feature in the sector.
A Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) report in 2002 commented that the AUTC and its predecessor bodies could have done more to foster effective dissemination:

The most significant criticism of the AUTC’s predecessors has been that they did not achieve wide dissemination of good practice generated by the teaching and learning developments funded by grants programmes. The AUTC’s focus on projects of national significance has been an attempt to ensure broader dissemination, but more could be done to ensure the investment in past grants programmes produces benefits for the quality of teaching and learning across the sector. (Department of Education, Science and Training, 2002 cited in Dow, 2008, p. 38)

A comprehensive analysis undertaken by Hicks (2004) into the uptake of projects funded by the AUTC identified the lack of coordinated dissemination and promotion of grant project outcomes. Hicks (2004) noted that DEST, the federal government department at the time of the AUTC, had a mandate for the dissemination of the AUTC project deliverables which predominately took the form of distribution of project deliverables to AUTC contact officers across the country. Hicks (2004) found that project teams that made a concerted effort to engage with prospective end-users had a higher chance of raising awareness, compared to project teams that did not take a planned approach to interacting with potential end-users:

The best examples of dissemination in the projects were those where it had been built into the process of the project, those that were multi-faceted, making use of a range of media and fora, and targeted to particular audiences. (p. 50)

The AUTC commissioned two projects in 2004 to inform future approaches to funding activities that would maximise the potential for upscaling and embedding innovation in higher education. The projects resulted in the reports: ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’ (McKenzie, et al., 2005) and ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ (Southwell, et al., 2005).

The projects investigated the conditions favourable to dissemination, and subsequently improved understanding about the interactive nature of these conditions in the context of improving teaching and learning in higher education. The project findings supported the development of recommendations directed towards the ALTC, institutions, discipline groups, and project developers, and focused on improving the dissemination, adoption, adaptation, implementation, and embedding of project outcomes.

The McKenzie et al. (2005) project report provided recommendations relating to the types of projects that should be funded, the application processes, the criteria for assessing applications, the development of mechanisms for providing guidance and support to applicants, intellectual property, the continued dissemination of project deliverables, the alignment between granting schemes and other aspects of the higher education context, and recommendations for collaborative and consultative projects specifically. For the ALTC and institutions, the project report provided recommendations relating to valuing, recognising, and rewarding teaching innovation and leadership in teaching; and, these recommendations were primarily directed at institutions related to the support for teaching innovation, adaptation, and implementation.
The project report also provided recommendations for academic and project developers related to formal courses on teaching and learning, the support provided to project teams, the brokering of information about innovations, and the development of project methodologies and dissemination strategies.

Similarly, the Southwell et al. (2005) project aimed to identify strategies for the ALTC that could be employed to maximise the likelihood of systemic change in teaching and learning across the Australian higher education sector. Five critical conditions conducive to the “successful implementation, embedding and up-scaling of an innovation” (Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 3) emerged from an investigation into Australian and international learning and teaching grants schemes and their deliverables. These conditions were found to be highly interrelated but were also importantly identified as discrete factors. Owing to this, specific strategies that might be employed to generate each condition, and consequently encourage successful dissemination, were able to be considered. The five conditions identified were: (1) effective, multi-level leadership, and management, (2) climate of readiness for change, (3) availability of resources, (4) comprehensive systems in institutions and funding bodies, and (5) funding design that demands, encourages, and supports risk-taking, change, and dissemination. The specific strategies identified to generate each of these conditions were presented in the project report as recommendations at the national, institutional, discipline, and project level.

**ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006)**

The AUTC-commissioned reports described above were the basis for the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006), which has guided grant proposals since its introduction. Current criteria in all grant programs include “Alignment between plans for the dissemination/embedding of the successful strategies and outcomes and the project design” (ALTC, 2010b, p. 7). Dissemination definitions and associated strategies have been described in the two AUTC reports that informed the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) and have formed the requirements for other ALTC-funded activities, such as the ALTC Fellowships Scheme. The current ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) is built on two premises of dissemination: Information Provision and Engagement. In particular, the framework proposes that dissemination involves not only the distribution of information, but also the process of embedding and upscaling of an innovation across new contexts. Such an approach requires a two-way process, whereby there is a combination of information provision as well as engagement through consultation, collaboration, and ongoing support.

The existing framework was released to the sector in 2006. It was developed to précis the Southwell et al. (2005) and McKenzie et al. (2005) reports, and to respond to an identified area of need in the sector. The framework separates dissemination into information provision or engaged dissemination, and provides a list of deliverables to illustrate the former and a process outline to illustrate the latter. The information is found on the second page of the current ALTC Dissemination Framework (See Appendix A).

In order to be successful in their applications, all of the projects funded under the ALTC Grants Scheme have been required to comply in some respect with the dissemination approach adopted by the ALTC, which is described in the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006). The ALTC Grants Scheme 2009 Report (2010a) revealed that, between 2005 and 2009, there were a total of 244 projects funded by the ALTC, equating to approximately $39M of funding.
Literature review

This section explores the literature on dissemination. The literature related to dissemination has been comprehensively reviewed in the previous two reports in particular. It is not the intention to replicate the work that was conducted in the previous studies, but rather to summarise the studies briefly and add to the information base by drawing on the literature and work conducted since those reports were published. This section focuses on definitions and conceptions of dissemination as well as providing a brief overview of the literature pertaining to the purposes of dissemination and the conditions that support it. This section also introduces the notion of developing a sense of valuing among the potential adopters in order to support effective dissemination.

Literature pertaining to the strategies and conditions for effective dissemination exist within the educational, health, and organisational development sectors. There appear to be similar processes identified across all of the literature that result in effective dissemination strategies. Since the original AUTC dissemination studies (McKenzie, et al., 2005; Southwell, et al., 2005) were conducted, further studies have tended to confirm the proposed strategies and conditions for effective dissemination (McKenzie, 2006; Pawson, 2006; Elwyn, Taubert, & Kowalczuk, 2007; Lawrenz, Gullickson, & Toal, 2007). These studies tend to produce indicators regarding the diversity of approaches taken to dissemination acknowledging the various influential contextual issues to identify what works for whom, in what circumstances, and in what respects.

Definition

Dissemination strategies are construed as being any activities or processes designed to distribute an innovation, “but also the activities that occur between the development of an innovation and its application in an appropriate setting” (Bywood, Lunnay, & Roche, 2008, p. 13). The ultimate purpose of dissemination is for the intended audience or target users to take up or adopt an innovation, information, or resources (Fincher, 2000). Unlike diffusion, which can be defined as the “passive spread” (Greenhalgh et al., 2004, p. 582) of innovations and outcomes, dissemination strategies are “active and planned efforts to persuade target groups to adopt an innovation” (Greenhalgh, Robert, Bate, et al., 2004, p. 6) or outcomes emerging from an investigation or project.

Dissemination ideally encourages implementation of the outcomes or innovation through embedding an innovation into an organisation or institution. Ultimately, the implementation of the innovation becomes “embedded” (see Glossary on p.87 for definition of embedding) making significant enhancements to teaching practice and student outcomes and usually involves structural, policy, and procedural changes to related systems, rather than being superficial adoption. Therefore, change in or transfer of practice is central to dissemination (King, 2003). Project deliverables or practices are considered sustainable in terms of their continued use over time (Coburn, 2003), in essence supporting innovations to be integrated into established systems and routines.

Typical activities cited in the literature characterised as distribution include activities such as developing websites, presenting at conferences/fora/symposia, and developing and contributing to repositories and/or other similar databases.

In contrast to understanding dissemination in terms of descriptions of use,
Coburn (2003) conceptualised the “scaling up” of innovations in terms of four interrelated dimensions: depth, sustainability, spread, and shift in reform ownership. Depth implies that an innovation has resulted in change beyond the surface or superficial level, which is reflected by a change in materials, beliefs, or pedagogical principles. Sustainability indicates that the change is maintained and ongoing over time both within and outside of the original context. The meaning of spread is the physical broadening and “scaling up” of the innovation across numerous contexts. Finally, the shift in reform ownership signifies that the innovation has been transferred from the original innovator to the adopter.

Rabin, Brownson, Haire-Joshu, Kreuter, and Weaver (2008) define dissemination as “an active approach of spreading evidence-based interventions to the target audience via determined channels using planned strategies” (p. 118). This definition is part of a useful glossary written by Rabin et al. (2008) for how dissemination and implementation research in the health sector has possible application to other sectors such as higher education. They claim that “Dissemination and Implementation (D&I) research is increasingly recognised as an important function of academia and is a growing priority for major health-related funders” (p. 117).

However, they acknowledge that the challenging aspect of D&I research is the lack of standardised terminology. They note that this can be partly explained by the relatively new appearance of D&I research on the health research agenda and by the great diversity of disciplines that made noteworthy contributions to the understandings of D&I research. They also acknowledge that the most important contributions originate from the non-health fields of agriculture, education, marketing, communication, and management.

Key purposes of dissemination, as well as conceptions and common terms related to dissemination emerging from previous literature, are presented in the remainder of this section.

**Purposes of dissemination**

A number of studies in the past decade have developed models of dissemination to ensure effective and successful dissemination of innovations.

King (2003) clearly conveyed the message that dissemination is a continuous process involving adaptations along the way and the inclusion of end-users from the outset and throughout the process. The importance of the objective of dissemination was also communicated, with an emphasis on consideration of the following questions:

- *What* do you want to disseminate?
- *Who* is your target audience?
- *Why* do you want to disseminate?
- *How* are you going to do it?
- *How* might you *involve* your target audience throughout the process?
- *Have* you allowed time for *evaluation, reflection, and replanning*?
- *How* will you know that your dissemination has been *successful*?

(Questions taken from King, H., 2003, p. 89)

King (2003) proposed three objectives of dissemination, characterised by a spectrum of activities, including: *dissemination for awareness, dissemination for understanding, and dissemination for action.*
Dissemination for awareness

King (2003) discussed the idea of dissemination at its simplest level as being the scattering of information or resources. At this level, the objective of dissemination is focused on raising the awareness of the target audience and end-users of the project information, innovation, or resource. This process is similar to that of advertising and marketing, whereby the communication is almost always one-way, directed from the disseminator to the intended audience. This may involve activities such as publishing papers, sending out flyers or promotional material, engaging in presentations, and sending emails or messages to listservs. During this process, the disseminator generally remains passive, which requires the intended audience to be much more active if they want to take up the information, innovation, or resource.

Dissemination for understanding

Dissemination for understanding refers to the process of “sowing” the information or resource (King, H., 2003). Conceptually, this objective of dissemination builds upon raising awareness by not only informing the end-users about the innovation or resource but also about educating them and increasing their knowledge so that they may take up the innovation themselves. King (2003) describes two types of dissemination that assist in improving the understanding of the target audience:

- **Active dissemination** involves the disseminator engaging more actively in the dissemination and information provision process via activities, such as events, workshops, presentations, etc.
- **Passive dissemination** requires the disseminator to provide accessible information to the target audience so that the end-users may retrieve the information when necessary, such as websites, libraries, and web-based archives and catalogues, resources, etc.

Dissemination for action

The final objective of dissemination discussed by King (2003), dissemination for action, was described as the “propagation” of information or resources. The idea of propagating suggests that the dissemination of information and resources is far more active and engaged; it is a continuous two-way process from the outset, rather than merely occurring at the end of a project. Such a process involves end-users at critical stages of the project and requires considerable “pro-activity, support and follow-up to the end-user” (King, H., 2003, p. 83). For there to be change or a transfer of practice, there needs to be more than just the provision of information or resources (Fincher, 2000).

Therefore, dissemination for action is characterised by the uptake of information or a particular innovation which results in a change of practice and possible adaptations to the original innovation or resource to meet the needs of the end-user in different contexts (King, H., 2003). Dissemination strategies for this objective include activities, such as case studies and guides, or events that create a community of practice such as conferences, seminars, or workshops (King, H., 2003).

Similarly, Gravestock (2002) discussed three objectives of dissemination that were originally proposed by Fincher (2000) with a greater focus on the involvement of end-users throughout the life of the project. In alignment with
King’s (2003) model, Gravestock’s (2002) model included the three objectives: dissemination for awareness, dissemination for knowledge, and dissemination for use, as well as the two dissemination modes (active and passive), all situated within the context of end-users (see Figure 2 below). These objectives directly relate to King’s (2003) objectives described above.

Figure 2. Gravestock’s (2002) model of dissemination

Gravestock’s (2002) model emphasises the importance of end-users at all stages of a project as well as acknowledging the two-way interactive nature of the disseminator and the end-user, rather than dissemination being a one-way process. The model encourages active engagement with end-users and involvement of end-users in the process of project development and dissemination. Gravestock (2002) indicated that “change can only take place by the action of end-users” (p. 120), meaning that end-users need to feel empowered to use the project deliverables because they have a sense of ownership as a result of contributing to the project in one way or another.

Similar to the King (2003) and Gravestock (2002) models, Bywood, Terao, and Roche (2008) discussed the Patterson and Conner (1982) Commitment-to-Change model which was designed to enable and measure organisational change. This model comprises three developmental phases, with progressive commitment stages in each phase (see Figure 3). The stages of change included inform, educate, and commit and these objectives clearly reflect those identified by King (2003).
A review of the dissemination strategies used by projects funded under the ALTC Grants Scheme

Conceptions of dissemination

Rabin et al. (2008) note that processes of dissemination and implementation of occur as a series of successive phases rather than as one event. Although different models of dissemination vary in the number and name of the identified stages, all models suggest that dissemination and implementation does not stop at the level of initial uptake; instead, further steps are necessary to ensure the long-term use of an intervention. Rabin et al. (2008) describes some commonly used models such as the innovation-decision process (knowledge, persuasion, decision, implementation, confirmation) and the RE-AIM framework (reach, adoption, implementation, maintenance; <http://www.re-aim.org/>).

Bywood et al. (2008) conducted an examination of the theories and models of change in the context of dissemination. They presented a multi-level model involving six elements crucial to the implementation of change (see Figure 4).

![Figure 4. Multi-level model in the implementation of change](image)

Bywood et al. (2008) describe implementing change as distributing information in the form of training and resources, obtaining support from other systems such as organisations or institutions, and preparing the environment for change. The final step after the implementation of change is to monitor and evaluate the intervention or source of change through measuring key theoretical constructs, and assessing the process and impact of the project. Such a process will inherently engage the target audience or population in providing feedback to refine and, if necessary, alter the intervention accordingly.
The project ‘Dissemination, adoption and adaptation of project innovations in higher education’, McKenzie et al. (McKenzie, et al., 2005) examined ways of experiencing the dissemination of teaching and learning innovations. McKenzie and Alexander (2006) went on to redefine and further extend the understandings of experiencing the dissemination of teaching and learning innovations. Five categories of dissemination experiences emerged from the analysis building on the three offered in the original report. These are described as follows:

- **Dissemination as distributing project products or information**
  In this conceptualisation, dissemination is described as an end-of-project process involving the one-way distribution of project information or resources. The dissemination activities would include such things as presenting at conferences, publishing scholarly output, and developing websites, which serve to let others know about the project as well as meet the needs of funding bodies (e.g., publication).

- **Dissemination as telling others about the project**
  Moving beyond the first description, this conceptualisation of dissemination indicates more of an active approach to the distribution of project information and resources. While the process primarily remains one-way in nature, the focus of this form of dissemination involves more personal engagement and interaction with the potential adopters of the project information or resources. The dissemination activities are generally the same as the above with further opportunities for personal interaction, and where both formal and informal opportunities are used to talk about the project. More than just satisfying funding body requirements, the intention of this kind of dissemination is to foster enthusiasm and encourage potential adoption of the project outcomes.

- **Dissemination as others using the project outcomes**
  This kind of dissemination has a greater focus on adoption of project outcomes as its major intention. The activities involved to disseminate would be similar to those above but would also focus more on engaging with potential adopters to increase understanding about the use of the project outcomes as well as to encourage application of the project outcomes. Such dissemination activities might include conducting workshops with potential adopters, producing professional development or support materials to support adoption of project outcomes, and developing case studies or best practice examples about the implementation and use of project outcomes.

- **Dissemination as spreading and embedding project impact**
  Extending beyond the previous category, this conceptualisation of dissemination focuses more directly on the long-term and sustainable nature of project outcomes. The main intention of this kind of dissemination is to embed project outcomes beyond just the project context and to broaden the adoption of project outcomes across the department or institution. This form of dissemination also requires more of a two-way communication process which seeks to support adoption and adaptation across different contexts. The dissemination activities involved might include establishing ongoing networks or communities of practice which enable continued communication, sharing of practices and ongoing support.

- **Dissemination as an ongoing two-way process aimed at bringing about change**
  This conceptualisation of dissemination expands upon the previous conceptualisation by intending to further adoption and maximise impact of the project outcomes on change in departments, institutions, and even the
broader sector context. This change is evidenced by a shift in the culture of teaching and learning within a particular context, with resulting impacts on the profession as a whole. Dissemination activities may include all those noted previously, but the focus of dissemination begins right at the outset of the project and the potential adopters are directly involved during all stages in order to develop a sense of ownership among potential adopters. Again, communication is seen as an ongoing two-way process that is sensitive to the needs and concerns of multiple contexts.

Gravestock (2002) noted that the ultimate goal of any dissemination strategy must be the adoption of a project’s outputs by the end-user; however, the common problem for all projects is how to do this effectively. Many writers note that dissemination will be limited if it simply involves the sending of information to the target audience in the form of, for example, books, journal articles, or CD-ROMs (Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004; Russell, Greenhalgh, Boynton, & Rigby, 2004; Bridger, 2008; Catterall, 2008; DerGurahian, 2008; Rabin, et al., 2008; Chalkidou, 2009; Coffield & Edward, 2009).

Effective dissemination requires the end-user to be aware of the project as early as possible and to have a detailed knowledge of the nature and content of the outputs, so that considered judgements can be made about whether or not to use the materials (Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010; Fincher, 2000; King, 2000, 2003). Dissemination is not a unitary activity or “event”, and effective dissemination strategies require several modes of addressing different levels and goals (Fincher, 2000). It is, therefore, important to ensure that careful consideration of a dissemination strategy occurs at the beginning of a project, not at the point when the final product is ready for distribution (National Center for the Dissemination of Disability Research, 1996b, 1996a, 2001).

**Conditions and attributes for effective dissemination**

It is useful to consider the conditions that support effective dissemination, as well as take into account the characteristics of the innovation, its adopters, and its context that may maximise uptake and implementation, and thus ensure effective dissemination.

Drawing on diffusion theory (Rogers, 1995), researchers such as Wejnert (2002), Rohrbach, D’Onofrio, Backer, and Montgomery (1996), Donaldson (2004), and Chalkidou (2009) identified attributes of an innovation that are likely to influence the speed and extent of its adoption. These features are succinctly summarised into three categories by Rabin et al. (2008, pp. 120-121):

- **Characteristics of the intervention**
  - relative advantage (effectiveness and cost-efficiency relative to alternatives)
  - compatibility (the fit of the innovation to the established ways of accomplishing the same goal)
  - observability (the extent to which the outcomes can be seen)
  - trialability (the extent to which the adopter must commit to full adoption)
  - complexity (how simple the innovation is to understand).
• Characteristics of the adopters
  Attributes of the organisation/community include its size, formalisation, perceived complexity, and readiness for the implantation of the innovation. The characteristics, attitudes, and behaviours of individuals within an adopting organisation (e.g., position in the organisation, education, individual concerns, motivations).

• Contextual factors
  The political, social, and organisational settings for the implementation of the intervention and include social support, legislations, and regulations, social networks, and norms and culture.

Characteristics of the adopters have also been discussed by other researchers. Briefly mentioned earlier, Bywood et al. (2008) discussed the Patterson and Conner (1982) Commitment-to-Change model. The model is based on the notion that behavioural change is more likely to occur when an individual is informed and aware of the change, understands why the change is necessary, and, therefore, has motivation to act. An individual who possesses these characteristics and who also has a positive perception about the change “is more likely to change their behaviour than an individual who is uninformed, uncertain and unmotivated” (Bywood, Terao, et al., 2008, p. 47). In linking the change model to studies on the dissemination of project innovations and outcomes, it is clear that there needs to be evidence of awareness, understanding, positive perception, and motivation among the potential adopters in order for transfer or change to be accepted and for dissemination to be effective.

Contextual factors have also been found to be important aspects of effective dissemination. Specifically, the Southwell et al. (2005) project ‘Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes’ proposed five core conditions that must be present to ensure successful dissemination. These conditions are each briefly described below.

• Effective multi-level leadership and management
  Effective multi-level leadership and management contributed to the successful embedding and upscaling of innovations and projects. Through findings from their study, Southwell et al. (2005) defined effective multi-level leadership and management as involving “the setting of clear goals; the development of a shared vision; the stability and consistency of leadership at different levels; and a high level of commitment to the success of the leadership at different levels” (p. 50). Successful dissemination was also characterised by the combination of supportive leadership and “champions” to assume the roles of: Sponsors/patrons (formal leaders who provide “institutional legitimacy”); Enthusiasts (“designers or early adopters of the innovation”); Second-generation innovators (“people who adopt and adapt first-generation innovations to new contexts”); and Enablers (individuals, such as project managers who provide practical day-to-day support) (Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 52).

• Climate of readiness for change
  For any innovation or project to be successfully disseminated, there needs to be a fertile environment and climate ready for systematic change. Southwell et al. (2005) discovered that such a change-ready climate requires a recognition and understanding of the need for a change to occur. This
recognition involves undertaking a process of critical reflection to determine the value of engaging in a potential high-risk undertaking. The climate that is ready for change would ideally have a responsive policy system which is dynamic in that it is guided by, and continues to guide, practice. A system that is ready for change would value educational quality and educational research at both the institutional and government level and engage in the scholarship of teaching.

- **Availability of resources**
  Southwell et al. (2005) argue that, for innovations and projects to be successful, ongoing access to resources within their institution and from external sources is required. These resources include human resources ("professional development and training, appropriate time and workload management and access to specialist expertise"); financial resources ("adequate funding and support within the institutions and from external sources … as well as capability for sustaining the infrastructure over the longer term"); and infrastructure resources ("appropriate equipment and facilities to carry out the project/program in the first instance for ongoing maintenance of the project/programme") (p. 6).

- **Comprehensive systems in institutions and funding bodies**
  Not only do innovations and projects require access to resources, but they also require “access to, and use of, institutional and national systems” (p. 8) to ensure successful implementation, embedding, and upscaling. As well as managing people, such systems provide the modes of coordinating, communicating, and supporting planning and quality assurance.

- **Funding scheme design**
  Southwell et al. (2005) determined that a funding scheme design that incorporates a staged application process is critical to the success of project dissemination and innovation outcomes. In addition, funding schemes that facilitate opportunities to identify a target user group ensure local ownership. Funding schemes enable project teams through budget requirements that allocate time and resourcing for planning and communication. Ideally, funding schemes stipulate the project boundaries, and also provide multiple opportunities to apply for funding that enables sustained embedding and upscaling beyond the initial project life, enabling sequential projects to build on work already completed.

Further studies have shown that the following attributes are pivotal in order for dissemination to be effective:

- the **target audience is aware of the project, its aims, and its outcomes** (Fincher, 2000; King, 2003)
- there is **demand for the outcomes** (King, 2000) as **change has to come from the end-user** (Fincher, 2000)
- there is a **match between the outcomes and the user** (Westbrook & Boethel, 1995; Rohrbach, et al., 1996; Greenhalgh, Robert, Macfarlane, et al., 2004)
- the **outcomes** are seen to have some **value** (Beaudry, Regnier, & Gagne, 2006; Goorden, van Lieshout, Wubben, & Omta, 2008; Benneworth & Jongbloed, 2010).
Valorisation

Valorisation is a staged model of dissemination used predominantly in Europe and Canada in relation to the transfer of technology from the development stage to the implementation stage in industry. Goorden, van Lieshout, Wubben, and Omta (2008) define knowledge valorisation as:

The formal transfer of knowledge resulting from basic and applied research in universities and research institutions, and from applied research and development in companies, to (other parties in) the commercial sector for economic benefit. (Goorden, et al., 2008, p. 4)

Through increasing humanities and social science research, researchers argue that universities can benefit from valorisation by ensuring that the research is seen to be of value\(^2\) to the community (Beaudry, et al., 2006). However, the transfer of knowledge gained in social research cannot occur if the potential user community does not see the value of the knowledge. Therefore, valorisation involves developing and creating a sense of value in the potential user community through prolonged engagement. The process of creating value from knowledge, not necessarily monetary value, is referred to as “knowledge exploitation” and is similar to the concept of “value extraction”. Sullivan (2000) defines value extraction as implying:

...the direct involvement of project target groups in the realization of specific activities and tools planned, in order that project final outcomes and outputs addressed to them, are co-produced with them and validated by them. Value extraction involves converting the created value into a form that is useful to the organization. (p. 226)

Beaudry et al. (2006) note that value extraction is required before assimilation, translation, and implementation can be conducted by the targeted user group and wider potential user community. To effectively disseminate, the innovation needs to be seen to be successfully implemented in the initially targeted user community, whether or not this initial community was associated with the conception of the project. This successful implementation and the associated value placed on the innovation by the initial community can then be followed by further dissemination to broader communities.

Valorisation also implies the brokering of knowledge to the community beyond the academic realm and the derivation of some resultant benefit. Valorisation involves making the most of innovative practices (or “exploiting”) in different contexts. It involves gradual incorporation, through formal and informal systems of capacity, building into the commonplace methods and practices used by organisations and the practices and experiences of every individual. The mode of attaining this is frequently described as a staged process. For example, the ECOTEC Research and Consulting Limited (2006) report on the Evaluation of mechanisms for the dissemination and exploitation of the results arising from

\(^2\) Value is defined in this instance as “the degree of usefulness or desirability of something, especially in comparison with other things” (Andriessen, 2003, p. 17)
programmes and initiatives managed by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture describes the following as stages in a valorisation process:

1. A focus on target group needs from the initial stages of elaborating and planning the project
2. Dissemination of innovative products and results
3. Selection and analysis of their suitability for transfer to meet identified new needs
4. Translation and adaptation to targeted new contexts
5. Piloting and experimentation
6. Full integration into the new context

Beaudry et al. (2006) emphasise the collaboration of the project team with the potential user community at each stage of valorisation and throughout the life of the project, with key points for the transfer of knowledge developed by that stage to the user community. The purpose of the iterative process is to embed the project outcomes, knowledge, and processes into a targeted “user community” to provide a test case and evidence of the potential value of the project in order to convince future potential adopters.

Summary

In summary, the literature pertaining to dissemination outlines a number of critical points for consideration. Recent investigations conducted and published since the earlier dissemination studies (Southwell, et al., 2005; McKenzie, et al., 2005) have emphasised the importance of viewing dissemination as an active process of spreading and embedding project outcomes to targeted audiences; it is also the means by which the audiences are involved and engaged at the outset, and throughout the life, of the project. Developing a sense of valuing and taking ownership of project outcomes in the target audience has also become an emergent and important theme in recent literature. This notion is also linked to the idea that in order for an innovation or outcome to be taken up the climate needs to be ready for the change and needs to be motivated to act in accordance with the change. Therefore, the literature indicates that in order for dissemination to be effective, there is a need for project teams to:

- identify who their target audience is and to engage them in the project right from the beginning
- assess the climate of readiness for change among the target audience to gauge interest, timeliness, and appropriateness of project outcomes
- encourage a sense of valuing and ownership of project outcomes among the target audience through active engagement and interaction
- foster the target audience’s adoption and transfer of project outcomes by considering the conditions and attributes that will support the dissemination and implementation process.
The approach

This section provides an account of the approach used for the investigation. Firstly, an overview of the project sample is provided. Secondly, an outline of the project methodology is given that describes its application to the current investigation. The section concludes with an overview of the project timeline.

Project sample

The project sample consisted of all ALTC projects that had a published final report on the ALTC website by 24 December 2009. Projects considered as being beyond the scope of the current investigation included projects completed or funded after 24 December 2009. Table 4 shows the total number and the grants scheme of projects funded by the ALTC from 2005 to 2009.

Table 4. Total projects funded by grants program and year funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants program</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority projects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline-based initiatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 244 projects funded by ALTC from 2005 to 2009, a total of 85 projects were found to have published final reports by 24 December 2009 (see Appendix D for a list of the projects under investigation).

Table 5 shows the number of completed projects included from each grants program.

Table 5. Completed projects under investigation by grants program and year completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants Program</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competitive grants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline-based initiatives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 No projects funded under these programs were completed in 2005
Illuminative evaluation methodology

Illuminative evaluation is primarily concerned with describing and interpreting particular phenomena, making use of a range of data sources. Using naturalistic methods to identify underlying factors and issues important to participants, illuminative evaluation specifically seeks to:

…study the innovative programme: how it operates; how it is influenced by the various situations in which it is applied; what those directly concerned regard as its advantages and disadvantages.... [Illuminative evaluation] attempts to discover and document what it is like to be participating in the scheme … to discern and discuss the innovation’s most significant features, recurring concomitants and critical processes. In short, it seeks to address and to illuminate a complex array of questions. (Parlett & Hamilton, 1977, p. 9)

The process of illuminative evaluation is a bottom-up, three-stage approach: observe, inquire further, and seek to explain (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). The observe phase allows the investigator to examine the context and determine the problem. To inquire further, a few observations are selected and investigated more intensively; for example, conducting interviews with key stakeholders to develop a deeper understanding of the problem. The final stage seeks to explain the observations and other data collected earlier. In the final stage, several interpretations for the cause and effect of the problem may be proposed. While there is not a prescribed set of methods for conducting an illuminative evaluation, there are common methods associated with the three phases. These may include the collection of background documentation and naturalistic observation in the observe phase and interviews to inquire further (Parlett & Hamilton, 1977). While rich data are collected from contributors at each phase of the evaluation, the methods used are not restricted to those listed above. Indeed, Parlett and Hamilton (1972) advise that illuminative evaluation should not be viewed as a prescription or rulebook as it does not adhere to a prescribed research design; rather, the best design is that which sheds the most light on a subject (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972).

In shedding light, illuminative evaluation seeks out multiple perspectives and each contributor’s perception is taken as truth (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). Multiple perspectives increase the validity of the data (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). The outcome of multiple perspectives is a rich data set drawing on participants’ experiences of the context. Concurrently, the context informs the direction and content of the illuminative evaluation.

Illuminative evaluation was devised as an educational research method by Parlett and Hamilton in their seminal 1972 paper. The learning milieu, or the sociocultural, psychological, institutional, and material context in which teaching and learning occurs must be acknowledged to develop an informed case (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). Illuminative evaluation was developed to address the concern that experimental research overlooks contextual factors, such as those of a social or political nature (Burden, 1998). As in Lave and Wenger’s (1991) construction of situated learning, knowledge, and behaviours associated with a context will be inextricably tied to that context. Illuminative evaluation seeks to identify the contextual characteristics of practices and interpret these characteristics in the language and style that is of most relevance to the context.
Illuminative evaluation must also consider the instructional system, which is comprised of the formal and structured components of the curriculum (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). For example, a new syllabus forms part of the instructional system and the evaluation of its success may be measured in terms of meeting goals and outcomes. However, each learning space is constrained or supported by factors outside the formal instructional system; for example, institutional administrative and financial arrangements, institutional values, teacher-student relationships, student values and perspectives, and teachers’ methods or orientation (Gordon, 1991; Ellis, 2003). These variables affect the instructional system at the individual, classroom, and institutional levels and require the evaluator to consider the transformations the innovation undertakes at each level when measuring the success of the innovation (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972). The success or failure of innovations should be considered in conjunction with assessing the intended aims and outcomes of the program. In combination, the learning milieu and the instructional system create a point of reference for the evaluator to determine the success of innovations (Parlett & Hamilton, 1972).

A review of the literature revealed studies using illuminative evaluation for educational innovations (Harris, 1977; Shapiro, Sector, & Butchart, 1983; Stew, 2008) Harris (1977) demonstrated the usefulness of the approach in the context of evaluating user education in libraries. He concluded that ongoing, contextual evaluation of user education would allow librarians to vary their teaching methods accordingly (Harris, 1977). More recently, Stew (2008) used interviews as the main data collection strategy in an illuminative evaluation examining postgraduate students’ reactions to mindfulness-based therapy for managing stress. While the data collection methods may vary across different research projects, the emphasis on the interpretation of responses is clearly shared.

The use of illuminative evaluation has increased in health fields. Recently, clinical health researchers have promoted the benefits of using an illuminative evaluation approach (see, for example, Dewar & Walker, 1999; Sloan & Watson, 2001; Macfarlane, Greenhalgh, Schofield, & Desombre, 2004). To evaluate their perceptions of a newly-introduced Quality Team Development program, Macfarlane et al. (2004) identified emerging themes in interviews with health care providers and assessors. Similarly, Russell et al. (2004) investigated the effectiveness of a professional email network for health care professionals by analysing staff emails, interview transcripts, and focus group discussions. In each study, the researchers illuminated the major themes that emerged from interviews with participants.

When using an illuminative evaluation strategy, an important consideration is the dual role of the researchers. Although the approach does not claim objectivity, as discussed by Shapiro (1988), the dilemma of the “independent outsider and knowledgeable insider” (Shapiro, 1988, p194) dual roles may be of concern to an audience with an inherent belief in the objectivity of research. A project leader with discipline-specific knowledge and contacts should be aware that historical and political factors may strongly influence the project outcomes (Guba & Lincoln, 1989). An element of self-reflection is required—a recognition of how their role may influence the practices of the project or institution under evaluation. Additionally, peer groups, collegial networks, or funding agencies may determine who is invited to “objectively” comment on the project (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).
Shapiro (1988) discusses this scenario in terms of the collaborative process used to develop a set of interview questions in a previous study:

...Indeed, many of the participants who were involved in designing the questionnaire expressed "good feelings". Only those who had not been contacted for their suggestions indicated annoyance with the instrument. (p195)

To avoid the dual role dilemma, researchers should seek to identify key players outside their own realm of contacts with whom to discuss project content and process. Advisory groups common to many project teams, such as external evaluators, critical readers, and reference groups satisfy the breadth of input that illuminative evaluation requires and establishes an element of objectivity.

The D-Cubed illuminative evaluation model

The planned strategies of the D-Cubed investigation were well suited to an illuminative evaluation approach. Figure 5 outlines the activities undertaken at each of the three stages inherent to the illuminative evaluation. The diagram highlights the momentum given to the project by each activity undertaken.

Figure 5: Project plan as an illuminative evaluation model

The project drew upon multiple perspectives from the outset, a practice which continued throughout the project. For example, in the observe phase, four perspectives were examined: literature review, artefacts from ALTC projects, artefacts from ALTC administration, and the experiences of former ALTC staff. In subsequent project activities, the multiple perspectives approach allowed the project team to investigate within, between, and over time, the experiences and needs of the sector and led to the development of resources.

The multiple perspectives approach is also reflected in the composition of the broader project team. The broader project team included the Senior Executive Reference Group, consultants, external evaluator, and critical readers, thus satisfying the breadth of input that illuminative evaluation requires.
A further consideration of this project was the context in which the problem resided. It was understood immediately by the project team that the investigation was firmly situated within the context of the ALTC, thus, the investigation took into account the historical and political factors which have shaped the ALTC, as outlined on pages 15 to 22. Similarly, systemic factors of interest to the state of dissemination were addressed at the institutional and project level in interviews with key project staff and institutional stakeholders.

Project timeline

Establishment (December 2009–February 2010)

The project plan had an opening stage that facilitated the establishment of elements crucial to the successful ongoing management of the project, such as employment of project staff and establishment of a shared understanding of project directions and processes. This included developing a shared communication plan, applying for ethics approval, and finalising a clear project management process. A regular newsletter was developed and shared at key instances (See Appendix E).

Illuminative evaluation activities (January 2010–December 2010)

The broader project team provided crucial verification and analytical input in developing the final project findings. These findings were shared with practitioners through the workshops conducted nationally and these practitioners were critical in providing feedback on production of support resources. The final stage consolidated project processes and deliverables to develop ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’, final report and resources, and included feedback from the external evaluator.

Project close (January 2011–April 2011)

The ALTC will receive the project report and resources at the end of the project. The project team will receive a final external evaluation report. Part One and Part Two reports will be submitted to the ALTC. This report represents the Part One report, while the Part Two report (submitted separately) outlines the dissemination activities and deliverables and outcomes of the project. Additionally, a final newsletter will be created and sent to all project contacts to inform them of the conclusion of the project.
The methods

This section details the methods used to carry out the project activities, including the purpose of each activity, and the data collection and analysis strategies used. Limitations and challenges are also presented. In keeping with the illuminative evaluation approach, the project's data collection and analysis was a staged and iterative process. Each stage of the project had a particular purpose, data collection method, and data analysis strategy. The stages of data collection are presented below.

Stage 1: Observe

In the first stage, an investigative framework was developed in consultation with the project consultants. The investigative framework was used to identify crucial questions to guide a review of the project sample final reports and subsequent interviews. The knowledge and experience of the project consultants was also drawn upon throughout this stage, not only in the development of the investigative framework, but also in the data coding and interview instrument development phases.

Review of project final reports

Purpose

Using the investigative framework, the project team closely read all final reports to identify the dissemination activities described in final reports submitted to ALTC. The review sought to categorise activities according to the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) delineation between Engaged Dissemination and Information Provision. Also, evidence of the use of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) as a conceptual resource for planning the dissemination strategy was sought. Finally, the review of final reports provided an indication of how project teams had understood dissemination. The following investigation aims were addressed in the review of reports:

Aim 1: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood
Aim 2: Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination
Aim 3: Glean lessons from past projects to inform and guide future project applicants and the ALTC

Data collection

Drawing upon the sample of the 85 completed projects, the project final reports were downloaded from the ALTC website where they were publicly available. Where formatting issues were encountered, electronic copies were directly provided by the ALTC. Two projects were incompatible with the software program used to analyse the data and were not subjected to the review process; therefore, only 83 project final reports were examined (n=83).

Data analysis

The review of reports used the qualitative data analysis software NVivo. NVivo facilitates coding of documents by themes or categories (“nodes”), the attribution of particular parameters to documents, such as program type and amount of funding (“casebook attributes”), and a wealth of query and reporting functions that facilitate analysis. Coding was undertaken by three members of the project team (Berry, Hinton, and Moore) with extensive input into the coding
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Team members examined the reports for evidence of dissemination. In accordance with the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006), nodes were created under the broad headings of engaged dissemination and information provision. For example, where a report mentioned the publication of a journal article, the team member assigned the corresponding text under the node information provision and the sub-node journal article was created. Alternatively, a report discussing a workshop as a dissemination activity was coded as engaged dissemination, creating a sub-node for workshops (for a list of coded nodes see Appendix F).

The coded data were synthesised in NVivo and brief summaries (called work-in-progress summaries) were written based on the NVivo outputs. The summaries were sent to the project consultants and to the Senior Executive Reference Group who provided feedback related to exploring potential gaps in the coding and providing insight as to how the document review would inform future project work. A proportion (30 per cent) of the coded reports was also cross-checked by each team member to ensure that there was consistency between coders. Team members recoded two of their own previously coded reports and were randomly allocated several other reports already coded by other team members. Incongruities in the coding were addressed at a project team roundtable as part of the process of clarifying definitions and understandings of dissemination and other concepts. The coding informed development of the online surveys, and assisted the project team to better understand the milieu of dissemination as it was expressed in completed projects.

Initiators' interviews

Purpose

The initiators' interviews were conducted with people who were closely involved with the development and implementation of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006). The purpose of the interviews was to gain a historical account of how ALTC projects disseminated their deliverables and also to explore the context in which the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) was developed. This data collection activity was carried out to address the following aims:

Aim 5: Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change

Aim 6: Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects

Data collection

Participants in this group were identified and selected on the basis of their institutional knowledge and experience in developing and implementing the ALTC Dissemination Framework in 2006. This participant group consisted of three former ALTC senior staff members, who were responsible for devising and implementing the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006). The three participants identified were initially contacted via email to invite them to participate in interviews, two of which were face-to-face on 23 April 2010 at the University of the Sunshine Coast. The third interview was conducted over the
telephone on 7 May 2010. Prior to the interviews, all participants were given a project information sheet and consent form to sign. All of the interviews were conducted by a member of the project team and were digitally recorded for later analysis (see Appendix G for a copy of the initiators’ interview questions). Each participant received a written summary of their interview to check for any discrepancies and was given the opportunity to alter any of their responses.

Data analysis

Based on the recordings, a written summary was completed for each of the interviews. The interviews focused on key questions regarding the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006), such as “what prompted the implementation of the Framework?”, “tell us about the Framework from your perspective”, and “what should be the role of the ALTC in dissemination practices?” The project team reviewed the overarching themes arising from each question at a roundtable discussion in May 2010, taking particular note of evidence for systematic change in the sector, the ALTC, or otherwise. One interview summary was selected and sent to the project external evaluator (Dr Helen King) to check for consistency against the audio recording.

Stage 2: Inquire further

The purpose of this stage was to explore further the emergent phenomenon and to delve more deeply into areas identified in stage one as requiring further investigation. The team again drew on the expertise of the project consultants, and also the Senior Executive Reference Group, whose experience with the ALTC grant process, from application to conclusion, was imperative for developing a valid set of instruments.

Web search

Purpose

The data that emerged from the review of the final reports suggested that websites were dominant modes of communication and were identified in many reports as a form of dissemination. The purpose of the website search was to test the effectiveness of this method of communication for sustained communication beyond the life of the project and to determine how accessible online information was. Thus it was decided to identify which projects had ongoing activity. The web search addressed the following aim:

*Aim 2: Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination*

Data collection

The website analysis element of the project drew upon the final reports of the 85 projects under investigation. Projects identified in the NVivo coding as having a project website or Exchange site were first subjected to analysis. In this activity, a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet was used to create a matrix for recording data. Where a project website had been identified in the final report, the URL was searched to determine the site’s activity; for example, websites were examined to determine the nature of the content relating to the project, when the site was last updated, evidence for interactivity or social networking, and, finally, if there were any contact details. To explore online content more deeply, project terms were then submitted to the Google search engine, such as the project name, project leader name, or a particular resource, and the nature of the online information pertaining to those projects was recorded in the spreadsheet.
An analysis of the ALTC Exchange was also carried out to determine the type of Exchange page available for each project, whether there was any activity on the page, and whether the page could be accessed by the public without a login. Similar to the examination of web content, the project team searched by project title in the Exchange search bar and recorded the results in a spreadsheet.

Data analysis
Descriptive data were recorded in a work-in-progress summary. Frequency tables were used to display data for the number of active, inactive, and redirected URLs, and the websites’ last updates. Websites observed to host a variety of content such as detailed project information and networking details, or online resources, were summarised as illustrative examples. The team compared the Google results for projects with a website listed in their final report, as opposed to those that did not mention a website in their report. Projects with social networking functions were also recorded in the work-in-progress summary. A review of content hosted on the ALTC Exchange was presented in a similar way. Project information found on the ALTC Exchange was grouped by the type of content and type of Exchange page on which the content was hosted.

The web and Exchange analysis and subsequent work-in-progress summary reinforced the team’s developing understanding of the importance of sustaining project outcomes beyond the project end date and the importance of creating findable project records. The results of the Exchange search were also shared with staff responsible for the ALTC Exchange.

Implementers’ interviews
Purpose
A second round of interviews was planned to address questions that were not answered in the review of final reports. The purpose of the implementers’ interviews was to glean substantive accounts of the dissemination activities and other features of a project that might lead to the embedding, upscaling, and sustainability of project outcomes. The implementers’ interviews sought to address the following investigation aims:

Aim 1: What is dissemination commonly understood to be?
Aim 4: Evaluate the sustainability of project outcomes
Aim 5: Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change
Aim 6: Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects

Data collection
Implementers were identified by their position within an institution, namely those charged with the authority or responsibility to act on or implement project findings from learning and teaching projects. The following positions formed the implementers’ group sample: deputy vice-chancellors, pro vice-chancellors, associate or assistant deans, heads of school, directors of academic development units, and PEI leaders. To distribute the sample broadly, the 85 projects under study were grouped by lead institution and their institution’s grouping before a sample of projects was taken. The groupings included the
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ATN ($n=17$), Go8 ($n=27$), IRU ($n=15$), and non-aligned institutions ($n=26$). A stratified random sample was taken to ensure equal representation from each of these groups. In other words, the maximum number of projects that could be sampled from each group was: ATN ($n=4$); Go8 ($n=6$); IRU ($n=4$); Non-A ($n=6$). A project team member identified implementers at the institutions of the 20 projects randomly selected. A total of 58 implementers were invited to be interviewed. Seven people were absent or on sabbatical from their roles; three people opted not to participate; and, three people felt that someone else was more suitable to be interviewed. Thirty people did not respond to the invitation.

Prior to conducting the interviews, the interview instrument was tested with the project consultants. The consultants were interviewed and provided feedback on the validity of the questions. Amendments were made to the structure and language of the instrument (see Appendix G for the final version of the implementers’ interview questions).

Telephone interviews were conducted with a total of 15 participants identified as implementers. Four implementers were from ATN institutions, four Go8, four IRUA, and three were non-aligned. The implementer group consisted of four DVC/PVCs, six Directors of Academic Development Units or equivalent, three heads of school or discipline, and two in PEI roles, across Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, Queensland, and New South Wales. All of the participants were given a project information sheet and a consent form to sign prior to conducting the interview. The interviews, each lasting 30–60 minutes, were conducted by three research assistants and were digitally recorded for later analysis.

Data analysis

Thematic analysis performed on the interview summaries was structured around the key investigation questions. These questions pertained to the sustainability of project outcomes within and outside implementers’ institutions. A written summary was completed for each of the interviews and one interview summary was randomly selected and given to the project leader to cross-check against the audio recording. Each participant also received a written summary of their interview to check for any discrepancies and was given the opportunity to alter any of their responses. Meta-summaries of implementers’ interviews were created in a Word document by three project team members (Berry, Gannaway, and Moore). The meta-summaries displayed the overall responses from each implementer and were grouped under each of the aims being addressed. In the final data analysis phase, the meta-summaries were drawn upon to identify projects that were most likely to have sustainable project outcomes and to identify projects to be used as illustrative examples.

Innovators’ interviews

Purpose

The second round of interviews gathered experiences from those who had been directly involved with leading ALTC projects. The purpose of interviewing this group, known as the innovators, was to explore further the dissemination activities used by projects, expanding on what had been found in the review of the final reports. In particular, the team was interested in the characteristics of projects that were considered to be effectively disseminated and the project processes that occurred that enabled effective dissemination.
The innovators’ interviews addressed the investigation aims:

**Aim 1:** What is dissemination commonly understood to be?

**Aim 2:** Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination

**Aim 4:** Evaluate the sustainability of project outcomes

**Aim 5:** Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change

**Aim 6:** Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects

**Data collection**

Innovators were identified on the basis of being named as the project leader on the final reports of one of the 85 projects under investigation. To ensure that a range of projects was included in the sample, data from the review of the final reports were used to identify projects with references to engaged and information dissemination activities. Forty-five final reports did not reference engaged dissemination and were categorised as information provision. Cross-checking of all projects identified as being information provision confirmed that each document reported one or more information provision activity. The remaining 40 reports made reference to engaged activities and were categorised as such; however, it should be noted that these projects also contained information provision activities. Between 29 July and 2 September 2010, 32 innovators were randomly selected and invited to partake in an interview. Three innovators were overseas; two opted out for other reasons and one was on study leave. Twelve innovators did not respond.

Prior to commencing the innovators’ interviews, the interview instrument was tested with project leaders of two current ALTC projects. The purpose of documenting the experiences of current project leaders was to determine that findings from completed project leaders were relevant to ongoing and newly funded ALTC projects.

Telephone interviews were conducted with a total of 14 participants identified as innovators. The sample represented 11 institutions from five states and one territory. Engaged and information provision projects were represented evenly. All of the participants were given a project information sheet and a consent form to sign prior to conducting the interview. The interviews were conducted by three research assistants, each lasting approximately 30–45 minutes, and were digitally recorded for later analysis (see Appendix G for the innovators’ interview guide).

**Data analysis**

Thematic analysis performed on the interview summaries was structured around the key investigation questions. These questions pertained to the dissemination activities that were perceived to have led to embedding, upscaling, and sustainability, within and outside the lead institution. A written summary was completed for each of the interviews and one interview summary was randomly selected and given to the project leader to cross-check against the audio recording. Each participant also received a written summary of their interview to check for any discrepancies and was given the opportunity to alter any of their responses. Meta-summaries of the implementers’ interviews were created in a Word document by three project team members (Berry, Gannaway,
and Moore). The meta-summaries displayed the overall responses from each innovator and were grouped under each of the aims being addressed. In the final data analysis phase, the meta-summaries were drawn upon to identify projects that were most likely to have sustainable project deliverables.

**Completed projects online survey**

**Purpose**

It was the intent of the project team to develop a much broader sense of understandings of dissemination in contrast to the more specific information collected from interviews. The purpose of the completed projects online survey was to develop an overall picture of the dissemination activities employed by the ALTC project teams and sought to address the following investigation aims:

**Aim 1: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood**

**Aim 2: Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination**

**Aim 4: Evaluate the sustainability of project outcomes**

**Aim 5: Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change**

**Aim 6: Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects**

**Aim 7: Produce support materials and professional development activities to support those actors and prospective grant applicants**

**Data collection**

The completed projects online survey sampled project team members from the 85 projects under investigation as well as 26 projects that were out of scope (i.e., had been completed but had not been published by the ALTC until after 24 December 2009). The survey asked participants to respond to two demographic questions, four open questions, and seven multiple-choice or scaled questions (see Appendix G for a copy of the completed projects online survey). Project team members of completed ALTC projects were identified by searching through all available final reports. Once project team members were identified, their names were entered into a database and their contact details were searched via the ALTC website or their own institution's website. Email addresses were collected for all project team members and were entered into the database to create a mailing list for the online survey. Four hundred and sixty-six project team members were identified from 111 completed projects.

Project team members who had already contributed data to the project were excluded from the sample ($n=22$). Deanne Gannaway and Deborah Southwell were identified as completed project team members and were excluded on the basis of being involved in the D-Cubed Project. Twenty-five people, identified as being leaders of current ALTC projects, were excluded and invited to participate in current project leaders’ online surveys. A final check confirmed that all projects had an opportunity to be represented in the survey sample.

A total of 417 people were emailed and invited to participate in the online survey on 15 September 2010. The D-Cubed Project team linked each completed project team member with a specific project to refer to, and the email invitations were customised to include the name of the project in question.
Participants were provided with an informed consent package and an electronic link to the survey location. Two reminders were sent to participants before the online survey closed on the 11 October 2010.

Ten completed project team members automatically opted out of the survey, indicating that they did not wish to receive further correspondence from the project. One person was unable to be contacted because they were on leave from their current position, and 16 people were unable to be contacted due to their email addresses bouncing. A total of 390 team members of completed projects were successfully emailed and 143 of those completed the survey, resulting in a 37 percent response rate. Sixty-three percent (n=73) of the completed projects were represented in the online survey. Of these, 78 per cent (n=66) of projects were of the 85 projects under investigation. The sample included 72 project team members (50 per cent), 45 project leaders (31 per cent), 18 project managers (13 per cent), and 7 collaborative partners (7 per cent).

Data analysis

Data from the online survey were exported from SurveyMonkey into a spreadsheet and summarised as descriptive data in a work-in-progress summary. Frequency tables and graphs were used to report on data from multiple-choice and scaled questions. Additionally, as open questions asked respondents to report on their understandings of dissemination, the dissemination strategies used in their project, and the overall success of the project with regard to dissemination strategies used, the team was able to organise these data around the survey questions which mapped onto the investigation questions. The online surveys asked current and completed project teams to describe their understanding of dissemination in their own words. These definitions were categorised into three different objectives: dissemination for (1) awareness, (2) understanding, and (3) action, in accordance with King’s (2003) taxonomy. In this way the team was able to construct an overall picture of how completed project teams managed dissemination. The predominant category was raising awareness. Respondents from current project teams had a higher ratio of action-to-awareness-based references than did members of completed projects, suggesting that a more action-focused approach to dissemination is now emerging.

Current projects online survey

Purpose

The purpose of the current projects online survey was to explore whether there had been any shifts in project leaders’ understandings of dissemination and dissemination practices when compared with those of completed projects. This was an important task for the D-Cubed Project to ensure that findings and recommendations based on data from completed projects were relevant to ongoing and new ALTC projects. The current projects online survey sought to address the following investigation aims:

Aim 1: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood
Aim 2: Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination
Aim 4: Evaluate the sustainability of project outcomes
Aim 5: Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling, and influencing change

Aim 6: Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects

Aim 7: Produce support materials and professional development activities to support those actors and prospective grant applicants

Data collection

The current projects online survey sampled all current ALTC project leaders (N = 138). The survey asked participants to respond to 10 questions about their project experience and current involvement, their understandings of dissemination and the status of their current project’s dissemination activities (see Appendix G for a copy of the current projects online survey). Current project leaders were identified by searching the ALTC website; once identified, their names were entered into a database and their contact details were searched via the ALTC website or their own institutions’ websites. Email addresses were collected for all project leaders and were entered into the database to create a mailing list for the online survey. Project team members who had already contributed data to the project were excluded from the sample (n=7). Deanne Gannaway and Jo McKenzie were identified as current project leaders and were excluded on the basis of being involved in the D-Cubed Project.

A total of 129 people were emailed and invited to participate in the online survey on 15 September 2010. Participants were provided with an information sheet and an electronic link to the survey location. Participants were asked to respond to questions in terms of the project they were currently leading and were provided with an informed consent package and an electronic link to complete the survey. Two reminders were sent to participants before the online survey closed on 11 October 2010.

One current project leader instantly opted out of the survey, indicating that they did not wish to receive further correspondence from the project. One person was unable to be contacted because they were on leave from their current position, and 4 people were unable to be contacted due to their email addresses bouncing. A total of 123 project leaders were successfully emailed with 62 of those completing the survey, resulting in a 50 per cent response rate.

Data analysis

Data from the online survey were exported from SurveyMonkey into a spreadsheet and summarised as descriptive data in a work-in-progress summary. Frequency tables and graphs were used to report on data from multiple-choice and scaled questions. Additionally, as open questions asked respondents to report on their understandings of dissemination and the dissemination strategies, the team was able to organise this data around the survey questions which mapped onto the investigation questions. In this way the team was able to construct an overall picture of how current project leaders’ experiences of dissemination compared with those of the completed projects.
**ALTC Promoting Excellence forum**

**Purpose**

The project team negotiated with the ALTC to present an extended session at the ALTC Promoting Excellence forum in September 2010. The purpose was threefold: to provide strategic professional development to key support staff; to cultivate a climate of readiness for change; and, to gather formative feedback on the draft framework and resources. Over two days (23–24 September 2010) the project team presented project background information and introduced colleagues to the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework and draft resources. The process of engaging with potential adopters at the forum was a planned project strategy for cultivating a climate of readiness for change and had the additional benefit of providing strategic professional development to key support staff. The following aims were addressed by the forum:

**Aim 1: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood**

**Aim 7: Produce support materials and professional development activities to support those actors and prospective grant applicants**

**Data collection**

The forum was attended by 64 participants (PEI leaders and contacts) and 7 ALTC personnel, with 45 people recorded as having attended the D-Cubed presentation. Participants had the opportunity to test the D-Cubed framework and the project resources against hypothetical grant applications. Feedback was collected through observations and discussions with small groups and on feedback sheets. The feedback sheets asked participants to rate how useful they thought each resource was on a five-point Likert scale (see Appendix G for a copy of the feedback sheet).

**Data analysis**

Records of observations and discussions were entered in a work-in-progress summary and the feedback sheet data were entered into a spreadsheet. The feedback sheet data were used to calculate the mean scores of each resource in terms of how useful PEI leaders and staff rated them to be. In keeping with an engaged dissemination approach, in which stakeholder ownership is fostered throughout the project, the data collected at the forum allowed the project team to disseminate and triangulate emergent findings with practitioner needs.

**D-Cubed workshops**

**Purpose**

The workshops were designed as a twofold process of engagement with ALTC grant applicants. Firstly, the workshops were a key data collection exercise for the development of the project resources and for furthering the team’s understanding of the needs of the sector and their willingness to work with materials developed from the project. Second, the project team sought to share preliminary findings from the project, with the intent of developing the climate of readiness for change, and provide professional development to prospective grant applicants and professional support staff.

The D-Cubed workshops sought to address the following aims:

**Aim 1: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood**
Data collection

The project team sought expressions of interest for institutions to host three-hour workshops in the second edition of the D-Cubed Newsletter (July 2010). Six institutions responded to the call: The University of New South Wales, The University of Queensland, Deakin University, Monash University, University of South Australia, and Murdoch University. A total of seven Prospective Applicants’ workshops were conducted in five states across Australia from 30 September to 9 November 2010.

All workshops were open invitation; however, institutions close to the host university were encouraged to attend a local workshop. Workshop invitations were initially sent to the heads of academic development units, PEI contacts, and grants and awards officers at institutions across Australia with the intention of reaching prospective grant applicants through a centralised unit. Additionally, the workshops were publicised through the ALTC News, the ALTC Exchange, ALTC Events, the D-Cubed mailing list, the D-Cubed newsletter, and the PEN mailing list. Members of the Senior Executive Reference Group were also instrumental in the promotion of workshops.

Attendees at the workshops comprised prospective grant applicants and other support staff, such as academic development staff and some PEI staff. Overall, there were 85 attendees from 25 institutions. Table 6 gives an overview of the attendance at the D-Cubed workshops.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Prospective Grant Applicants</th>
<th>Support Staff</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CQU, Rockhampton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ, Brisbane</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW, Sydney</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin, Melbourne</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash, Melbourne</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UniSA, Adelaide</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch, Perth</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the workshops, participants were introduced to the elements of the D-Cubed framework and the project resources. Written feedback was sought on the project resources where participants wrote their comments on A3-sized laminated copies of each resource. Comments were transferred to a spreadsheet for later analysis. Additionally, feedback sheets were used to determine participants’ overall ratings (using a five-point Likert scale) of how useful each resource was. Seventy-three feedback sheets were collected over six workshops. No feedback data were available from the CQU workshop as the resources had not been developed at the time.

Participants were contacted within a week of having completed a workshop and were asked to complete a workshop evaluation form via SurveyMonkey. The
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Data analysis

The data collected during the workshops were entered into spreadsheets. Written feedback on each resource was distributed under three headings: positive feedback, critical comments, and other suggestions. The headings provided the team with a clear sense of the changes required in order to make the resources user-ready, while positive feedback affirmed that the resources were addressing real needs of the sector. Scores on the feedback sheets were tallied to show the perceived usefulness of each resource. While ranking the popularity of each resource was not the intention, the ratings given by workshop participants were useful for validating the written comments received. Feedback from workshops ultimately shaped the final version of the resources.

Forty-seven people completed the workshop evaluation form with 42 providing their email address and indicating that they would like to provide feedback on the final resources; four people indicated no; and one person did not answer the question.

D-Cubed webinars

Purpose

The project team hosted two online workshops, or webinars, upon the completion of the face-to-face workshops. The webinar was hosted via the Wimba Classroom (<www.wimba.com>), an online collaborative learning resource. A prospective applicants’ webinar was held on 7 December to ensure that people who were unable to attend a face-to-face workshop for reasons of remoteness or unavailability were given an opportunity to engage with the resources before they were finalised. The previous participants’ webinar was held on 9 December and invited previous participants of face-to-face workshops to work with and comment on the penultimate version of the project resources and to see the transformation each resource had undergone as a result of their feedback. Both webinars were designed to be a confirmatory project activity, confirming the findings from preceding workshops and the usefulness of the refined resources. The following aim was addressed by the webinars:

Aim 7: Produce support materials and professional development activities to support those actors and prospective grant applicants

Data collection

Prospective applicants’ webinar: Potential participants for the prospective applicants’ webinar (people who had previously registered for a workshop but had not attended) were contacted via email. In addition, several people who had contacted the project officer indicating that they would like to access a recorded workshop were invited. Invitations were again sent to PEI staff and directors of academic development units to be distributed in their networks. Finally, all project informants and participants were sent an invitation, including innovators, implementers, completed project teams, current project leaders, and new ALTC grant leaders. The contact lists were filtered to ensure that no duplicate emails were sent.

A total of 659 people were invited to attend the webinar. Twenty-five emails did not reach the intended addresses due to incorrect contact details, thus 634
people were successfully emailed. The email invitation contained the research information sheet and directed potential participants to a SurveyMonkey page where they entered their contact details to register. Fifty-three people registered for the prospective applicants' webinar, a response rate of 8.4 per cent; however, the webinar was only attended by 17 people from 12 institutions.

Feedback was sought from participants for the purpose of confirming the usefulness of resources for prospective grant applicants. During the webinar, participants were presented with the refined resources and asked whether each resource would be useful to them by indicating yes or no (using a function of the Wimba Classroom). The webinar was recorded using the archive function on Wimba Classroom and the project team took note of participants' written questions and feedback and recorded each yes/no response.

**Previous participants’ webinar:** Previous workshop participants who had given permission to be contacted regarding the final resources were invited by email, which included a link to a registration page hosted by SurveyMonkey. Forty-two participants were successfully emailed an invitation to the webinar, resulting in 19 registrations which was a 45 per cent response rate. Of the 19 registrants, eight people from eight institutions attended the previous participants’ webinar.

Feedback was sought from participants regarding their views on the refined resources. Each refined resource was presented and time for group discussion was provided. The webinar was recorded using the archive function on Wimba Classroom and the project team took note of participants' written questions and feedback.

**Data analysis**

As the purpose of the two webinars was to obtain confirmation of the appropriateness of resources for prospective applicants and the sector, the feedback from webinars was discussed during a project team working session on 14–15 December. During and after the session, the team integrated the feedback into the final draft of the project resources.

**Stage 3: Seek to explain**

The focus of this stage was to investigate further evidence of systemic change and to identify projects with potential for long-term embedding and upscaling of project innovations. In line with an illuminative evaluation approach, multiple sources, or perspectives, were examined to provide a holistic account of the ALTC projects’ activities. Based on a synthesis of findings, this stage enabled the refinement of the new dissemination framework and the finalisation of the project resources.

**Part Two reports**

**Purpose**

Project teams are required to submit a second report to the ALTC upon completion of their project. For the purposes of this project, the core element within the Part Two report was a section that asks project teams to outline the dissemination of project outcomes and the project’s potential for systemic change. The examination of the Part Two reports of the projects under investigation was undertaken to establish the project teams’ perception of the dissemination activities which had occurred and the evidence for systematic change beyond the project completion date.
Data collection

The sections of interest from 65 Part Two reports were extracted by ALTC staff. Three reports were incomplete and removed from the analysis. Sixty-two Part Two reports were examined on the basis of the completion of check boxes in which project teams reported against five indicators of dissemination of project deliverables and five indicators of potential for systematic change. The results from each report were entered into a spreadsheet for analysis.

Data analysis

A descriptive analysis was performed on the spreadsheet data. The project team counted the frequency with which each indicator was reported by projects. The results of this analysis contributed to the identification of test cases which were examined for evidence of embedding and upscaling of project innovations and used to triangulate the data during the refinement of the new dissemination framework.

External evaluators' reports

Purpose

In a similar nature to the Part Two reports, the project team used the external evaluators’ reports to further substantiate findings from the analysis of final reports.

Data collection

Forty-eight evaluators’ reports were provided by the ALTC and examined as part of the analysis undertaken in the refinement process (see below).

Data analysis

A member of the project team reviewed all forty-eight evaluators’ reports and identified common themes across all reports. As each report was somewhat varied in structure and content, the reports were examined for language referring to upscaling, embedding, and sustainability of project outcomes.

A thematic analysis of a subset (n = 8) of the external evaluators’ reports contributed to the identification of test cases. The external evaluators’ reports were used to triangulate the data during the refinement of the new dissemination framework.

Developing test cases and testing the framework

Purpose

In order to make the refinements to the new dissemination framework, the team first needed to identify projects that would constitute the test cases. The purpose of this activity was to test the elements of the new dissemination framework on completed projects to ensure that the framework corresponded to an aspect of the project that led to success or was a challenge to embedding, upscaling, and ensuring sustainability of project outcomes.

Data collection

An examination of the data available for each project was carried out to identify projects with the highest data saturation; namely, the projects which had data from the most sources. Of the 85 projects under investigation, those identified
as having data from a final report \((N=85)\), an interview summary \((n=29)\), a Part Two report \((n=62)\), an external evaluation \((n=32)\), and a completed project team member’s online survey response \((n=66)\) were included as test cases. The projects were cross-referenced in an Excel spreadsheet, revealing eight projects that had a complete data set.

**Data analysis**

The eight test cases were divided among three team members (Gannaway, Hinton, and Moore) and analysed using a thematic approach where the data for each test case were examined in light of each element of the new dissemination framework. The process of testing the framework against completed projects augmented the earlier testing which had been undertaken during workshops.

**Synthesising key findings**

The illuminative evaluation methodology culminated in the project team seeking to explain the dynamics of dissemination in ALTC-funded grant projects. This was achieved by identifying a set of key findings based on a synthesis of the results of all data collection activities. This synthesis was both formative and summative; it evolved over time as the team shared emergent findings with various project advisors and at workshops, and it was confirmed by a detailed working session in which the team reviewed the results of each data collection exercise and synthesised these into a set of findings. Rather than publishing the full set of results, which is cumbersome given the number of data collection exercises and the variety inherent in the mixed methods approach, this report instead highlights those results that are most relevant to the synthesised findings. The focus on multiple perspectives inherent in the illuminative evaluation methodology has meant that, rather than making judgements about whether individual projects have been successful or unsuccessful, the project team adopted the approach that all projects had generated valuable insights about dissemination and that harvesting these was more useful than summatively judging dissemination success or failure.

**Limitations and challenges**

The project approach presented challenges and limitations. The principal challenge was to disentangle dissemination in general from the impact of individual projects and ensure the project remained on course to examine the former. This has been a constant focus for the project team. The other challenge has been the unique nature of projects. The project team has had to be prudent in citing examples because projects would be easily identifiable. To offset this, ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’ draws extensively on illustrative examples, which are not part of the investigation as such, but which are solicited illustrations of particular emergent findings.

There is a limitation with regard to sampling, in that, despite the team’s attempt to be random in its sampling method for selecting innovators, interview participants were essentially self-selected. There may be a particular characteristic of the interview participants that is different from those in the random sample who chose not to respond.

The team was aware of the exigent limitations and challenges throughout the project, and took steps to ameliorate them wherever possible.
Findings and discussion

This section introduces the results and summarises key findings of the investigation. It draws upon the various data collection activities and synthesises them in accordance with the relevant investigation aims. A summary of the key findings and recommendations is provided at the conclusion of this section.

Common understandings of dissemination

This segment explores common understandings of dissemination, to address the investigation aim: Define and explain dissemination as it is commonly understood. To achieve this, it outlines findings in relation to definitions of dissemination and use of the existing ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006).

Definitions of dissemination

Definitions of dissemination were elicited from three data collection strategies: interviews, surveys, and workshops.

Interviews conducted with innovators and implementers enabled the project team to develop a sense of how the sector understands the term “dissemination”. It was common for discussions about dissemination to be shaped in terms of transmitting a message and sharing knowledge, supporting a “traditional” view of dissemination as information provision. However, qualifying statements made explicit the importance of dissemination as being something more than raising awareness about the project. The idea of assessing the climate was summed up by one participant who commented, “you could disseminate but that doesn’t mean anyone would do the slightest thing.” The notion of identifying people who are most likely to benefit from the dissemination was evident. In addition, interview participants commented on the importance of engaging with people during the various phases of the project and transferring a degree of ownership of the project to them. Finally, the credibility of the innovator was described as being imperative by interviewees.

Implementers discussed dissemination in terms of transmitting a message and sharing knowledge. While the implementers’ interviews revealed awareness-raising as being the main interpretation of the term “dissemination”, other themes emerging from the discussion included the credibility of the disseminator, the perceived need for the project, and the importance of reaching people who would most benefit. This suggested an acknowledgement of the importance of, understanding of, and engagement with, a targeted group.

The online surveys asked current and completed project teams to describe their understanding of dissemination in their own words. These definitions were categorised into three different objectives: dissemination for (1) awareness, (2) understanding, and (3) action, in accordance with King’s (2003) taxonomy. The predominant category was raising awareness. Respondents from current project teams had a higher ratio of action-to-awareness-based references than did members of completed projects, suggesting that a more action-focused approach to dissemination is now emerging.

Workshop participants were presented with a selection of definitions of dissemination and asked to rate the one which most closely aligned with their own understanding of dissemination.
The definitions were:

- sharing project outcomes across the sector in formal and informal ways
- the process of understanding and engaging with potential adopters, and nurturing commitment to sustained change, using an intentional strategy throughout the life of the project
- not merely the distribution of products or outcomes from the project, but investing in activities that support the implementation of the project outcomes
- the distribution of the outcomes of the study beyond the group of researchers who undertook the study.

At the ALTC Promoting Excellence forum, 62 per cent (n=45) of participants agreed with the following definition: the process of understanding and engaging with potential adopters, and nurturing commitment to sustained change, using an intentional strategy throughout the life of the project. A majority of workshop participants also agreed with the working definition. Discussion about the definitions prompted the following insights from workshop participants:

- dissemination does not end when the project ends;
- dissemination of project outcomes must go beyond the project team;
- dissemination supports the implementation of project outcomes;
- dissemination must take into account who the targeted potential adopters, stakeholders, and end-users are; and
- dissemination is an active process.

The project team also used workshops to ascertain whether participants thought the word dissemination should be changed. The question yielded varied responses. Many participants toyed with replacement words such as “dispersion”, “diffusion”, and “distribution”. Others suggested the inclusion of adjectives, such as “complex dissemination” (to contrast with simple), “active” (to contrast with passive), or the inclusion of a descriptor (“engaged” or “effective”) to indicate quality. Some participants proposed more radical changes. For example, one group of PEI forum participants proposed that to fully understand dissemination, one must engage in a process involving four stages: explore, engage, embed, exchange; or E4. Despite the creativity shown by many, the majority of participants agreed that the word itself was not the problem. Dissemination is a term engrained in the discourse of the scholarship of learning and teaching and of the ALTC. In the words of one workshop participant, “we wouldn’t be here today if you didn’t have dissemination in the workshop title”.

Finding 1: Clearer definition of key terms is required if the sector is to move forward in the quality and effectiveness of dissemination.

Discussion

It is evident that the sector lacks a shared language for discussing and describing the decisions that project teams make about dissemination. This is an area of need that has been evident in the sector for some time, and one of the gaps that the existing ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) was designed to fill when it was introduced in 2006, according to the initiators’ interviews.
These complexities in nomenclature are also explored by McKenzie, et al. (2005) who state, “there are multiple ways of understanding precisely what constitutes “dissemination” in general, and in higher education in particular” (p. 6).

The discussions that occurred during the workshops and interviews indicated a need for clarification of what it means to disseminate, but the multiple understandings of dissemination offered by participants confirmed that there is no single way to disseminate. Therefore, the following key definitions are proposed:

- **Dissemination**: The planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.
- **Dissemination activities**: The individual actions by which aspects of the project are disseminated to others, as a core aspect of the project.
- **Dissemination strategy**: The intentionally developed approach to dissemination of a particular project which includes identification of targeted potential adopters, an assessment of the climate of readiness for change, planning how engagement will be built throughout the project, and enabling transfer of project outcomes.
- **Embedding**: “The engagement of an innovation in the local process and perhaps the modification of policies, procedures and structures to accommodate the new practice” (Southwell et al., 2005, p. 81).
- **Upscaling**: Influencing practice beyond the project’s original site or scope.
- **Sustainability**: The continuation of benefits after project funding has ceased” (Joyes, Turnock, Cotterill, & Banks, 2009, p. 131).

**Recommendation 1**: That the ALTC adopts a revised definition of dissemination, specifically that dissemination be taken to mean: The planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

**Use of the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006)**

Interviews with former ALTC staff (the “initiators”) who developed and introduced the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) revealed that they had not intended the framework to become such a pivotal document. Instead, a view consistent across all three interviews was that the framework was a shorthand representation of key ideas from the McKenzie et al. (2005) report and the Southwell et al. (2005) report. All three interviewees expressed concern about the level of importance the framework had subsequently been afforded by the sector. In the words of one initiator, “it was simply a tool to help people think, it was nothing more than that and if anyone thinks it goes beyond that then I’m a little bit disturbed by that”. Another commented that “in and of itself, it’s not a self-explanatory document and it’s not meant to be—it was meant to be a two-page synthesis”.

The review of final reports of completed projects showed that only five of 83 projects explicitly referred to the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) as a conceptual organiser when recording their dissemination strategy or activities.
Interviews with project leaders indicated that they gave higher weighting to those activities described as engaged dissemination activities in the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) and ascribed a lesser value to the information-provision activities, by describing their information-provision activities as “just” or “only”. Those who referred to information-provision activities ensured that the interviewer knew that they had also used engaged activities that they had “more than simply” sent information out. This view reflects a devaluing of those activities described in the framework as “information-provision activities”. While interviewees reported using the language of the framework in applications, it seemed this was more often to satisfy requirements than because the framework had guided their project design. One such interviewee explained that it was essential to:

...convey to the people reading our application that we had paid attention to the directions which is an essential part of the game. There was an element of what we wanted to do but also what folks would want us to be seen to be doing.

The online survey indicated that half of all participants (from both completed and current projects) had used the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) to obtain information about dissemination strategies for their project. It is evident that more people who are currently completing projects are referring to the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) than did participants from completed projects. Figure 6 below displays the percentage of projects referring to the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006).

![Figure 6. Percentage of projects referring to the ALTC Dissemination Framework](image)

Survey participants were asked where they sourced advice and support from regarding dissemination strategies. For participants in both current and completed projects, there appeared to be a reliance on the reference group and previous personal experience in research grants in helping project teams to develop their dissemination strategies. There was an increased reliance among current project leaders, compared to completed project teams, on project team members’ previous experience in research activities and previous ALTC grants (see Figure 7).
Finding 2: The ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) is not a sufficient mechanism for supporting an understanding of effective dissemination.

Discussion

A detailed dissemination framework adopted by a funding organisation has the potential to be a potent tool for guiding and supporting a project leader’s approach to dissemination, their formation of an appropriate dissemination strategy, and their selection of dissemination activities. This is a potential that framework currently in use does not seem to realise. The existing framework seems to have, perhaps inadvertently, set up a hierarchy that presumes that engaged dissemination is more effective and important than information provision activities. This was evident in both the interview and workshop findings. It is the view of the D-Cubed project team that such a preference is not in keeping with the dissemination literature and with the findings of this project. In fact, both types of dissemination activities are useful, the critical factor being that dissemination is planned with change in mind. In other words, there is a need for project teams to find and cultivate a climate of readiness for change, build knowledge and awareness throughout the life of the project, and facilitate the target potential adopter’s commitment to change.

Recommendation 2: That the ALTC considers replacing the existing ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) with the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework and adopts the D-Cubed definitions of dissemination, dissemination strategy, and dissemination activities.

What is being done to disseminate?

This segment explores the reported use of dissemination activities in projects to address the investigation aim: Investigate what has been done to disseminate and identify other resources for effective dissemination. To achieve this it outlines findings in relation to common dissemination activities, use of online technologies, timing of dissemination, and dissemination strategies.
Common dissemination activities

An inventory of dissemination activities was developed from the analysis of final reports in the initial observation phase. Analysis revealed 28 categories that related to dissemination activities which were coded as being either information provision or engaged dissemination, according to the descriptions in the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006). Much greater diversity of approaches was evident in those activities coded as information provision than in those coded as engaged dissemination. Information provision dissemination activities were far more prevalent in final reports than in engaged dissemination activities. Overall, the review of final reports indicated that completed projects have had significant reach to a broad range of stakeholders.

Respondents in both survey groups were asked to report the dissemination activities undertaken in their projects. The list of dissemination activities was the basis for developing the multiple-choice question in the survey.

While there appeared to be a shift in the theoretical understanding of dissemination from completed projects to current projects (see page 51 above), this was not reflected in the actual activities being employed in current projects. Activities used in current projects were similar to completed projects; however, there was less preference for publication of books and/or book chapters. Instead, building networks was a preferred dissemination activity and websites were found to be of equal preference to workshops. An analysis of the data revealed a preference for traditional methods of dissemination in completed projects, with the five most commonly used dissemination activities being:

- presenting at conferences
- publishing a book or book chapter
- hosting project events
- running workshops
- writing journal articles.

The most prevalent engaged dissemination activities were project events. These events and meetings took the form of professional and discipline-based seminars, fora, and conferences hosted in a central location, as well as travelling roadshows where project team members visited sites across the country. Some were developed purposely for disseminating project activities and some were appended to existing activities and gatherings. Ascertaining the exact nature of these activities, and whether they fostered genuine engagement and collaboration with targeted potential adopters, was difficult. Another consideration was whether they were specifically intended to provide information about the project; or, whether they were developed solely for the purposes of data collection. The local level administration required to organise visits to various sites was noted as an onerous and expensive task that required time and resourcing. Funding was frequently allocated from project budgets for room hire and catering; however, the hidden costs of associated administration and organisation were mentioned in 6 of the 15 implementers’ interviews and were raised in informal discussions across the life of the project.

Table 7 displays the percentage of projects which employed and/or intended to employ (for current projects) specific dissemination activities. The highest rated activities are highlighted in blue.
A review of the dissemination strategies used by projects funded under the ALTC Grants Scheme

Table 7. Number and percentage of projects that employed and/or intended to employ specific dissemination activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination activities employed/intended to employ</th>
<th>Completed (N=143)</th>
<th>Current (N=62)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference presentation</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book or book chapter</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project events</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal articles</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media announcements</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-specific email lists</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadshow or travelling showcases</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in institutional or organisational structures</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project branding</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online discussion forum or social networking space</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided seeding funding or subproject funding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listservs belonging to other organisations</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews with implementers and innovators, external evaluations, and project final reports highlighted the need to use multiple modes and media to attract and reach a number of different people at various points in time throughout the life of the project.

One of the unanticipated activities was the use of media. There were a number of projects identified that reported active engagement with mainstream media, such as newspapers, magazines, radio, and television. Engagement with the

---

4 These activities are explored in further detail in ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’

5 The term network is used interchangeable, but generally refers to existing or specifically created formal and informal opportunities for interacting with potential adopters
media included industry-specific publications, such as *Campus Review* (or professional newsletters with a higher education or discipline-specific readership), as well as those appealing to broader interests, such as *The Australian Financial Review* and local community newspapers.

**Finding 3:** The most popular method of communication of project outcomes remains traditional academic modes such as conference presentations, book publications and publication in academic journals and conferences.

**Discussion**

The use of peer-reviewed scholarly works is still a dominant and credible means of communication of the value of project outcomes. The process of peer review was not sought as a key question, but was still mentioned by interviewees, online survey respondents, and workshop participants as an indicator of value and of merit. As noted by one completed project participant:

> ... academic publishing needs to be a key dissemination strategy as it demands one to refine and polish ideas and ensures those ideas are more broadly circulated and potentially considered as opposed to reports and resources just sitting on ALTC and other institutional project websites.

The popularity of traditional academic artefacts may be appropriate for the culture of potential adopters. These communication methods are viewed as providing scholarly credibility, because they have been peer reviewed. However, the prevalence of workshops, project events, and network-building is also notable, suggesting that project teams are interacting with targeted potential adopters through a range of active, engaged methods. Maintenance of both streams of activity is important to support immediate evidence-informed change.

**Use of online technologies**

The web search revealed that the majority of projects (70 per cent) had active websites, or pages on websites, housing relevant project information. Eight websites had URLs different from those listed in the final report, but a clear redirection to the new URL was available. A further eight websites were obsolete. One website for a project completed in 2007, and seven websites for projects completed from 2008–2009, were no longer accessible and revealed a “server not found” or “not found on this server” message. The exception was one which revealed that the site was under redevelopment. The search revealed that websites were most commonly hosted by a university (e.g., lead institution) and by non-university URLs (e.g., a privately developed or commissioned site (see Table 8).
The web analysis activity revealed that social networking was not widely used in 2006-2009 projects. For example, only four projects listed the ALTC Exchange as the main project website. A Google search for key words and project titles resulted in few direct links to websites related to projects reported in the final reports, suggesting that there are inconsistencies with project titles, resources developed, and search engine optimisation strategies.

Interviews with innovators revealed that there was a heightened level of expectation for the ALTC Exchange as a repository and a platform for social networking. This facility was noted as being unavailable in time for projects to use or as not having anticipated functions.

**Finding 4: A web presence is a common dissemination activity, but its potential impact is limited due to maintenance issues after the project concludes.**

**Discussion**

Although the web search and analysis did not elicit evidence as to why projects developed websites, dissemination is arguably a key motivator in investing resources in this medium. Nearly half of the project sites listed in the final reports are still live; however, many do not appear to have been updated since the end of the project. It is possible that many of these websites will remain static, thus minimising the likelihood of sustained, engaged dissemination.

A possible recommendation for future projects would be to ensure consistency in language between reports and web-based resources to assist with web searches. Search engine optimisation would also be a way to make ALTC projects more likely to appear in the first few pages of web search results.

**Recommendation 3: That the ALTC considers introducing standards, with training and support, for the communication of project outcomes using the web.**
Timing of dissemination

Over half of the current project leaders indicated that they had started, or intended to start, disseminating during the life of the project, while 42 per cent reported that they would actually start dissemination either prior to, or during, the project’s proposal phase. Figure 8 below represents when current project leaders indicated that their dissemination strategies would start.

Figure 8. Percentage of responses indicating when current project leaders would begin their dissemination strategies

Coding of the dissemination activities described in project final reports reinforced that there were overlaps between project activity and dissemination in projects. The use of focus groups is an example of this. A number of reports explicitly identified that these data collection exercises were also dissemination activities, and in others it was implicitly so. For example, projects reported that focus groups and face-to-face meetings were used, not only to gather feedback, but also to share information gathered to date and to share tentative project outcomes.

Finding 5: There is an espoused understanding amongst grant recipients that dissemination activities occur during the life of the project, rather than after the project concludes.

Discussion

The data show that consultative or participatory project design has the effect of enabling dissemination throughout the life of the project. This type of engagement has been described by Hicks (2004) as “dissemination in parallel with generation” (p. 35). While the projects made use of engaged activities to collect data and for professional development, engagement did not necessarily occur with those who could take responsibility for embedding and upscaling for project outcomes and ensure implementation beyond the life of the project. For example, projects funded under the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program appeared to have been actively disseminated because project design included interactive workshops, development programs, and
retreats. Deeper analysis revealed that the engagement described was not for the purposes of dissemination, because it did not include a high level of engagement with the project deliverables' potential adopters: those who would make the project deliverables available for future end-users. Therefore, the identification and targeting of potential adopters is of critical importance.

**Dissemination strategies**

The project final reports tended to list dissemination activities in an atomistic manner, rather than articulating a guiding strategy for dissemination that informed the activities that were employed by the project.

The atomistic approach was also evident in innovators’ interviews. When asked to describe their dissemination strategy, the dominant method was to list activities rather than to use language consistent with a strategic approach. Of the fourteen innovators interviewed, nine interviewees understood the need for a multi-level, multilayer approach which actively interacted with, and engaged, a particular group. Despite this, there was a view that dissemination was really about ensuring that, in the words of one interview respondents, as “many people/stakeholders as possible are aware of what was discovered”.

Intentional planning for dissemination was emphasised as being pivotal. The open-ended comments in the completed projects online survey in response to the question: “Any lessons or particular experiences learnt related to dissemination that you would like to share?” resulted in a number of responses that indicated the need for planning. A typical example was: “There was not time energy or money left at the end of the project to really extend the dissemination. This really needs to be better planned, funded and accounted for in the project design/application.”

The notion of dissemination being driven by a strategy, not merely a collection of discrete activities, was largely absent across all the data collected within the eight test cases. Only one of the eight projects clearly identified a dissemination strategy that had a clear purpose and rationale, a clear target group with whom engagement was actively sought, and a clearly articulated budget and time frame that was designed to facilitate the strategy. This strategy was designed to be flexible, responsive to project progress, and adaptable as necessary. Two other projects in the test case sample stressed the notion of reflexivity, adaptability, and ability to interact with potential adopters; however, this was largely framed in the context of “learning as we went” and projects being “so bloody organic in how they effect change and get picked up, [that] you really need to be prepared to chew the ear of every person you meet about your project”.

**Finding 6: Dissemination is commonly described as a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose.**

**Discussion**

The value of being able to articulate a strategy—a planned process intentionally constructed to achieve a particular purpose—is clearly evident. The Oxford dictionary defines a strategy as “a plan of action designed to achieve a long-term or overall aim” (Oxford University, 2009). This definition suggests that there is an intentional, cohesive series of activities designed to achieve a particular purpose. The notion of planned activities was noted in Rabin et al.’s
(2008) definition of a dissemination strategy as being “an active approach of spreading evidence-based interventions to the target audience via determined channels using planned strategies” (p. 118). These strategies ideally would be conceived within the overall project plan, not as an isolated strategy that sits alongside of the project, but is an embedded function of the project design.

These aspects were largely missing from the data described above, despite the fact that the statement “Plans for the dissemination/embedding of the successful strategies and outcomes that are integrated within the project design” was a standard criterion in the program guidelines from 2007 to 2009. This suggested that different levels of understanding may exist among those who assess ALTC grants as to the importance of an effective dissemination plan or strategy as a crucial component of project design.

**Recommendation 4: That ALTC grants briefings, such as those conducted for assessors, grant applicants and project managers, include the new D-Cubed materials as appropriate.**

In addition, the data in the open-ended “lessons learnt” question on the completed projects online survey suggested that applicants perceived a need to interact with the widest audience possible in order to maximise potential uptake. The absence of a clear identification of the targeted group is problematic in that it means that effort, energy, and resources may not have the greatest benefit.

**Features of successful dissemination**

This segment explores features of successful dissemination to address the investigation aims: “Evaluate the sustainability of project outcome” and “Identify characteristics of projects and their dissemination strategies that lead to embedding, upscaling and influencing change”. To achieve this, it outlines findings in relation to sustained involvement, evidence of change, targeting potential adopters, and climate of readiness for change.

**Sustained involvement**

The relatively short-lived nature of these projects, in comparison to projects in public health or education literature, became apparent when the D-Cubed project team attempted to contact project team members for completed projects. As described in the approach section of this report, a comprehensive database of all those listed in final reports was developed. There was considerable “churn” in the process, with 25 per cent of those listed in project teams no longer contactable. The personal involvement of project leaders and project team members was an indicator of the reliance on the personal investment of key project personnel to champion project outcomes. As a respondent to the online survey noted in an open-ended response: “The minute you hear ‘my secondment/project is up in December’ you can bet that it’s going to die”.

The online survey indicated that only 48 per cent of project team members remained in regular contact after the project had concluded. Perhaps unsurprisingly, collaborative partners had the lowest level of ongoing participation and contact. Those who indicated that they had acted as project leaders had the highest level of ongoing contact and the highest reported adoption of project outcomes by their home institutions and other organisations.
The limitation of time was a constant theme across interviews, external evaluation reports, final reports, Part Two reports, and some open-ended survey questions. Involvement in ALTC projects tended to be viewed as an additional task, rather than a core task, for many of those innovators interviewed. Most project leaders appeared to be running ALTC projects in conjunction with other institutional commitments. A statement similar to “For all team members at the different institutions, the project workload was on top of an existing full workload for their institution” was found in 12 of the 48 external evaluation reports. This finding resonates with the common theme emerging from innovator interviews—the struggle of balancing project work with the “day job”. Frequently, this included teaching, research, and high-level administrative tasks and responsibilities. These roles appear to persist despite proposal budget allocations for portions of funding to be used for relief from normal duties. This project work/career balance issue may account for comments such as an observation made by one online completed project member’s response to the open-ended statement that “The team was exhausted and drained by the end, and opportunities were not taken up”.

The review of final reports also attempted to determine instances where further funding had been obtained or sought as a result of the ALTC project. Fifteen projects (18 per cent) were coded under this category, since they had expressly indicated that they would be investigating further funding opportunities. Responses to a similar question in the online survey for completed projects suggested that the actual engagement with project funding at the project’s completion was higher than reported in the final reports. An overview of the responses to the question related to funding opportunities is found in Table 9 below.

Table 9. Online survey responses indicating post-project funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Continued Funding/Additional Project Funding</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued institutional funding</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly led to other ALTC projects that were funded and which included original project team members</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly led to other ALTC projects that were funded and which did not directly involve original project members</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to other ALTC proposals that had been rejected</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to other projects funded from sources other than the ALTC (such as ARC or professional associations)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finding 7: ALTC grant holders tend to equate the end of the grant with an end of their involvement in that topic, possibly as a result of ALTC project work being viewed as an additional workload.

Discussion

Unlike project leaders of activities funded by competitive research grants (where project outcomes and activities conducted during a project life become integral to the project leader’s academic career), the end of the grant for project leaders of the projects funded between 2006 to 2009 appears to be equated to an end of their involvement in that topic. This perception creates an environment in which people are likely to “reinvent the wheel”, with projects starting from scratch each time rather than building on what is already known.
This “dip-in, dip-out” approach has implications for the sustainability of the project outcomes after the project has concluded.

The implications of taking on an ALTC grant and the impact of the workload may be the reasons for the view that a project ends with the project funding end date, particularly since the evidence gathered in this project, and in the preceding dissemination studies, suggests that ongoing support after project funding concludes is pivotal to embedding outcomes into institutional processes and upscaling (see, for example, Southwell et al. (2005b) on funding scheme design). Informal comments throughout the project suggested that project leaders and team members have difficulty justifying ongoing activity to management after the project concludes; however, establishing definitive evidence of this, and potential impact on embedding and upscaling projects, was beyond the scope of this project. Given that discipline research activities do not appear to be viewed as tasks additional to normal duties, while scholarship of teaching work appears to be, it may be worth exploring this further.

**Recommendation 5: That the ALTC considers funding further investigation into the potential impact of workload on undertaking scholarship of learning and teaching projects, including embedding and upscaling project outcomes.**

Evidence of change

The project team defined change as the achievement of upscaling, embedding, or both. Respondents to the completed projects online survey were asked to respond to questions similar to those used in the Part Two final reports. Part Two reporting requires project leaders to indicate the projects’ potential to achieve changes, while the online survey asked respondents whether they had seen any evidence of changes occurring since the project ended. The results of these questions were compared to the responses collected in a related question in the online survey, illustrated in Table 10 below. In addition, 46 per cent of respondents to the online survey reported that they were unaware of “Changes to Dept/School/Faculty or institution curriculum development, learning and teaching practices and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions outside the project team”. Evidence from the Part Two reports suggested that most project leaders (n=61) thought that the projects had the greatest potential for systemic change on a faculty or departmental level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence from Part Two reports</th>
<th>Online survey responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree/agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree/agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to dept/school/faculty or institution curriculum development, learning and teaching practices, and/or teaching management processes in one or more of the institutions of the project team</td>
<td>97% (n=61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change to the curriculum development, learning and teaching practices, and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions outside the project team</td>
<td>86% (n=54)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Comparison in perceptions of upscaling between Part Two reports and online survey responses
A belief held by eight of the 15 implementer interviewees was that the projects may not have had embedded implementation in the lead institution but may have had wider uptake by other institutions. Sixteen of the 48 external evaluation reports expressed a common concern that, at the time the external evaluation was conducted for the preparation and submission of the Part Two report, it was too soon to ascertain whether any long-term change, in the form of sustained embedding and upscaling, had occurred.

**Finding 8: It is not possible to accurately measure or determine evidence of long-term changes that may have occurred as a result of the project based on the current reporting mechanisms.**

**Discussion**

The importance of enacting the intention of the ALTC funding to precipitate change is noted. The ALTC has consistently maintained an agenda to effect change in higher education. For example:

> …promote and support strategic change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching, including curriculum development and assessment [emphasis added]. ALTC mission statement extract in Grants Scheme Guidelines 2005–06 dated 24 March 2006 (The Carrick Institute of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education Ltd, 2006)

> We aspire to lead and support the transformation of learning and teaching in Australian higher education, ensuring all students benefit from the highest quality learning experience [emphasis added]. ALTC Vision statement in ALTC strategic plan 2010–13 dated 9 September 2010 (ALTC, 2010c)

Although this creates an expectation that projects might effect change as a result of the funding, the consistent message from external evaluation reports was that there was a need for projects to have a period of consolidation and to build on activities, but that the short project time frames did not allow for this.

Similarly, interviewees and survey respondents concurred that sustained change takes a long time to occur. A core perception among interviewees and online survey respondents was that the actual embedding and upscaling of project outcomes occurred well beyond the limited time frame of the project.

Part Two reports ask about the perception of the project having the potential for ongoing impact. This potential may not, in fact, eventuate, as illustrated by the relatively low rate of agreement with the statements in the online survey, in contrast to Part Two report responses. The Part Two reports do not provide information that can be used reliably to measure possible impact and change as they are developed too soon after the project ends to provide evidence of change. The absence of a post-project report was also noted in three interviews with implementers. Having post-project reports publicly available for ascertaining what had been adopted by other institutions, in order to share experiences in adapting into other contexts, was viewed as being useful.
Recommendation 6: That the ALTC considers amending project reporting requirements to include a post-project Part Three report to be collected one year after conclusion of project. The report should allow project teams to report on: what activities have occurred since the end of the project; how project outcomes are sustained; changes/maintenance to website or resources; and, future plans and opportunities.

Targeting potential adopters

The online survey open-ended responses for both current and completed projects indicated a heightened level of awareness of the need to engage with individuals. More frequent reference was made to the need to engage with “stakeholders” in the completed projects survey, but the term “stakeholders” was used varying to describe students, professional associations, academic staff, and industry. The use of the term “target audience” (used 13 times by 62 respondents) was more prevalent in the current project survey than in the completed projects survey (used 4 times by 147 respondents). The open-ended responses also suggested that there was a higher level of awareness of the need to engage with people who are most likely to use the project deliverables than with the general public, as suggested in the following response:

As all the members of the team were also all the members of Australia's curriculum developers in this grant, the context of dissemination may have been different to other grants where one or two institutions were conducting a project that could be rolled out to others. All the people who may have required dissemination too, were IN the project and that context is important. To some degree the target audience was ourselves...

Those activities that involved engagement with the target group were viewed as being the most successful by innovators questioned about the effectiveness of dissemination activities. The engaged activities cited included workshops, engaging with “change operatives”, and talking to stakeholders. This perception resulted in the use of statements that encompassed whole disciplines or professions, rather than targeting individuals. In contrast to the view expressed by one interviewee that “disciplines can’t affect change, only people within that discipline can”, many projects focused on targeting disciplines rather than individuals. A dominant theme emerging from interviews was the perceived challenge of raising audience awareness about the project. Stakeholders’ lack of engagement with the published material, and a lack of support from institutions or professional bodies, contributed to this problem and resulted in a “build it, they will come” expectation.

A core perception emerging from the data collected in workshops, surveys, and interviews was that, to be successful, the project had to reach and impact the whole sector—that “bigger is better”. To this end, most of the projects investigated listed a number of collaborating or partner institutions, but the actual involvement of these groups varied considerably.

Projects that took a “push” dissemination approach, typically by producing a website and largely neglecting any personal interaction, appeared to have only a limited life beyond the project end date. Based upon a review of final reports,
Part Two reports, interviews, surveys, and external evaluations, it appears as though uptake beyond the project team has been limited. It seems unlikely that outcomes of such projects will be adopted at a later stage, except through the serendipity of a potential adopter stumbling upon the online materials and deciding to embed or upscale the project outcomes.

**Finding 9: Projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset.**

**Discussion**

Engagement with potential adopters is crucial. Potential adopters are those organisations and individuals who would adopt and adapt the program, products, policies, or processes for use in their institutions (i.e., to embed and upscale the project, independent of the project team, in a sustainable manner). These people are variously described in the data collection activities as “target audience”, “end-users”, and “stakeholders”, though these terms are also used far more broadly in describing anyone with an interest in, or who is set to benefit from, the project, regardless of whether they are actually able to effect change.

The findings from this study confirm that ongoing involvement with those who will adopt and adapt the outputs is pivotal. This implies an understanding of who is going to adopt the project and of the target group’s characteristics. This is in keeping with the literature which suggests that:

> Efforts to disseminate effective programs will be more successful when specific marketing targets are identified, programs are tailored to meet the needs of these various market segments, programs are packaged in attractive formats and change agent field representatives are carefully selected and trained to adapt to the culture [of the targets]. (Rohrbach, D’Onofrio, & Backer, 1996 p. 926)

The notion of engagement with potential adopters is not new; it is core to Diffusion Theory (Rogers, 1995), was explored by Moses in 1998 in her “Desiderata for successful introduction of change” (1988), and is pivotal to change management literature. (See, for example, work such as Grundy, 1987; Fullan, 2001, 2006)

A potential adopter is not simply a stakeholder in the project. Stakeholders appear to be classified, in many projects, as anybody with a potential interest in, or potential to be affected by, the project, such as students, industry, or professional representatives and future employers. While their views and experiences are important to the shaping of the innovation or initiative, their contribution to the project is not typically to implement change. For maximum impact, the identification of potential adopters who can implement project outcomes is required.

For this reason, clear terminology is required. It is important to make distinctions between project stakeholders (anyone with a stake or interest in the project), end-users (people for whom the intervention is designed, such as students), targeted potential adopters (those people or organisations who are able to actually take up the changes proposed, should they be persuaded to do so), and change enablers (those people who can, in a range of ways, increase the likelihood of embedding, upscaling and sustainability of project outcomes).
The language used to identify those people with whom projects interact (students, stakeholders, collaborators etc.) frequently seems to impede the clarity of planning for dissemination. The naming conventions are important in this regard. Projects often reported extensive interaction with a broad range of stakeholders, but this can obscure the importance of planning dissemination to reach, in particular, those people with whom the project seeks to engage. Put another way, the phrase “engaged dissemination” is problematic because, in referring to interactions with stakeholders in a broad sense, project teams can neglect to facilitate change. In the projects that were examined most closely, a majority had engaged extensively with stakeholders, but had not sufficiently directed their dissemination to the actual targeted potential adopters for the project. This created adverse outcomes. For example, enthusiastic educators were limited in the degree to which they could use the project innovation because of lack of institutional commitment, and a major institutional initiative seemed to vanish with the departure of its project leader. Four key roles that have emerged are:

- **Change enablers**: People who can increase the likelihood of embedding, upscaling and sustainability of project outcomes.
- **Targeted potential adopters**: People with whom the project seeks to engage and to whom project deliverables are transferred for the purpose of change.
- **End-users**: People for whom the intervention is designed, such as students.
- **Stakeholder**: Anyone with a stake or interest in the project.

### Climate of readiness for change

The Southwell et al. (2005) report identified the importance of the readiness of the climate for change as one of five crucial conditions for the effective dissemination of project outcomes. This element is missing from the current ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006).

The interviews and workshops showed that project leaders frequently grappled with being able to articulate what *climate of readiness for change* means in terms of their project and to identify how or if a climate is ready for change, or how to increase the readiness for change. The interviews with innovators frequently elicited comments about climate of readiness, though it was not typically referred to in these terms. Instead, interviewees described how “the time was right” and that “the sector was hungry for information”.

The awareness of the importance of climate of readiness for change was mixed, however. The online surveys asked participants to rank prospective professional development resources, including a climate of readiness for change resource (described as “a calculator which can help assess whether the sector is ready for the changes you are proposing/envisaging”). It was ranked lowest in both surveys. Workshop participants also considered this resource. The workshop included an explanation of the concept, and an opportunity to use the draft climate of readiness resource. Participants rated it more highly after hearing the workshop explanation about its importance.

**Finding 10**: Project leaders grapple with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing a climate of readiness for change.

### Discussion

The literature associated with valorisation and diffusion theory, and the Southwell (2005a) report, suggests that an understanding of the climate needs...
to be central to the development of a dissemination strategy. The challenge concerns assessing that the climate is indeed ready for change. Assessing the climate of readiness for change involves more than discovering what the current fad is, or what topic is capturing the imagination of the sector at a particular time. It requires an understanding of culture and organisational structures at the sites where change is anticipated. Knowing which organisations to work through that ultimately need to have ownership of deliverables, and identifying particular groups of people (potential adopters) who can facilitate change, appears to be a feature of those projects that could be described as embedded or upscaled, and therefore sustained. This is consistent with Hicks’ (2004) finding that successful dissemination entails the “explicit targeting of audiences for the resource material produced and the use of deliberate dissemination strategies aimed at those audiences” (Hicks, 2004, p. 40).

Embedding and upscaling is affected by the recognition of the need for change, proactive leadership, and a close alignment between the project and the strategic direction of the institutions at which change is intended to occur. This necessitates an understanding of the nature of the project and the various other components that signal climate of readiness (these are further outlined in the proposed new dissemination framework; see page 79). Explicitly addressing the climate of readiness for change frees a project from being dependent on serendipity and good luck.

That climate of readiness is well-explored in the literature, and yet seems elusive in people’s language and reasoning, affirms the importance of a robust program of professional development about effective dissemination. The ALTC is well placed to coordinate such professional development and to encourage it as a focus at the institutional level.

**Recommendation 7: That the ALTC takes responsibility for providing relevant professional development opportunities regarding dissemination, as well as encouraging institutions to deliver such offerings at the local level.**

There is considerable evidence that there has been a gradual adoption of effective dissemination approaches, and that the previous reports by Southwell et al. (2005) and McKenzie et al. (2005) have had an impact on the understanding of dissemination as used in the sector. It is hoped that the findings of this study will make a similar contribution. However, effective dissemination is an ever-evolving topic of discussion and debate. For this reason, there needs to be a means of ensuring the ALTC’s approach to dissemination remains relevant as the context changes. Therefore, it is recommended that an evidence-based review of dissemination activities and effectiveness be commissioned regularly by the ALTC. It is recommended that it be undertaken by a differently composed project team each cycle to ensure fresh perspectives, and that the team be encouraged to work with previous leaders (as featured in this project, and the two previous reports).

**Recommendation 8: That an evidence-based review of dissemination activities and effectiveness be commissioned regularly by the ALTC, on a five-year cycle.**
Roles in supporting dissemination

This segment explores the allocation of responsibility for supporting dissemination to address the investigation aim: *Explore the actors, roles, processes, and documentation in supporting effective dissemination, before, during, and after projects*. To do this it outlines the role of the ALTC in particular, and others in general.

Role of the ALTC

The online surveys found that 43 per cent (n=143) of completed project team members had direct contact with ALTC personnel for support regarding dissemination. This percentage has decreased over time, with 32 per cent (n=62) of current project leaders contacting the ALTC for support. The important role of the ALTC in supporting project progress was affirmed by interview participants.

Networking events organised by the ALTC, (e.g., project management workshops and leadership and assessment project leaders’ meetings, seminars, fora), and sponsored events, such as the Western Australian Networking and Dissemination (WAND) event, were very positively viewed by innovators and implementers to foster collaborations. They were seen as key dissemination responsibilities of the ALTC.

Innovators and implementers shared similar views on what the ALTC could do to improve their support of disseminating project deliverables. The concept of facilitating the dissemination of deliverables across disciplines was viewed to be an ALTC responsibility by three project leaders of the 14 interviewed. This facilitation is seen to take the form of providing support and infrastructure such as an online repository. The ALTC website, despite comments that it was difficult to navigate and search, was seen to be critical for housing records. The interviews, in particular, stressed the need for the ALTC to act as a clearinghouse and a repository for project artefacts. Overall, interviewees' responses suggested that the ALTC could do more to support the dissemination of project outcomes, particularly in terms of a systematic process for connecting like projects at key points: at proposal stage, during the project life, and after the projects have concluded. The need to showcase project outcomes after the project’s conclusion was repeatedly mentioned. The value of the ALTC-organised or sponsored thematic events on topics, such as assessment, first year teaching, and learning spaces, was acknowledged as being valuable in connecting people, knowledge, and practice.

**Finding 11:** The ALTC is perceived as having an obligation to support the dissemination of project outcomes through providing a searchable repository for project deliverables and facilitating opportunities for making links between projects.

Discussion

There is a sense, in some of the early projects, that ALTC had a responsibility for taking a role in active distribution and in encouraging uptake of project findings. This view may be a legacy from when AUTC project deliverables were distributed by the Commonwealth department (then DEST). This approach was noted by Hicks (2004) as not being particularly successful. The view that the responsibility of distribution as a role of the ALTC was held by very few project leaders when final reports, interviews, and surveys were reviewed. Instead,
interviewees saw the role of the ALTC as providing a searchable clearinghouse or repository for project deliverables and facilitating opportunities for making links between projects. There is also a perception emerging from discussions at various workshops, and comments in interviews, that the ALTC is an umbrella organisation, and, as such, is the only organisation that oversees which projects are currently being submitted as applications and undertaken. There is potential benefit for groups, such as the grants programs standing committees, to be appointed as brokers and possibly to link similar projects at the proposal stage.

**Recommendation 9:** That the ALTC explores further opportunities to address sectoral expectations that it be a broker for project ideas and clearinghouse for project deliverables.

**Other roles that enable dissemination**

The Southwell et al. (2005) report stressed the importance of effective leadership across multiple levels and functions of the project if the project were to be assured of successful completion, implementation, embedding, and upscaling. Consistent with the findings in the Southwell et al. (2005) report, the innovators’ and implementers’ interviews revealed that the inclusion of multiple levels and functions is important.

Sign-off on project proposals and reports by senior leaders is a requirement of ALTC grants guidelines, partly to ensure that projects are aligned to institutional strategic directions. While interview participants generally acknowledged the potential for the role of the DVC/PVC in facilitating implementation, embedding, and upscaling, seven of the 15 implementers’ interviews worryingly reported that the level of engagement was more of a “rubber stamp approach” (as reported in an implementer’s interview). This approach gave rise to situations where, despite the fact that the project proposal was approved by the senior management, the project was not aligned to institutional strategic directions and, as a result, outcomes had not been adopted. Two such examples were found in the test case sample.

The ability to allocate workload and resources after the project’s completion was identified by interviewees as being crucial to sustainability. When institutional leaders were actively involved in a project, project leaders and team members believed that they were helping to raise the profile of a project among institutional staff, but stressed the need for these leaders to be “hands-on and active members of the project”. One project leader described the use of the reference/steering group as “dissemination agents”. In this instance, members of the reference group were specifically targeted for inclusion because of their ability to disseminate project findings and embed and upscale, as well as contribute to the project activities. This view was supported by other projects which included “people you want to disseminate to” on their reference group.

The identification of change enablers was seen in two test case projects. In both instances, the change enabler was an active member of a project team in a position to implement changes. Other projects developed mentors, or fellow schemes, where individuals were enlisted to offer mentorship, which they continued to provide after the project funding had come to an end. They were passionate about the project intentions and acted, to an extent, in the capacity of “champions” (who are identified in the Southwell et al. (2005) report as being important).
Most project leaders interviewed acknowledged the support offered by the institutional PEI officers and academic development units in developing the proposals and offering support for developing, coordinating, and evaluating dissemination activities. The data present a mixed picture in this regard, as survey respondents reported quite low levels of drawing upon PEI and academic development unit support (see Figure 8 on page 58). The role of academic development team members, described by interviewees as being the translators and disseminators of project innovations into an institutional context, was less prevalent in contrast to Hicks’ (2004) observation that “the impact of these projects .... would appear dependent, to a large extent, on the interest and willingness of educational development units in universities to promote and make use of the resources in their institutions” (p. 7).

The importance of working with people “who know people” and who understand the political nuances and have the cultural acumen to inform the project was identified in interviews with implementers and innovators as being crucial to success. These people were not necessarily leaders in the formal sense of the word, but, rather, individuals who were familiar with the practical nuances particular to the institution or discipline setting. These people knew who to talk to, who to include on the project team, the ebbs and flows of work, and internal politics that could assist in raising awareness of the project by institutional decision makers, described by one project leader as “reaching willing ears”.

Many final reports, Part Two final reports, and interviews indicate the importance and value of the external evaluator providing formative feedback on dissemination activities as the project progressed. This experience was by no means consistent and a review of external evaluation reports suggests that external evaluators may not be aware of dissemination as being other than diffusion or distribution.

Finding 12: Successful dissemination strategies have multiple layers of change enablers who facilitate dissemination.

Discussion

The important role played by change enablers, well-documented in the literature, was apparent in this investigation. While this will be common knowledge for some applicants, others may need to be further supported in building relationships and understanding the importance of people in change-enabling roles. The findings also present an opportunity for those in change-enabling roles to consider how they can mentor, advocate for, and champion the work of project teams.

Recommendation 10: That the ALTC affirms the importance of involving change enablers in achieving project outcomes by reflecting this in guidelines, relevant professional development, and interactions with senior learning and teaching leaders.

Recommendation 11: That the ALTC considers developing induction materials for external evaluators, including information on the ALTC’s approach to dissemination.
Summary of key findings

Finding 1: Clearer definition of key terms is required if the sector is to move forward in the quality and effectiveness of dissemination.

Finding 2: The ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006) is not a sufficient mechanism for supporting an understanding of effective dissemination.

Finding 3: The most popular method of communication of project outcomes remains traditional academic modes such as conference presentations, book publications and publication in academic journals and conferences.

Finding 4: A web presence is a common dissemination activity, but its potential impact is limited due to maintenance issues after the project concludes.

Finding 5: There is an espoused understanding amongst grant recipients that dissemination activities occur during the life of the project, rather than after the project concludes.

Finding 6: Dissemination is commonly described as a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose.

Finding 7: ALTC grant holders tend to equate the end of the grant with an end of their involvement in that topic, possibly as a result of ALTC project work being viewed as an additional workload.

Finding 8: It is not possible to accurately measure or determine evidence of long-term changes that may have occurred as a result of the project based on the current reporting mechanisms.

Finding 9: Projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset.

Finding 10: Project leaders grapple with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing a climate of readiness for change.

Finding 11: The ALTC is perceived as having an obligation to support the dissemination of project outcomes through providing a searchable repository for project deliverables and facilitating opportunities for making links between projects.

Finding 12: Successful dissemination strategies have multiple layers of change enablers who facilitate dissemination.
The deliverables

This chapter introduces the four major project deliverables, narrates the process by which they were developed, and, where relevant, makes recommendations regarding the embedding of these project deliverables into the operations of the ALTC.

Sector-wide workshops

D-Cubed facilitated workshops for prospective applicants, support staff, and ALTC Fellows throughout the project. These workshops, which are documented in more detail on page 45, provided professional development for over 150 colleagues and informed the development and refinement of the other project deliverables. Feedback from workshop attendees indicated that the workshops were positively received, with high levels of agreement that:

- the workshop enabled them to have greater understanding of dissemination
- their attendance at the workshop was relevant to their current or potential role in an ALTC project
- the workshop was clearly structured
- the workshop facilitator’s explanations were clear
- they would attend similar events in the future if they were available
- they intended to share information from this workshop with other colleagues
- they would recommend further discussion of issues identified in this workshop with colleagues.

D-Cubed dissemination framework and definition

The project found that the provision of a dissemination framework is valuable, and that there is a compelling case for a new framework that reflects the understandings of dissemination that have emerged through the project. The case for a new framework is explored in greater depth on page 53. In response to these findings, the D-Cubed team proposes a new definition and framework for dissemination.

Process of development

A draft framework and definition of dissemination were initially created to represent concepts that were emerging during the observe phase. The framework and definition were then tested and developed iteratively over a five-month period:

- (July 2010) within the team
- (July 2010) with the senior consultants
- (August 2010) publicly with the PEN network
- (September–November 2010) at the workshops
- (November–December 2010) final refinements made by interrogating the framework against test cases and in terms of appropriate graphic design
**Definitions of key terms**

The definition of dissemination used in ALTC guidelines is:

> dissemination is understood to be more than distribution of information or making it available in some way. While embracing this aspect, dissemination also implies that some action has been taken to embed and upscale the innovation within its own context (discipline or institution) and/or to replicate or transform an innovation in a new context and to embed the innovation in that new context. (Southwell et al., 2005, p. 2 as cited in The Carrick Institute of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education Ltd, 2006)

It is proposed that a new definition be adopted that aligns closely with the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework. Further, two subsidiary definitions are proposed, to distinguish between strategy and activities. These definitions are:

**Dissemination**: the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

**Dissemination strategy**: The intentionally-developed approach to dissemination of a particular project which includes identification of targeted potential adopters, an assessment of the climate of readiness for change, planning how engagement will be built throughout the project, and enabling transfer of project outcomes.

**Dissemination activities**: The individual actions by which aspects of the project are disseminated to others, for awareness, knowledge, and action.

**Framework description**

The framework has been designed for three uses: a project planning framework, as a project reflection framework, and as a visual scaffold that can be used to build familiarity and to enable a consistent approach.

The framework consists of three interlocking elements (assess climate, engage, and transfer) and indicates that dissemination is most effective when all three elements are in place. It is also designed to be non-linear and cyclical as, during the life of a project, there are shifts within and between each element. For example, if the climate of readiness for change were to become stronger, the group with whom the project engages throughout the life of the project would be likely to expand, which may, in turn, have a positive effect on the value of project outcomes.

The framework is illustrated in Figure 9 overleaf.
Dissemination Framework

Dissemination is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

Assess climate of readiness for change
- Understand the intended impacts and perceived benefits
- Address an evident need
- Consider the feasibility of project implementation
- Ensure the project is grounded in existing knowledge
- Identify targeted potential adopters
- Identify potential change enablers
- Understand the culture and structures of institutions
- Ascertain a willingness and ability to change including readiness of leadership to bear resourcing costs.

Enable transfer of project outcomes
- Make the outcomes adaptable
- Make the outcomes findable
- Determine the capacity of the project to provide ongoing support
- Articulate the value of the project outcomes
- Nurture ongoing commitment, ownership and capacity to adopt

Engage throughout the project
- Interact with targeted potential adopters on an ongoing basis
- Plan for interaction and respond to changes and opportunities
- Build credibility and familiarity
- Cultivate readiness for change
- Build empowerment and ownership in adopters and institutions

Dissemination is most effective when all three elements are in place, resulting in the greatest possibility of embedding, upscaling and sustainability.
The elements of the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework

*Assess climate of readiness for change:* The climate of readiness for change is the existence of “a fertile environment [which] nurtures a climate of risk taking and systematic change [which are] essential conditions for successful innovation and dissemination” (Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 53). To be most effective, assessing the climate occurs at the planning stage, and is revisited frequently throughout the project. The considerations for assessing climate of readiness for change are listed within the framework.

*Engage:* Engaging with targeted potential adopters throughout the project invites authentic involvement of targeted potential adopters and includes them in the evolution of the project findings to have “mind changing encounter[s] [not] to articulate your own point of view but rather to engage the psyche of the other person” (Gardner, 2004, p. 163). To be most effective, engagement is planned for, and takes place throughout, the life of the project, not merely at the project’s end. The considerations for engaging throughout the project are listed within the framework.

*Transfer:* Transfer describes the processes undertaken to maintain momentum and impact beyond the funded life of the project and beyond the project team. It is concerned with sustaining the influence of the project in the long-term. The considerations for enabling transfer of project outcomes are listed within the framework.

**Embedding and upscaling leading to sustainability**

Sustainability is “the continuation of benefits after project funding has ceased” (Joyes, Turnock, Cotterill, & Banks, 2009, p. 131). Sustainability is a guiding principle of the ALTC, and is, therefore, a crucial consideration for ALTC-funded grants. The D-Cubed model of dissemination, which the framework expresses, suggests that sustainability is reached through embedding and upscaling. Embedding institutionalises the change that the project seeks to make and upscaling takes the change into another context or setting. The framework proposes that sustainability is best achieved by paying attention to climate, engagement, and transfer.

**Importance of scholarly contributions to sustainability**

An underlying assumption of the framework is that projects will typically generate scholarly outputs as part of their dissemination activity, contributing new knowledge and assuring the future availability of that knowledge to current and future educators and researchers.

**D-Cubed dissemination resources**

Another deliverable from D-Cubed has been the development of resources for prospective ALTC Grants Scheme applicants, to support the planning and undertaking of effective dissemination. The importance of this deliverable, and the sector’s readiness for it, has been affirmed through workshop feedback. These resources have been developed through an engaged process with the D-Cubed targeted potential adopters. This process is depicted described below.

**Initial scoping and user testing**

Development began with an analysis of relevant literature, initiators’ interviews,
reflection within the project team, and early workshops with PEI staff and prospective applicants. This process led to a list of eight proposed resources. The list, and a brief summary of each resource, was presented to staff who attended the Coolangatta Promoting Excellence Network meeting on 9 and 10 August 2010. The 19 participants were mostly PEI project officers, or grants and awards officers/managers, from 10 Table A and 2 Table B providers, across Western Australia, South Australia, New South Wales, and Queensland. Participants were asked to rate the appeal of each resource concept and to provide open-ended feedback. The results of this feedback were as follows:

- a budget resource for costing effective dissemination into project budgets (rated 4.8/5 in survey)
- advice on success factors (rated 4.7/5 in survey)
- a revised dissemination framework (rated 4.6/5 in survey)
- a decision-making matrix to assess sustainability of dissemination strategies (rated 4.6/5 in survey)
- strategies for measuring and evidencing impact (rated 4.2/5 in survey)
- a resource on communities of practice and Web 2.0 technologies (rated 4.1/5 in survey)
- a spiral dissemination design (rated 3.9/5 in survey)
- a climate of readiness for change calculator (rated 3.7/5 in survey).

The Senior Executive Reference Group then considered the proposed resources, referring also to the summaries developed for each.

**Development of prototypes**

The feedback informed the production of prototype resources, which were then tested and evaluated in a workshop with the project consultants. The team produced the following prototypes:

- a budget resource for costing effective dissemination into project budgets
- a revised dissemination framework
- a decision-making matrix to assess sustainability of dissemination strategies
- the wheel of influence (King, 2010) (a strategy for measuring and evidencing impact)
- a climate of readiness for change calculator.

The core project team, with the graphic designer, then redeveloped the resources ready for user testing. The prototypes listed above were augmented by the following:

- ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’ (incorporating advice on success factors and a resource on communities of practice and Web 2.0 technologies)
- resources catalogue (a new document intended to introduce and assist navigation through the resources)
topic bibliography (a new resource not included in the initial scoping process).

**Redevelopment and user testing**

The suite of resources was then shared with, and tested by, colleagues through the ALTC Promoting Excellence forum, six prospective applicants’ workshops, an ALTC Fellows’ workshop and input from critical readers.

**Guiding principles for resource development**

The guiding principles for production of the resources were that they must: take into account the diversity of prospective users, including both career researchers and novices; be as sustainable as possible, without the likelihood of becoming outdated; be adaptable as living documents, able to be manipulated at the institutional and individual level as required. In use, they call upon prospective applicants to be discerning in what resources they work with, to suit the particular purposes and intentions for each project. No “one-size-fits-all” solution to dissemination exists. The resources are designed to be used in any order in a manner suited to the needs of the particular project.

**Finalisation of resources**

The extensive feedback that colleagues generously provided has informed the finalisation of the Planning Resources, which are collated into the ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’. The Guide is a practitioner-focused guide for prospective applicants and those who support them which provides a brief overview of the project, and then explores the nature and purpose of dissemination, argues the importance of planning projects with sustained change in mind, and presents a range of effective dissemination activities. Examples of good practice are included to illustrate the range of ways that project teams have successfully approached dissemination.

This guide also contains the entire set of resources, which are:

- **‘Thinking about planning a dissemination strategy’**
  This resource supports prospective applicants to design a dissemination strategy that facilitates engagement with potential adopters across the life of the project.

- **‘Thinking about identifying your target groups’**
  This resource encourages consideration of who comprises the project’s potential target groups. It classifies the target group in terms of end-users, potential adopters, enablers, and the wider sector; and it provides guiding questions to identify each of these groups.

- **‘Thinking about assessing the climate of readiness for change’**
  This resource provides a series of questions to ascertain the degree to which there is a climate of readiness for change. Based on the climate considerations from the D-Cubed Dissemination Framework, it also provides advice for responding to situations where the climate is not yet ready for change.

- **‘Thinking about dissemination budget planning’**
  This resource outlines key considerations of budgeting for dissemination. It achieves this by working through a detailed list of dissemination activities.
posing questions for consideration about cost factors (including offering suggestions for reducing expenditure) and sustainability implications

- ‘Thinking about sustainability of dissemination’
  This resource prompts applicants’ thinking about the sustainability of their dissemination strategy by raising a series of questions related to effort, costs, and findability. Prompts for environmental sustainability are also included.

- ‘Thinking about dissemination literature’
  This resource summarises a collection of useful articles about dissemination. It compresses an extensive reference list into a top-ten list of readings, with hyperlinks and summaries for each.

The revised dissemination framework is now a separate project deliverable; and, the User’s Guide to Dissemination and the Resources Catalogue have been incorporated into ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’.

The resources are collated into ‘The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination’ available as a PDF file at <http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/dissemination>

Quick Guide series

This series of four one-page guides provides brief summaries of salient points for senior managers, prospective applicants, assessors and evaluators, and support staff. The series has evolved from its original intention to produce a guide for assessors, following feedback requesting guides for other readerships.

The quick guides are included in Appendix H and available at <http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/dissemination>

Making the deliverables available

Dissemination, like project design, project management and evaluation, is central to the operation of the ALTC Grants Scheme. Therefore, it is important that the D-Cubed deliverables be made available to prospective applicants and others through the ALTC website, publications and events. The following two recommendations relate to embedding the deliverables into the operations of the ALTC.

Recommendation 12: That the ALTC makes available the D-Cubed deliverables through a dedicated space on both the publicly-accessible ALTC website and the password-protected ALTC Grants Portal.
Reflections

This section concludes the final report by turning the focus inwards, to illuminate aspects of the D-Cubed Project that were considered to be highlights, critical success factors, and lessons. We share them here in a spirit of collegiality with others travelling on like paths. The section ends, facing outwards again, with a consideration of future activities to enhance the effectiveness of dissemination in grants projects funded by the ALTC.

The D-Cubed Project has elicited a rich data set that underpins the project recommendations and the project deliverables. Furthermore, feedback we received from throughout the sector suggests that the approach to dissemination that D-Cubed articulates is beginning to gain traction with prospective applicants, and others; and, that the climate is ready for colleagues to consider and work with the findings that the project offers.

Project highlights

The evaluative nature of the project and that one of its primary aims has been to inform decisions of the ALTC regarding dissemination means that its impact and value are still emerging. Therefore, this will largely depend upon the decisions regarding the recommendations proposed throughout the report.

An indicator of the project’s future success will be that there is an increased quality of dissemination from future ALTC-funded grants. With the limitations of timing in mind (without the benefit of hindsight) we have identified two major project highlights thus far.

Firstly, the response to our project as a whole has signalled an enthusiastic interest in dissemination and a climate of readiness for change. The workshops provided a strong example of this, with 95.7 per cent of survey respondents strongly agreeing, or agreeing, that the workshop enabled them to have greater understanding of dissemination; and, 89.4 per cent strongly agreeing, or agreeing, that they intended to share information from this workshop with other colleagues from their institutions. Feedback also suggested that further workshops would be well-received with 89.2 per cent of workshop attendees strongly agreeing, or agreeing, that they would recommend further discussion of issues identified in this workshop with colleagues in their institutions. Comments from participants include:

I found the workshop extremely useful for my thinking about dissemination in my current and prospective projects. Because the facilitator had an inclusive approach to the workshop and was open to new ideas, it was good to feel that I could make a positive contribution to the D-Cubed project as well.

Secondly, it has been affirming to see that the work undertaken through the McKenzie et al. (2005) and Southwell et al. (2005) reports, and the focus that the ALTC has maintained on dissemination throughout its existence, has had a positive impact on the sector. Throughout the project, we observed the familiarity the sector has with the importance of dissemination, and the survey findings point to positive shifts in how people understand dissemination (as explored on page 54).
Critical success factors for the project

The success of the D-Cubed project is largely due to the climate of readiness for change that exists for a renewed focus on dissemination, the generosity of colleagues in contributing to the project, and the mentorship and guidance which supported the core project team. This project has benefited greatly from the high degree of interest in dissemination both across the sector and within the ALTC. This interest was evident at the outset when the ALTC made a special call for project applications to evaluate dissemination effectiveness of previously-funded grants (the round in which the D-Cubed project was the successful applicant). Its importance fuelled our interest in developing the project, and, as the project has progressed, the climate of readiness for change has become increasingly evident.

The rich evidence base on which our project is built is the direct result of the generous contributions of our many project participants, and also of the ALTC staff who provided indispensable assistance and expertise in assembling key documentation for our data set. Over 350 people made generous contributions by variously completing an online survey, attending a workshop, being interviewed, or, in some cases, all three.

Staff at the ALTC prepared documentation that would otherwise have been unavailable to us, such as external evaluation reports and extracts from Part Two reports.

The insightful mentoring we received has been another critical success factor. In this regard, we particularly recognise the Senior Executive Reference Group, our external evaluator, and our project consultants.

Lessons learnt

We found the project to be a profoundly edifying experience. It has reinforced for us the central importance of effective dissemination, and allowed us to be our own test case of the project findings as they emerged. For example, it became apparent to us, as we clarified the identities of our targeted potential adopters, that prospective grant applicants had not been a sufficient focus in the original application. We addressed this at the project mid-point by varying the plan and budget to include workshops with prospective applicants across the country.

Another lesson learnt, though not yet fully addressed, was the importance of creating an effective online presence. We used the ALTC Exchange, a project email list, and an institutional web page at The University of Queensland to make some information available, but the information was neither cohesive nor compelling. We are addressing this through an agreement with the ALTC to make the D-Cubed deliverables available on the ALTC website once the project concludes.

Another challenge was to maintain clarity of purpose, particularly given the propensity of discussions about dissemination to turn into discussions about measuring impact, which, although centrally important, was not the remit of the D-Cubed project.

Lastly, we learnt the power of cohesion, diligent project management, and regular detailed communication within the core and broader project team. This has been pivotal in keeping the project on track, given its short time-frame.
Future activities

As with most projects, the formal conclusion of D-Cubed brings with it a list of planned future activities. There are three main activities that the project leaders intend to pursue beyond the life of the project, namely:

1. Submitting journal and conference publications
2. Pursuing opportunities for further engagement with colleagues in the United Kingdom
3. Investigating the feasibility of publishing an edited book on dissemination

The adoption by the ALTC of the recommendations in this report will help to ensure that the D-Cubed project findings are embedded, upscaled, and able to be sustained. Given that the proposed new framework represents a significant change, further professional development would be one means of supporting its adoption by future grant applicants. Also, our findings invite the ALTC to reconsider a number of aspects of its grants guidelines, particularly the framework and the definition of dissemination. It is important that there is harmony between the various messages that the ALTC sends to the sector regarding dissemination. Discussion is already underway for the placement of D-Cubed resources on the ALTC website, and this is important to ensuring that prospective applicants can easily access the current information about dissemination that emerges from this project.
### Glossary of key concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change Enablers</td>
<td>People who can increase the likelihood of embedding, upscaling and sustainability of project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate of Readiness</td>
<td>The existence of “a fertile environment [which] nurtures a climate of risk taking and systematic change [which are] essential conditions for successful innovation and dissemination” (Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 53).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>The tangible products that a project produces and seeks to disseminate to others, as a core aspect of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>The planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Activities</td>
<td>The individual actions by which aspects of the project are disseminated to others, for awareness, knowledge, and action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination Strategy</td>
<td>The intentionally-developed approach to dissemination of a particular project which includes identification of targeted potential adopters, and assessment of the climate of readiness for change, planning how engagement will be built throughout the project, and enabling transfer of project outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding</td>
<td>“The engagement of an innovation in the local process and perhaps the modification of policies, procedures and structures to accommodate the new practice” (Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 81).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End-users</td>
<td>People for whom the intervention is designed, such as students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>The authentic involvement of targeted potential adopters by including them in the evolution of the project findings throughout the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>“…an idea, product, process or service that adds value, is useful or transforms current practice in the context to which it is applied. ‘First-generation innovators’ are those who do or create something new or different. ‘Second-generation innovators’ are those who take an innovation from one context and replicate, adapt or transform it for use within a new context” (ALTC, Southwell, et al., 2005, p. 2; 2010b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>A term to describe the overall influence of the project, including tangible results such as project findings, recommendations and deliverables as well as less tangible results such as cultural change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTC Dissemination</td>
<td>A conceptual model developed by the ALTC to assist those involved in the programs of ALTC to developing both engaged and information provision dissemination strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALTC Exchange</td>
<td>An online community for learning and teaching professionals in higher education which was operational in the period 2008 - 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATN (Australian</td>
<td>A network of five Australian universities that espouse a focus on partnerships and practically-grounded research and education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Network)</td>
<td>The members are Curtin University of Technology, University of South Australia, RMIT University, University of Technology Sydney and the Queensland University of Technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Grants</td>
<td>The ALTC Competitive Grants program was in operation from 2005 – 2010 to support innovation, research, and development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>The topics it covers include: (1) research and development focusing on issues of emerging and continuing importance, (2) strategic approaches to learning and teaching that address the increasing diversity of the student body, and (3) development of robust methods of identifying and rewarding excellence in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Dissemination</td>
<td>A term from the ALTC Dissemination Framework which refers to “consultation, collaboration and support for ongoing dissemination both during the project and after the project is completed” (ALTC, 2006, p. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Go8 (Group of Eight)</strong></td>
<td>A network of eight Australian universities that espouse a research intensive culture and comprehensive education. The members are The University of Western Australia, Australian National University, The University of Melbourne, University of Adelaide, Monash University, The University of New South Wales, The University of Queensland and The University of Sydney.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementer</strong></td>
<td>Those actively involved in project teams funded under Grants Schemes and were responsible for ensuring the implementation and sustainability of project deliverables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Provision</strong></td>
<td>A term from the ALTC Dissemination Framework which refers to “the one-way flow of information of project outcomes, typically in the form of reports, websites and publications” (2006, p. 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiator</strong></td>
<td>Senior ALTC staff member who was responsible for devising or implementing the ALTC Dissemination Framework (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovator</strong></td>
<td>Those actively involved in project teams funded under the Grants Schemes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IRUA (Innovative Research Universities Australia)</strong></td>
<td>A network of seven Australian universities that espouse a shared commitment to nationally and internationally significant research. (Charles Darwin University, Flinders University, Griffith University, James Cook University, La Trobe University, Murdoch University, The University of Newcastle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program</strong></td>
<td>The ALTC Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching program has been in place since 2005 to build leadership capacity and support systematic and sustainable models of academic leadership in ways that promote and advance learning and teaching in Australian higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Aligned</strong></td>
<td>A university that is not a member of an identified network (see ATN, Go8, IRUA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NVivo</strong></td>
<td>Computer-assisted qualitative analysis coding software.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner Institution</strong></td>
<td>“Those institutions that are actively engaged with the project through project team members. Institutions represented in an advisory process are not partner institutions” (ALTC, 2010b, p.29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority Projects Program</strong></td>
<td>The ALTC Priority Projects program was in operation from 2005-2010 to respond to priorities emanating from the ALTC’s designated responsibilities and supports projects addressing topics including (1) academic standards, assessment practices and reporting, (2) curriculum renewal, (3) teaching and learning spaces, and (4) peer review for promotion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices


ALTC Dissemination Framework

Dissemination is more than distribution of information or making it available in some way. While embracing this aspect, dissemination also requires that some action has been taken to embed and upscale the innovation within its own context (discipline or institution) and or to replicate or transform an innovation in a new context and to embed the innovation in the new context. It is this broad view of dissemination that the ALTC wishes to promote and support.

Dissemination can be considered to involve two forms, engaged and information provision dissemination. Information provision forms of dissemination have been the prevalent approach to dissemination in projects, involving the one way flow of information of project outcomes, typically in the form of reports, websites and publications. While this is a useful, and in many cases necessary, form, it is not effective in achieving dissemination to others, nor in achieving further adoption or adaptation. Active or engaged strategies are more effective in achieving this. The approach advocated by ALTC is an engaged-focused approach to dissemination, involving consultation, collaboration and support for ongoing dissemination both during the project and after the project is completed.

The following framework is presented to assist those involved in the programs of ALTC to develop both engaged and information provision dissemination strategies in line with ALTC’s stated mission to promote and advance learning and teaching in Australian higher education and specially to support the achievement of Objective A to promote and support strategic change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching, including curriculum development and assessment; and Objective D: to develop effective mechanisms for the identification, development, dissemination and embedding of good individual and institutional practice in learning and teaching in Australian higher education.

The Dissemination Framework applies across all programs of the Institute and will be implemented as an overall approach. Specific programs may develop more specific dissemination strategies based on these general strategies, particularly the Grants, Disciplines, RIN, and the Fellowships schemes.

*The Framework draws extensively from the two reports prepared for ALTC on the dissemination of project innovations in higher education. The full reports can be found on the ALTC site at http://www.altc.edu.au/carnix/go/home/grants/pid/06
The Dissemination Framework is directed at two levels, the Project level and ALTC level.

**Project Level**
All projects should consider and respond to the following in addressing their dissemination strategy. These would normally be developed at the project submission stage, but will involve further development during the project implementation itself, particularly through engagement with ALTC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaged</th>
<th>Information provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Identify potential users and stakeholders</td>
<td>1. Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe strategies to engage with the users throughout the project development, focusing on the intended adoption.</td>
<td>2. Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identify the range of project outcomes and potential users of the different outcomes that could be adopted and implemented by different groups.</td>
<td>3. Conference presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Describe strategies for enabling each identified group of intended users to become aware of the relevant outcomes and ideas and how they might be involved in making effective use of them.</td>
<td>4. Publications eg Journal articles,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Describe strategies for engaging with intended users and obtaining feedback during the project development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Outline evaluation strategies on the impact of their project outcomes with the intended user communities during and following the project development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATLC Level**
ALTC will identify a range of support and dissemination strategies for the various schemes that will draw upon both the Engaged and Information provision strategies most relevant to the particular scheme to support the dissemination of projects themselves as well as extend the outcomes of the projects more widely than would be possible at a project level alone.
Appendix B: List of meetings

Core project team
Regular meetings including face-to-face, Skype, and telephone at least fortnightly throughout the life of the project

ALTC
Website development meeting on 19 October, 2010

Critical readers
Feedback provided in meetings and through email in December 2010 and January 2011

External evaluator
Skype-based meetings on 20 April, 4 June, and 1 September 2010

Graphic designer
Design meetings held as required throughout the life of the project

Project consultants
Face-to-face meetings on 3-4 February and 26-27 August 2010. Telephone meetings on 15 April, 13 July, 14 July, 6 December, and 15 December 2010

Promoting Excellence Initiative colleagues
Interactions with this group are outlined in Appendix D: List of D-Cubed Dissemination Activities

Senior Executive Reference Group
Telephone meetings on 27 April, 6 August and 9 December 2010

Workshop participants
Interactions with this group are outlined in Appendix D: List of D-Cubed Dissemination Activities
Appendix C: External evaluator’s reports

D-Cubed Project: External Evaluation Final Report

Helen King, Higher Education Consultant (now at the University of Bath, UK)

21 March 2011

Introduction

Project Aims and Activities: Overview

The D-Cubed project aimed to provide a rich illuminative evaluation of the phenomenon of dissemination in relation to the ALTC-funded projects. It planned to draw on a range of primary and secondary data sources including documentation, interviews and expert input.

Overall, D-Cubed intended to confirm whether the ALTC Dissemination Framework had achieved the desired outcomes and to determine any necessary refinements to the Framework in response to changing needs of the sector.

Using an engaged dissemination strategy, D-Cubed aimed to provide evidence and resources to assist future grant applicants to employ effective dissemination strategies informed by a strong evidence base about what constitutes effective dissemination. The approach would involve key stakeholders in the process including innovators (those actively involved in project teams) and implementers (Senior Management; PEI forum), such that the emergent findings could be disseminated and triangulated with practitioner needs.

D-Cubed proceeded through three main investigative stages:

Stage 1: Analysis of ALTC projects using a specially designed framework

Stage 2: Semi-structured interviews with selected projects

Stage 3: Survey

Approach to Evaluation

Being based in the UK, my evaluation came from a very external viewpoint and was based on monitoring the ‘BaseCamp’ updates, occasional Skype conversations with the project leaders (Deanne Gannaway and Tilly Hinton), feedback from the project team members via an email questionnaire (July/August 2010) and a review of the final outputs. From this evidence I was able to gain a broad overview of the processes and progress of the project. Although I was unable to comment on the day-to-day activities of the project, indirect evidence (such as the achievement of targets and milestones, and the production of documents and resources) suggested that my perspective offers a real reflection of the general experience of the project.
Evaluation

Appropriateness of Rationale for the Project

Over the last 10 years there has been a surprisingly small amount of literature produced on the dissemination of the outcomes of learning and teaching projects in higher education; surprising due to the large amount of money spent on these particularly in the UK and Australia. The literature that does exist is mostly based on experience and opinion (albeit from colleagues with considerable expertise). The D-Cubed project, therefore, is very welcome in providing a research-based addition to this field.

Methodology

Evidence on the BaseCamp project management website indicated that the research team took a thorough, rigorous, transparent and well-documented approach. The coding framework for analysis of the project reports was clearly laid out. Communication between the researchers during the analysis stage was good which ensured comparability between the different coders.

The project adopted a rigorous, multi-methods approach including a literature review, document analyses, online surveys, face-to-face interviews and workshops. The activities and findings were well managed and documented through the ‘Work In Progress’ and ‘Critical Path’ documents, regular meetings and the use of the BaseCamp online tool. Useful tools and resources, such as the work-in-progress documents and the literature review, were produced along the way thereby providing a strong basis on which the final outputs could be developed.

Rather than sticking rigidly to their original project aims and plans, the team acted with responsive flexibility to research findings, opportunities and changing contexts (e.g. HERDSA abstract rejection, the fact that the ALTC dissemination framework was not used rigorously by projects - leading to a change in survey questions; mapping of research questions with data in order to make data collection process more efficient). They developed their aims and plans well to meet these changes without undermining or diminishing the original objectives and outcomes.

As well as identifying examples of good practice, D-Cubed itself also modelled an effective dissemination strategy by engaging stakeholders early on, disseminating findings as they arose rather than waiting until the end (also sensible for getting final reports written!), documenting processes and activities, and ensuring team members had clear roles and buy-in to the project’s values and intended outcomes. In addition, as one team member noted, the workshops helped to foster a ‘climate of readiness’, thereby enhancing the potential take-up of the project outcomes.

D-Cubed exhibited a model of good practice in leadership, team and project management. The leaders were enthusiastic, motivated and supportive of their team. They really believed in what they were doing in terms of better understanding dissemination and in supporting others to be able to disseminate their excellent practice.
Team perspectives

In July 2010, a brief email questionnaire was circulated to the team members, reference group and external consultants inviting their comments on the overall project. Responses were received from one reference group member, one external consultant and four team members.

The responses echoed my observations on the strengths of the project including a strong team involving a range of professionals with a range of skills, supportive leaders, and a good investigative methodology with sector-wide consultation that addresses a need in the sector.

As well as contributing to the project, team members also noted a number of professional development opportunities for themselves in being involved. These included keeping current or learning more about dissemination theory and practice, the opportunity to apply the outcomes to their own context, developing their understanding of managing projects, qualitative research, running workshops and understanding HE systems and processes.

Internal Communication

I was particularly impressed with the approach to communication within the D-Cubed investigation. The BaseCamp online facility provided a useful tool for sharing files, messages and ‘to do’ lists and, thus, both supported communication and acted as a record of the investigation’s process and progress. This facility was used effectively and certainly proved very useful for keeping track of day-to-day activities. Associated with this were the ‘Critical Path’ documents which provided up-to-date progress summaries. These documents were helpful for gaining a quick overview of key milestones and achievements and were very useful both for monitoring progress and for noting future activities.

External Communication

The investigation intended to be an ‘illuminative evaluation’ taking an ‘engaged dissemination’ approach. To this end, one would expect extensive communication beyond the internal team that sought to identify and involve key stakeholders from the beginning. The team endeavoured to take this approach and, despite a late set-up for the Senior Executive Reference Group, succeeded in getting stakeholder groups engaged. The meetings with PEI colleagues were an excellent example of an ongoing dissemination process which provided an opportunity to share findings with potential end users.

Much of the team’s communication strategy involved face-to-face contacts, but it also included a series of newsletters for wider sharing of their work, and a number of ‘Work in Progress’ documents which outlined key findings from the investigation as they arose. These were useful for briefing stakeholders, as a means of documenting outcomes and for providing a foundation for the final report.

Outputs

The text-based materials produced from the project provide an excellent and valuable legacy. The Quick Guides provide summaries of the findings from D-Cubed specifically targeted at different stakeholders which identify key findings
of most importance to each of these (prospective applicants, support staff, senior managers, assessors and external evaluators). The D-Cubed Guide provides an invaluable and succinct overview of the findings from the project including an excellent synopsis of the literature on dissemination, a summary of the key findings from the project, a new model for dissemination, guidance on planning a dissemination strategy and ideas for dissemination activities, and a useful annotated list of related resources. The guide captures, in an accessible and practical way, the rigour of the project and the forward thinking of the project leaders; not only did they identify dissemination theory and practice used in the past but they built on these to develop a new and highly practical framework for dissemination, with associated planning and development tools.

These materials provide a legacy but the project also continues to reach forward in active ways through conference contributions (HERDSA, ISSOTL), national and international workshops and a book proposal.

**Conclusion**

Throughout the project, D-Cubed progressed well and kept its project plan on track despite the occasional set-back. The project benefited from a strong methodology and experienced and enthusiastic team leaders. The team was well versed in the relevant literature and demonstrated good practice in their approaches to project management, research and its dissemination. From the outset it was apparent that the lessons learnt and outcomes would be extremely valuable not only to the ALTC and its projects but also to higher education colleagues nationally and internationally.

Overall, in terms of project management, quality of deliverables and process, and ongoing impacts on the sector nationally and internationally, the D-Cubed project has met and exceeded its objectives and, in my opinion, has demonstrated excellent value for money. It has been a pleasure to work with such reflective, creative and forward-thinking colleagues and I look forward to continuing my collaborations with them in the future.
Appendix D: List of projects investigated
Projects are grouped here by year funded, in alphabetical order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Project</th>
<th>Year Funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Group Work in Media and Communications</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Students Unfamiliar with Assessment Practices in Australian Universities</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Caught Between a Rock and Several Hard Places&quot;: Cultivating the Roles of the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) and the Course Coordinator</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the Assessment of Learning in Australian Higher Education: Biological Science</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Assessment Feedback as an Instrument of Reflective Learning Practice in Human Biology</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Learning and Teaching Communities</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A New Enabling Technology for Learning and Teaching Quantitative Skills</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Leadership Capabilities for Australian Higher Education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Law Postgraduate Network (ALPN)</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Writing Programs Network (AWPN)</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking Archaeology Honours Degrees at Australian Universities</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarking Clinical Learning in Speech Pathology to Support Assessment, Discipline Standards, Teaching Innovation and Student Learning</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridging Gaps in Music Teacher Education: Developing Exemplary Practice Models Using Peer Collaboration</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Academic Leadership Capability at the Course Level: Developing Course Coordinators as Academic Leaders</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business as Usual? A Collaborative and Inclusive Investigation of the Existing Resources, Strengths, Gaps and Challenges to be Addressed for Sustainability in Teaching and Learning in Australian University Business Faculties</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS™ Directions: Leading the Integration of a Competency Based Assessment Tool in Speech Pathology Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dancing Between Diversity and Consistency: Evaluating Assessment in Postgraduate Studies in Dance</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing a Diverse, Future Orientated Vision for Undergraduate Psychology in Australia</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and Implement a Pilot Program of ‘External Peer Review of Teaching’ in Four Australian Universities</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Multi-Level Leadership in the Use of Student Feedback to Enhance Student Learning and Teaching Practice</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Distributed Institutional Leadership Capacity in Online Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of the Clinical Assessment of Physiotherapy Skills (CAPS): A Standardised and Valid Approach to Assessment of Clinical Competence in Physiotherapy</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development, Deployment and Educational Assessment of an Advanced Immersive Learning Environment for Process Engineering Design and Operations</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Learning Communities (DLC): Investigating the Application of Social Software to Support Networked Learning</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating Strategies for Incorporating Australian Indigenous Content into Psychology Undergraduate Programs Throughout Australia</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Leadership for Learning and Teaching: Developing the Faculty Scholars Model</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity: A Longitudinal Study of how Student Diversity Relates to Resilience and Successful Progression in a New Generation University</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educating the Net Generation: Implications for Learning and Teaching in Australian Universities</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding Development of Intercultural Competence in Business Education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the Student Educational Experience through School-Based Curriculum Improvement Leaders</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring the Supply and Quality of Engineering Graduates with Attributes for the New Century</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending Teaching and Learning Initiatives in the Cross-Disciplinary Field of Biotechnology</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating Academic Standards for Planning Practice Education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Teaching and Instructional Issues and Opportunities for the Architecture and Associated Disciplines</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Leadership Capability of Academic Coordinators in Postgraduate and Undergraduate Programs in Business</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation with Quality Assurance: Online Curriculum Development for the University of New England’s Multi-Institutional Collaborative Programs in German at UNE, James Cook, and Newcastle Universities</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership and Assessment: Strengthening the Nexus</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership for Implementing Improvements in the Learning and Teaching Quality Cycle</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading for Effective Partnering in Clinical Contexts</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linuxgym: A Sustainable and Easy-To-Use Automated Developmental Assessment Tool for Computer Scripting Skills</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Educational Change in the ICT Discipline at Tertiary Education Level</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics for 21st Century Engineering Students</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Instruction in the Humanities</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project EnRoLE: Encouraging Role-Based Learning Environments</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Indicators for Best Practice Approaches to Experiential Placements in Pharmacy Programs</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising the Profile of Teaching and Learning: Scientists Teaching Scientists</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-conceptualising Tertiary Science Education for the 21st Century</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remotely Accessible Laboratories—Enhancing Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional Teachers in Australian Higher Education</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Assessing Meta-Attributes in Engineering: Identifying, Developing and Disseminating Good Practice</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Impact of Web-Based Lecture Technologies on Current and Future Practice in Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature and Roles of Arts Degrees in Contemporary Society</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiddas Showin’ Up, Talkin’ Up and Puttin’ Up: Indigenous Women and Educational Leadership</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting for the Future: More Than Numbers</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development Learning: Maximising the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning to the Student Experience</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Accessible Teaching and Support Initiative (CATS)</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development and Assessment of Methods to Enhance Communication and Life Skills in Veterinary Students</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Repository for Teacher Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Academics and Higher Education Futures</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ePortfolio Use by University Students in Australia: Informing Excellence in Policy and Practice</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Teaching and Learning Resource Delivery Modes in Arts</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Staff and Student Engagement with Graduate Attribute Development, Assessment and Standards in Business Faculties</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating the Integration of Evidence Based Practice into Speech Pathology Curricula: A Scoping Study to Examine the Congruence Between Academic Curricula and Work Based Needs</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Thinking in Higher Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of Teaching and Instructional Issues and Opportunities for the Construction Management, Quantity Surveying and Building Surveying Disciplines</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Video Analysis to Develop Learning and Assessment of University Students’ Practical and Communication Skills</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating the Application of IT Generated Data as an Indicator of Learning and Teaching Performance in Higher Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and Teaching for Interprofessional Practice in Health</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping the Future of Occupational Therapy Education in the 21st Century: Review and Analysis of Existing Australian Competency Standards for Entry-Level Occupational Therapists and Their Impact on Occupational Therapy Curricula across Australia</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting the Challenges of Clinical Exercise Science and Practice: A Collaborative University-Industry Approach to Align the Education of the AAESS-Accredited Exercise Physiologist with the Challenges of its Recent Admittance into Allied Health</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Education: Developing Depth Through Networks and Evidence-Based Research</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review of Teaching in Australia Higher Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physcips: Multi-level, Multimedia Resources for Teaching First Year Physics</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ReMarks PDF</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Skill Development: Questions of Curriculum and Pedagogy</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Sociology in Australia</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Role of Honours in Contemporary Australian Higher Education</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Microscopy for Enhancing Learning and Teaching</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: List of D-Cubed dissemination activities

**ALTC Exchange**
A group was formed on the ALTC Exchange in March 2010 as a repository for the project newsletter and to house background information and preliminary materials. With assistance from ALTC Exchange staff, the workshops were also promoted on the site’s main page.

**CADAD meeting**
Deanne Gannaway attended the CADAD meeting held on 20 and 21 October 2010 as a proxy member and was invited to provide a brief update on project progress and key findings to date. Informal feedback was obtained across the 2 day meeting.

**D-Cubed mailing list**
A mailing list was developed early on in the project to provide an avenue for the project team to raise awareness about the project and for interested parties to track the project’s progress. At the time of writing this report, the mailing list had 50 subscribers from Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

**D-Cubed newsletter**
A regular newsletter was established and sent to subscribers of the project mailing list, the Senior Executive Reference Group, Consultants, External Evaluator, Critical Readers, the Promoting Excellence Network (QLD) mailing list, PEI staff in New South Wales institutions, and is also available on the project’s ALTC Exchange site. Five newsletters were published between May and December 2010, providing background information initially and reporting on project activities and findings in the latter part of the year.

**Other mailing lists**
The HERDSA mailing list and the ALTC News were used as project dissemination activities. These lists were valuable in that they reached a large and relevant group, including prospective applicants and academic developers. The lists were used to promote the project newsletter and workshops.

**PEN mailing list**
Set up by the Promoting Excellence Network in Queensland, the PEN mailing list has 63 subscribers consisting of PEI and academic development staff from across Australia. The PEN list was an effective resource that the project team used to raise awareness about the project and was especially useful for addressing potential workshop participants.

**Senior Executive Reference Group**
The Senior Executive Reference Group played a key role in the project’s dissemination strategy. As advocates of the project, the willingness of the reference group to attach their names to the project was indicative of how they valued it. Additionally, the senior management positions held by members of the Senior Executive Reference Group enabled them to act as change agents within and outside of their institutions. Finally, the project was benefited by having an ALTC staff member on the reference group as it not only provided the team greater understanding of the context of their work, but allowed for the transfer of project information back to its key stakeholder group.
Workshops and other presentations

There were three types of workshops, namely prospective applicant workshops, PEI workshops (such as the PEN QLD meeting in March), and ALTC events (such as the Promoting Excellence forum held in September 2010 and the ALTC Fellows workshop in October 2010). Held over five states, the project team facilitated nine prospective applicants’ workshops including two webinars, was involved in two PEI meetings and attended four ALTC events including the Promoting Excellence Forum and the Fellows workshop. A total of 86 people attended the prospective applicant workshops (face-to-face and webinar), and over 150 people were reached during the ALTC events and other workshops.

Institutions represented at D-Cubed workshops:
1. Australian Catholic University
2. Avondale College (NSW)
3. Bond University
4. CQUniversity Australia
5. Charles Darwin University
6. Charles Sturt University
7. Christian Heritage College (QLD)
8. Curtin University
9. Deakin University
10. Edith Cowan University
11. Flinders University
12. Griffith University
13. James Cook University
14. La Trobe University
15. Macquarie University
16. Monash University
17. Murdoch University
18. Queensland University of Technology
19. RMIT University
20. Southern Cross University
21. Swinburne University of Technology
22. Tabor College Inc. (SA)
23. Tabor College inc. (VIC)
24. The Australian National University
25. The University of Adelaide
26. The University of Melbourne
27. The University of New South Wales
28. The University of Newcastle
29. The University of Notre Dame Australia
30. The University of Queensland
31. The University of Western Australia
32. University of Ballarat
33. University of Canberra
34. University of New England
35. University of South Australia
36. University of Southern Queensland
37. University of Technology, Sydney
38. University of the Sunshine Coast
39. University of Western Sydney
40. University of Wollongong
41. Victoria University
## Appendix F: Activities coded under Information Provision and Engaged nodes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Provision</th>
<th>Engaged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Audio or video material</td>
<td>• Cascade model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ALTC Exchange</td>
<td>• Engagement with stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Blogs</td>
<td>• Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conference</td>
<td>• Interactive email list, discussion forum, or social networking site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Email list</td>
<td>• Networks and communities of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Newsletter</td>
<td>• Participatory dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Offline electronic resource</td>
<td>• Upscaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project conference/forum/symposium/roadshow</td>
<td>• Visits to other institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publication</td>
<td>• Workshops with user groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Repository</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stakeholder meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Copies of research instruments

Initiators’ interview questions

1. What led up to/prompted/motivated the implementation of the Framework?
   • What corporate decisions were made regarding the Framework?
   • How and why was the decision made to use the two reports as a basis for the Framework?
   • What was the process behind developing the Framework from the two reports?

2. Tell us about the ALTC Dissemination Framework from your perspective
   • What was your role in developing the Framework?
   • What was the rationale behind presenting the project level part of the Framework as a table?

3. What have been your observations of how the Framework has been implemented and understood in the context of the ALTC Grants Scheme?
   • What impact do you think the Framework has made?
   • Has there been a shift in understanding about dissemination?

4. What is the role of the ALTC in dissemination practices?
   • Are there any areas in which the ALTC could further their role in dissemination practices?

5. What are your recommendations or suggestions for improving understanding about dissemination?
   • What are the conditions to promote more effective dissemination?
Implementers’ interview questions

The project team has identified that there are a number of ALTC projects that your institution has led. The focus of this interview is to establish whether there are any features of the projects or characteristics of these projects that you believe may lead to the project outcomes being embedded or sustained or taken up more widely, both within your institution and outside of your institution. The projects we will be referring to will be … (list projects)

- Am I safe in assuming that you know of these project/s?
- What has your involvement (if any) been with these project/s?

Implementation

In thinking about these projects, I’d like to start by discussing how project outcomes are implemented

- Can you describe how the outcomes of these projects have been implemented in your institution?
- What was your role in implementing project outcomes within your institution?
  - Was there anybody in particular who ensured that project outcomes were implemented within your institution?
- Are there any particular features of the project that you believe supported implementation?
- Can you identify any dissemination strategies that were used to ensure the project outcomes were implemented within your institution?
- Have any of the project outcomes become part of common practice at your institution?
  - Would you describe the outcomes of this/these project/s as being embedded in your institution?

Expansion

Following on from how the projects have been implemented, I’d like to discuss how the project outcomes have been expanded

- Have you seen any evidence of the project outcomes moving beyond the initial project group?
  - Would you describe the outcomes of this/these project/s as being upscaled within your institution?
  - What about outside of your institution?
- Can you identify any dissemination strategies that were used to encourage project outcomes to be taken up beyond the initial project group?
- What factors would you say helped enable the uptake of the project outcomes beyond the project end date?
- What factors would you say hindered the uptake of the project outcomes beyond the project end date?
I’d now like you to consider the different roles of institutional players in ensuring the uptake of project outcomes beyond the project end date

- What is the role of ALTC in promoting uptake of project outcomes?
  - DVCs and other similar roles?
  - Associate Deans?
  - ADUs?
  - Discipline experts?

- What have been the impacts on the institution as a result of these projects?

Uptake of Projects Hosted by Other Institutions

I’d like to get a sense of how you, in your role at the university, get information about other projects

- How do you hear about the outcomes or existence of other projects?
  - How do you know what’s happening?
  - What mode of getting information to you works best for you? Least?

- If you think a particular project outcome might be useful to your institution, what do you do?

- Has your institution taken up any outcomes from projects at other institutions?
  - What features of this/these project/s that made it stand out?
  - Why was the decision made to take up these project outcomes in particular?

- Are you aware of or have you engaged with any dissemination strategies used by projects outside of your institution?

Finally, I’d like to discuss again the different roles of institutional players in the decision to take up outcomes from projects outside of their own institution

- DVCs and other similar roles?
- ADUs?
- Associate Deans?
- Discipline experts?
- Others?

Thank you for your input. Before we close, is there anything else you would like to add that we haven’t yet discussed?

Thank you again for your participation. I’ll forward a summary of this conversation to you soon for your approval.
Innovators’ interview questions

Dissemination

Firstly, I’d like to get a sense of your understanding of dissemination

- So if you could start by describing what dissemination means to you.
  - What is dissemination?
  - What does dissemination involve?

- What features would you expect to see in a project that you think has been effectively disseminated?
  - What do you think the outcomes of effective dissemination are?

Project Dissemination

I’d like to move on to look at the project you worked on with a specific focus on dissemination

- Did you use the ALTC framework or the two reports on dissemination on the ALTC website to help you devise your project dissemination strategy?
  - How did it influence your proposal?
  - Did it influence your project progression in any way?

- Please describe what dissemination strategies were used in your project?

- In thinking back to the dissemination strategies proposed in the initial project application, were there any changes? (If changes) What prompted those changes?
  - Did you learn any dissemination strategies from other projects?

- Where did you get advice and support from about possible dissemination strategies during the life of the project?
  - Did you learn any dissemination strategies from other projects?

- Were there any particular strategies that you used that you feel were particularly successful in supporting you to disseminate?

- Was there anything that particularly hindered your dissemination strategies?
  - Anything that limited the way that you wanted to disseminate?
  - Any challenges?

- Did you experience any changes in the way you thought about dissemination over the life of the project?
  - What were your expectations and interpretations of dissemination at onset of your project?
  - At the end of the project?
Deliverables and Target Audience

All projects are expected to develop some form of concrete resources or deliverables. This might include a final report, amongst other things

- What format did these take for your project?
- How did you distribute them and who were they distributed to?
  - Who did you send your final reports and resources to?
  - How did they get them?
  - What did you expect people to do with them?
  - How do you know what other projects have done?
  - Do you read other project reports?

- How did you decide who needed to be involved in your project?
  - Was there a particular group you targeted as being end-users of the project outcomes?
  - What strategies did you put in place to ensure that this group would take up the project outcomes?
  - What did you do to ensure that they could be reached?
  - How did you know that this project would be well received?

- Did you distribute anything else other than resources?
  - Lessons learnt?
  - Successes?
  - External evaluations?

Uptake, Embedding, and Sustainability

I’d like to talk about the impact your project dissemination strategy had in terms of getting people beyond your project team to use the project outcomes

- Can you describe any evidence that use of the project outcomes/resources/deliverables has continued beyond the project team?
  - How did you encourage uptake beyond your project team?
  - Was there any particular dissemination strategy that assisted this?

- Did your project build on any other project or lead to any other projects?
  - How did you hear of the original?

The next few questions refer to how you think the project has been able to be sustained beyond the project end date

- Please describe what’s happened since the project ended
  - Have the project outcomes/resources/deliverables continued to be used in your institution beyond the project end date?
  - What evidence is there to indicate this?
  - (If relevant) How did you capture that evidence/what form is the evidence?
• What factors would you say helped sustain the use of the project outcomes/resources/deliverables beyond the project end date?

• Are there any particular strategies that you used to ensure that the use of project outcomes/resources/deliverables continued?
  o What did you do to ensure that the project outcomes/resources/deliverables become part of daily practice at your institution?
  o Has it continued at other institutions?

Role of Institutional Players

Finally, turning to the different roles that are played by institutional players in ensuring implementation of project outcomes in an institution...

• What is the role of
  o ALTC in dissemination?
  o DVCs or similar roles?
  o ADUs?
  o PEI support?
  o Discipline experts?
  o Project leaders?
  o Others?

Thank you for your input. Before we close, is there anything else you would like to add that we haven’t yet discussed?

Thank you again for you participation. I’ll forward a summary of this conversation to you soon for your approval.
The completed projects online survey

Thank you for participating in the D-Cubed survey.

The following survey refers to the project nominated in the email you received. Please refer back to your email to make sure your responses are relevant to the project nominated.

Your responses to this survey are entirely confidential and you are free to withdraw from the study at any point. This study has been cleared by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of the Sunshine Coast. For further information, please view the project information sheet (PDF).

1. Please identify the role you had in the project identified in the email invitation. You can select more than one if necessary

☐ Project leader
☐ Project manager
☐ Project team member
☐ Collaborative partner

Other (please specify)

2. Since the project ended, how much ongoing contact related to this project do you have with the project team?

☐ No contact
☐ Infrequent contact
☐ Regular contact

3. What do you understand the term “dissemination” to mean?

4. Please select which of the following might broadly describe your project’s intention. You can select more than one if necessary.

☐ To scope current practices and identify key issues
☐ To build leadership capacity
☐ To improve students’ learning through educational technology
☐ To make changes in curriculum
☐ To investigate and test existing knowledge for potential use in a particular area or across the sector

Other (please specify)
5. Please describe any aspects of the project that you are aware of that are still ongoing

6. Since the project has ended and a final report was delivered to ALTC, have you seen evidence of...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continued institutional funding</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not applicable to this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of project outcomes into practice within the discipline or institution of the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of project outcomes into practice in disciplines or institutions outside of the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum change within your institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Dept/School/Faculty or institution curriculum development, learning and teaching practices and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions of the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Dept/School/Faculty or institution curriculum development, learning and teaching practices and/or teaching management processes in one or more institutions outside of the project team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please describe any evidence of the project outcomes having ongoing impact in your institution or outside of your institution.
8. What has happened to the deliverables/resources that were developed as outcomes from the project since the project concluded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables/resources developed were published on the ALTC website or ALTC exchange</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Not applicable to this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables/resources developed were published on a website other than those hosted by ALTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables/resources developed were distributed in hard copy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports were put up on a website other than the ALTC website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports were distributed in hard copy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please describe another other methods of circulation if used
9. The following list of activities have commonly been used in previous ALTC funded projects. Tick as many as you are aware may apply to the project listed in your email invitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Used both during and after the project</th>
<th>Used after the project</th>
<th>Used during the project</th>
<th>Did not use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference presentation (such as posters, keynote and paper presentations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project events (such as a project forum or conference or summit which interested parties can register attendance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road show or travelling showcases (where project leaders provide presentations about the project at a range of sites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (where project leaders are invited to present workshops at sites outside of the project home institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars (or workshops conducted using web-based technologies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks (such as communities of practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided seeding funding or subproject funding (for activities at sites other than the project lead institution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in institutional or organisational structures (such as academic boards or similar decision-making bodies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/book chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article/s (such as peer reviewed academic journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media announcements (such as press releases, television interviews or newspaper articles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports (other than the final report required by ALTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a project branding (such as logos, catchy titles and colour schemes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures (such as leaflets or information pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters (to keep potential end users in touch with project progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listservs belonging to other organisations (such as HERDSA listserv)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific email lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online discussion forum or social networking spaces (such as the ALTC Exchange, Ning or Facebook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (including using a website as an online repository)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have used other types of dissemination activities, please describe them.
10. Where did you obtained advice and support from about dissemination strategies during the life of your project? Please select as many as apply.

- ALTC Dissemination Framework (table available on ALTC website)
- AUTC Report: Strategies for Effective Dissemination of Project Outcomes (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2005)
- Academic Development Unit at your institution
- Senior academic administrators at your institution
- Promoting Excellence Initiative (PEI) support personnel at your institution
- Reference group
- Profession/industry people
- Personal experience on a previous ALTC project
- Prior experience in research grants
- Experience of other project members on previous ALTC projects
- Received no support

Other (please specify)

11. Please rank the extent to which you think each of the following resources would be helpful for current project teams and future grant applicants in developing their dissemination strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisions to the ALTC dissemination framework to support dissemination strategy planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool to assist assessing how sustainable a proposed dissemination strategies will be beyond the life of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets providing examples of successful dissemination strategies, the features that made them successful and vignettes from previous project leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for measuring and evidencing the extent of influence the project has had</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A calculator which can help assess whether the sector is ready for the changes you are proposing/envisaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A budget tool that can help work out what needs to be included into project budgetlines related to dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dissemination bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other tools or resources you think would be helpful?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Has the project linked to any other projects or ALTC activities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentiment</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directly led to other ALTC projects that were funded that had original project team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directly led to other ALTC projects that were funded that does not directly involve original project members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to other ALTC proposals that have been rejected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to other projects funded from sources other than ALTC (such as ARC or professional associations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to an ALTC fellowship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led to an ALTC teaching award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify)

13. Any lessons or particular experiences learnt related to dissemination that you would like to share?

[Blank space for text input]
The current projects online survey

Thank you for participating in the D-Cubed survey.

The following survey refers to ALTC funded project you currently lead.

Your responses to this survey are entirely confidential and you are free to withdraw from the study at any point. This study has been cleared by the Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of the Sunshine Coast. For further information, please view the project information sheet (PDF).

1. Prior to this project, how many times have you been...
   - Involved in an institutionally funded teaching and learning project
   - Involved in a previous ALTC funded project
   - The recipient of an institutional teaching award
   - The recipient of a national teaching award
   - Awarded a fellowship

2. What links does your project have to other funded activities? Has the project...
   - Built on previous institutionally funded project/s
   - Built on previous ALTC funded project/s
   - Made links with other current ALTC-funded projects
   - Will lead to other ALTC projects

3. How far along are you in the project?
   - How far along are you in the project? Not yet begun
   - Have recently begun
   - Mid way
   - Almost complete
   - Complete and waiting for sign off from ALTC

4. What do you understand the term "dissemination" to mean?
5. According to your project proposal, when did you or your current project team plan that dissemination strategies would start?

- According to your project proposal, when did you or your current project team plan that dissemination strategies would start? Prior to the proposal application phase
- During the proposal application phase
- During the life of the project
- After the project outcomes have been developed
- Have not yet thought about dissemination timing

6. Please rank the extent to which you think each of the following resources would be for current project teams and future grant applicants in developing their dissemination strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Somewhat helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revisions to the ALTC dissemination framework to support dissemination strategy planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A tool to assist assessing how sustainable a proposed dissemination strategies will be beyond the life of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact sheets providing examples of successful dissemination strategies, the features that made them successful and vignettes from previous project leaders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools for measuring and evidencing the extent of influence the project has had</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A calculator which can help assess whether the sector is ready for the changes you are proposing/ envisaging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A budget tool that can help work out what needs to be included into project budgetlines related to dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A dissemination bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any other tools or resources you think would be helpful?
7. Where have you obtained advice and support from about dissemination strategies during your project?

- ALTC personnel
- ALTC Dissemination Framework (table available on ALTC website)
- AUTC Report: Strategies for Effective Dissemination of Project Outcomes (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2005)
- Academic Development Unit at your institution
- Senior academic administrators at your institution
- Promoting Excellence Initiative (PEI) support personnel at your institution
- Reference group
- Professional/industry people
- Personal experience on a previous ALTC project
- Prior experience in research grants
- Experience of other project members on previous ALTC projects
- Received no support

Other (please specify)
8. The following list of activities have commonly been used in previous ALTC funded projects. Tick as many as apply to your project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No intention to use</th>
<th>Intend to or have used during the project</th>
<th>Intend to use after the project</th>
<th>Will use both during and after the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference presentation (such as posters, keynote and paper presentations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project events (such as a project forum or conference or summit which interested parties can register attendance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road show or travelling showcases (where project leaders provide presentations about the project at a range of sites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops (where project leaders are invited to present workshops at sites outside of the project home institutions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webinars (or workshops conducted using web-based technologies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks (such as communities of practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided seeding funding or subproject funding (for activities at sites other than the project lead institution)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in institutional or organisational structures (such as academic boards or similar decision-making bodies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book/book chapter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal article/s (such as peer reviewed academic journals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media announcements (such as press releases, television interviews or news paper articles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports (other than the final report required by ALTC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a project branding (such as logos, catchy titles and colour schemes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures (such as leaflets or information pages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters (to keep potential end users in touch with project progress)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listservs belonging to other organisations (such as HERDSA listserver)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project specific email lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online discussion forum or social networking spaces (such as the ALTC Exchange, Ning or Facebook)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (including using a website as an online repository)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have used other types of dissemination activities, please describe them.
9. Have there been any changes to dissemination strategies that differ to those proposed in the initial project application?

- [ ] No
- [x] Yes

If yes, please describe what prompted those changes.

10. Any lessons or particular experiences learnt related to dissemination so far that you would like to share?
The resources feedback sheet

Possible Professional Development Resources - Your Feedback Please...

One of the outputs of D-Cubed will be a range of professional development resources for future grant applicants. We would be thankful for your feedback on the following professional development resource ideas which are emerging from our research. Please indicate the extent to which the resource appeals to you, and provide comments where desired.

1. **A decision-making matrix to assess sustainability of dissemination strategies**: A simple grid tool to assess different dissemination activities against sustainability criteria such as immediate and ongoing costs, effort, findability, environmental impacts and longevity.
   
   **Appeal:**
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at all appealing Very appealing

   **Comments:**
   
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

2. **A revised Dissemination Framework**: The Framework has the potential to be a potent tool for guiding and supporting project leaders’ conceptions of dissemination, a potential which the current framework seems not to realise.

   **Appeal:**
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at all appealing Very appealing

   **Comments:**
   
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

3. **User’s Guide to Effective Dissemination**: Includes examples of dissemination activities, strategies and success factors and resources on communities of practice and Web 2.0.

   **Appeal:**
   
   1 2 3 4 5
   Not at all appealing Very appealing

   **Comments:**
   
   .................................................................
   .................................................................

   Possible Professional Development Resources - Your Feedback Please...
4. **Strategies for measuring influence**: Tools for measuring influence such as the Excel-based Wheel of Influence Tool (which visually depicts the extent of communication and collaboration within a project).

   **Appeal:**

   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

   Not at all appealing
   Very appealing

   **Comments:**

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   5. **A climate of readiness for change scorecard**: A tool to ascertain the degree to which the project addresses an area of need, in which stakeholders are ready and willing to embrace new ideas and approaches (a climate of readiness for change).

   **Appeal:**

   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

   Not at all appealing
   Very appealing

   **Comments:**

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   6. **A budget tool for costing effective dissemination into project budgets**: A list of budgeting and cost-saving considerations to assist with application budget development.

   **Appeal:**

   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

   Not at all appealing
   Very appealing

   **Comments:**

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   7. **Topic Bibliography**: A bibliography of dissemination resources and scholarly articles.

   **Appeal:**

   1
   2
   3
   4
   5

   Not at all appealing
   Very appealing

   **Comments:**

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   8. **Other resource ideas/requests**

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   ...........................................................................................................................

   **Thank you for your input.**
The workshop feedback sheet

Thank you for participating in the D-Cubed "Doing dissemination: Exploring theory and practice" workshop.

We would greatly appreciate your feedback on the workshop you attended recently. At the end of this feedback form there will be an opportunity for you to provide your email address if you would like to receive professional development resources presented at the workshop.

Your responses to this feedback form are entirely confidential and you are free to withdraw at any point.

1. Which of the workshops did you attend?

☐ Which of the workshops did you attend?  Brisbane (30 Sept)

☐ Sydney (30 Sept)

☐ Melbourne (at Deakin, 26 Oct)

☐ Melbourne (at Monash, 27 Oct)

☐ Adelaide (5 Nov)

☐ Perth (at UWA, 8 Nov)

☐ Perth (at Murdoch, 9 Nov)

☐ Webinar

2. What were you hoping to gain from attending this workshop?

[Text box for feedback]
3. **To what extent do you agree with the following statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The workshop enabled me to have more understanding of dissemination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My attendance at this workshop was relevant to my current or potential role in an ALTC project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop was clearly structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The workshop facilitator’s explanations were clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would attend similar events in the future if they were available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I intend to share information from this workshop with other colleagues from my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommended further discussion of issues identified in this workshop with colleagues in my institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS**

*Please add any suggestions on how this workshop could be improved or any further comments you have for the D-Cubed project team.*

5. **Would you like to receive a copy and provide final feedback on the refined dissemination planning resources?**

- [ ] No
- [x] Yes, (Please provide your email address so we can keep in contact with you)
Quick Guide to Dissemination for Prospective Applicants

This summary — arising from the D-Cubed Project — provides a quick guide to dissemination for those considering applying for an ALTC-funded grant. Dissemination is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

Top 3 Findings

There are twelve findings in the D-Cubed Final Report and the Guide. Here are the top 3 for prospective applicants:

1. Dissemination is commonly described as a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose. (Finding 6)
2. Project leaders grapple with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing a climate of readiness for change. (Finding 13)
3. Successful dissemination strategies have multiple layers of change enablers who facilitate dissemination. (Finding 12)

To read the findings in their entirety, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination.

Assess climate of readiness for change

People and systems need to be ready to change, or at least able to be convinced that change is worthwhile. This means that you need to be clear about who it is who will benefit from your project (end-users) and who would be likely to take them up (targeted potential adopters). Your assessment of the climate of readiness for change is an underpinning feature of your project rationale. Addressing climate will also help you argue the value of and need for the project. If you determine that the climate isn’t ready, then consider reshaping your project to build readiness. Remember to think about change enablers for your project because they are vital for sustainability.

Engage throughout the project

Effective dissemination can’t be an afterthought, and it needs to occur throughout the project. Think about the junctures during your project when you can usefully connect with your targeted potential adopters. Also think of how you will ensure that you can respond to opportunities to engage that arise unexpectedly during the life of the project. Other reasons to engage include further cultivating the climate of readiness for change, and building credibility, familiarity, empowerment and ownership. Use the resources in The D-Cubed Guide to develop a dissemination strategy and select appropriate dissemination activities.

Enable transfer of project outcomes

The impact of the project needs to continue after the money runs out. Top priorities for you include considering how the outcomes will be both findable and adaptable — the better you do this, the more likely it will be that people can benefit from your work. Be aware that the end of the project may not mean the end of your involvement and make sure that senior management is aware of potential ongoing involvement and workload implications.

For more information, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination and the D-Cubed Project Final Report. This resource is available from http://www.tecli.qut.edu.au/dissemination
Quick Guide to Dissemination for Assessors and Evaluators

This summary — arising from the D-Cubed Project — provides a quick guide to dissemination for those who are assessing grant applications or who are guiding and supporting projects in an external evaluator role. Dissemination is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

Top 3 Findings

There are twelve findings in the D-Cubed Final Report and the Guide. Here are the top 3 for assessors and external evaluators:

1. There is an espoused understanding amongst grant recipients that dissemination activities occur during the life of the project, rather than after the project concludes. (Finding 5)
2. Projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset. (Finding 9)
3. Project leaders grapple with identifying, articulating, and responding to or developing a climate of readiness for change. (Finding 10)

To read the findings in their entirety, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination.

Assess climate of readiness for change

People and systems need to be ready to change, or at least able to be convinced that change is worthwhile. You can give valuable feedback to the project team about their assessment of the climate of readiness for change, which is an underpinning factor of the project rationale and their argument for the value of and need for the project. Look for indicators that the team has identified targeted potential adopters and that they understand the climate and systems within which the targeted adopters operate.

Engage throughout the project

Effective dissemination can’t be an afterthought, and it needs to occur throughout the project. The project design, and timeline and budget, need to make explicit the ways in which the team will engage with targeted potential adopters. You can look for an approach which occurs throughout the project and challenge dissemination approaches that are excessively end-of-project focused.

Enable transfer of project outcomes

The impact of the project needs to continue after the money runs out. One of the important evaluative judgements you can make is about the project team’s plans to enable transfer, by seeking information about how they will make outcomes findable, transferable and adaptable, and how they intend to nurture ongoing commitment, ownership and capacity to adopt.

For more information, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination and the D-Cubed Project Final Report. This resource is available from http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/dissemination

---

A review of the dissemination strategies used by projects funded under the ALTC Grants Scheme
Quick Guide to Dissemination for Senior Managers

This summary — arising from the D-Cubed Project — provides a quick guide that summarises the influence that learning and teaching leaders can have on ensuring ALTC grant success and sustainability. Dissemination is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

Top 3 Findings

There are twelve findings in the D-Cubed Final Report and the Guide. Here are the top 3 for senior managers:

1. ALTC grant holders tend to equate the end of the grant with an end of their involvement in that topic, possibly as a result of ALTC project work being viewed as an additional workload. (Finding 7)

2. Projects that have successfully embedded and upscaled have identified and engaged with potential adopters from the outset. (Finding 9)

3. Successful dissemination strategies have multiple layers of change enablers who facilitate dissemination. (Finding 12)

To read the findings in their entirety, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination.

Assess climate of readiness for change

People and systems need to be ready to change, or at least able to be convinced that change is worthwhile. As a leader in learning and teaching, you are in a unique position to both influence and “read” the climate. Your expertise can ensure that projects which emerge from your institution do indeed target areas where there is a climate of readiness for change. Your leadership can foster the climate of readiness in areas of need.

Engage throughout the project

Effective dissemination can’t be an afterthought, and it needs to occur throughout the project. You can support project teams by attending and lending profile to project events, as well as by making opportunities available at your institution for projects to engage with staff. Your active endorsement of projects will assist project teams to build credibility and familiarity.

Enable transfer of project outcomes

The impact of the project needs to continue after the money runs out. You can assist in enabling transfer through your willingness to operationalise changes, advocate for the importance of the outcomes, to nurture ongoing commitment and provide ongoing institutional support.

For more information, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination and the D-Cubed Project Final Report.

This resource is available from http://www.qld.edu.au/dissemination

Support for this initiative has been provided by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council Ltd, an initiative of the Australian Government, www.altc.edu.au
Quick Guide to Dissemination for Support Staff

This summary — arising from the D-Cubed Project — provides a quick guide to dissemination for those who support the development of grants applications. Dissemination is the planned process of understanding potential adopters and engaging with them throughout the life of the project, to facilitate commitment to sustained change.

Top 3 Findings

There are twelve findings in the D-Cubed Final Report and the Guide. Here are the top 3 for support staff:

1. The most popular method of communication of project outcomes remains traditional academic modes such as conference presentations, book publications and publication in academic journals and conferences. (Finding 3)
2. A web presence is a common dissemination activity, but its potential impact is limited due to maintenance issues after the project concludes. (Finding 4)
3. Dissemination is commonly described as a collection of atomistic activities, rather than as a clearly planned strategy designed to achieve a particular purpose. (Finding 6)

To read the findings in their entirety, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination.

Assess climate of readiness for change

People and systems need to be ready to change, or at least able to be convinced that change is worthwhile. When you’re working with applicants, prompt them to articulate the purpose of the project, to identify targeted potential adopters and change enablers and to assess the willingness and ability to change at both personal and institutional levels. If the applicant realizes that the climate isn’t ready, you can help them reshape their project into one that focuses on making the climate more ready for change. If the applicant writes compellingly about readiness, they will be addressing both project rationale and value of and need for the project.

Engage throughout the project

Effective dissemination can’t be an afterthought; it needs to occur throughout the project. As you support prospective applicants with refining their project design, and timeline and budget, look for indicators that engagement has been built in throughout the project. Ask them how their budget will allow for both planned and contingent dissemination expenditure. Challenge a strategy that is too heavily dependent on a single activity type, or that is too end-of-project focussed, or that doesn’t seem to get the balance right between awareness, understanding and action. Remember that there are D-Cubed resources (in the Guide) that can scaffold your discussions with prospective applicants.

Enable transfer of project outcomes

The impact of the project needs to continue after the money runs out. Your questions about how the project will influence sustained change can assist project teams to devise a dissemination strategy that makes transfer far more likely to occur. Encourage teams to consider how they will nurture in others ongoing commitment, ownership and capacity to adopt and how their project plan and dissemination strategy will address this. Work with applicants to devise ways to support their ongoing involvement in the topic beyond the funded life of the project.

For more information, go to The D-Cubed Guide: Planning for Effective Dissemination and the D-Cubed Project Final Report. This resource is available from http://www.led.uq.edu.au/dissemination