University of Canberra

Sandra Burr

Creative and Practice-led Research Symposium

University of Canberra, 9 October 2010
An Australian Postgraduate Writers Network event (a component of the Australian Writing Programs Network ALTC project)

Around the Room: A summary of the symposium discussions

Abstract:

A summary of the *Creative and Practice-Led Research Symposium*, University of Canberra, 9 October 2009

Biographical note:

Dr. Sandra Burr has a doctorate in creative writing. She completed her PhD on the topic of women and horses and continues to research and write on equine issues. She is an Adjunct Professional Associate at the University of Canberra where she teaches creative writing and practice-led research. She also reviews for *TEXT: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses* and *M/C Reviews* http://www.media-culture.org.au.

Keywords:

Practice-led research – Creative research – Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC)

Program design: Chris Hardy, University of Canberra

Introduction

There are many burning issues facing the higher education sector in relation to creative and practice-led research. Dennis Strand's influential report, *Research in the Creative Arts* (1998), identified the conditions as they then were, and made a number of proposals and projections for the future. At the time that the Strand report was published, few staff in the creative arts held postgraduate degrees, and only 3.9% of research higher degrees students in Australia were working in the creative arts (Strand 1998, xiv); many of those would have been conducting conventional humanities or social science projects. This has changed radically, with increasing numbers of staff holding doctoral level degrees, and with greatly increased demand for research higher degree places in creative practice. This rich environment brings with it commensurate pressures: to develop the appropriate language for this research paradigm; to provide supervisors with skills in the specifics of working with creative practitioners as researchers; to build a national community of researchers at both student and supervisor level; and to provide the best possible environment in which students can generate knowledge relevant to the field and to add social capital.

The inaugural *Creative and Practice-Led Research Symposium* represents a reflective pause, a moment if you like, where we stepped outside our practice and took stock of where we are at in terms of creative practice in the academy, and where we need to go. Held at the University of Canberra on 9 October 2009, and co-convened by Professor Jen Webb (University of Canberra) and Associate Professor Donna Lee Brien (CQUniversity, Australia), the symposium was funded by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) under their funding of Webb and Brien's ALTC Competitive Grants Scheme project. It brought together leading creative and practice-led research practitioners from Australia's higher education sector including relevant program heads, convenors and invited postgraduate students in Design, Writing, and the Visual, Performing and New Media arts (including film), with the aim of identifying and discussing the current environment and future aspirations in the field of creative practice. In all, thirty-seven participants from sixteen institutions accepted an invitation to attend the symposium.

The day was divided into three sessions: session one examined the current context; session two the student context; and the third session looked at the supervisory context. At the start of each session two keynote speakers each made a brief presentation aimed at stimulating discussion and expanded versions of four of these presentations (those by Stephen Barrass, Scott Brook, Ross Gibson and Cheryl Stock) can be found in this Special Issue. Participants then split into three groups and workshopped two prepared key questions that were central to each sessional topic. A plenary session followed in which the findings of each workshop session were presented and discussed by the whole group. The format of the symposium enabled the views of all participants to be heard and recorded. The below seeks to summarise these discussions.

Session one: The current context

Participants were asked to consider issues of sustainability in relation to creative and practice-led research in the academy.

In general, it was felt that sustainability is about building and increasing our value as academics and artists to the rest of the world. Of primary concern was how to achieve sustainable creative practice within the academy. It was suggested that there is a need for continuing reflection about creative practice in the academic context, and the identification of cultural frames to determine what creative knowledge production is and how it is assessed.

A discussion about the undesirability of maintaining patriarchal notions of art within the academy drew attention to the need to sustain cultural difference within the academy. It was felt that it is essential that non-traditional, non-European knowledge forms within the academy should be preserved together with a genuine consideration of the ownership issues so often associated with such tacit knowledge. There was also debate over whether the Western educative function of universities should be adhered to, or whether students should be allowed to be self-directed. In response, it was pointed out that universities are, to some extent, in the "PhD industry". At present, we produce PhD graduates for companies and other employers and contexts that do not always need or want a PhD graduate and, therefore, how do we achieve sustainability if there are no jobs for graduates either in industry or academia? One solution may be to strengthen the nexus between industry and the academy as a way to create jobs for graduates. Some industries, such as architecture, necessarily require accreditation, which might limit the potential of those students and this raised questions about the compatibility of accreditation and creativity. In response, it was noted that compared to industry, the academic environment—especially in the domain of practice-led research—is an enviable playground where experimentation and failure are a valued as part of the learning process. As someone put it, creative graduates are "power practitioners": they possess the ability to think critically and creatively and have acquired a culture of lifelong learning. Consequently, our graduates enter the workforce with a set of skills and attributes that are transferable across industries and is one factor that ensures their sustainability. Developing linkages and articulating our practice as academics and artists will help us to increase our value across the board

while encouraging moves from work integrated learning towards ways of helping the professions and establishing national priorities.

Participants also pondered how we, as creative practice oriented academics, sustain and motivate ourselves in an increasingly burdensome administrative and teaching-oriented environment. While the current academic framework was viewed by some as an impediment to practice, others observed that some institutions were embracing a concept of sustainability where the teaching-research nexus, practice-research nexus and the research-pedagogy nexus are moving closer together. There was also a suggestion that creative practice academics should keep agitating to have funding such as Australia Council grants counted as research income as another means of sustaining creative practice research within the academy. It was also agreed that unlike the scientific environment, creative practice academics need to exist in a space of "not knowing" before embarking on a research project and we should therefore recognise that curiosity not only drives but sustains our sector. Another way of ensuring sustainability would be to adopt a more collaborative knowledge sharing approach with other institutions. We could, for example, share exemplars of some of the processes and practices that universities are applying to sustainability in HDR and other student populations. Collaboration across institutions would also be another way of achieving critical mass. Activities such as this symposium were cited as a way of making this happen, but require resourcing.

It was also noted that the pool of examiners and supervisors in the fields of creative practice is very small. To avoid over straining those already in the pool and indeed, to sustain a freshness of practice, there is a need to train more examiners and supervisors and for a register of examiners and supervisors with particular skills to be established. While such a register already exists for writers on the *Australian Postgraduate Writers Network (APWN)*, the whole process could be further expanded to include a wider range of creative practice. Finally, it was felt that a follow-up symposium or similar national forum would be useful in sustaining the momentum and interest created by this event.

The second question interrogated the relationship between 'aesthetic quality', 'research' and 'professional qualities/viability' in relation to outcomes/outputs.

The academy, industry and the art world all influence decisions about quality, value and aesthetic assessment with the creative PhD being an example in the academic context. Tensions not only exist about how to assess the quality of a creative PhD, but are also inherent in the relationship that exists between producing work and the need to reflect on that work without necessarily saying what it means. Who, then, decides what the assessable criteria should be and will the academic imperative to normalise these processes impact negatively on creativity?

Concern was also expressed about the extent of industry influence in determining what the academy produces and there was some disquiet over the fact that we, as creative practitioners, are compelled to think in terms of producing a product at all. Conversely artists practicing outside academia are equally concerned that institutions are "taking over" their practice and defining it in ways that the artists themselves do not. Issues stemming from how we reflect upon outcomes and outputs reveal further

tensions between products and processes. How, for example, do we articulate something as problematic as intuition, which is central to how we work as practice-led researchers in the academy? Many felt that, instead of complaining about the status quo, we should embrace current academic debate and see it as an opportunity to shape creativity in the academy. As one participant observed while urging us all to be more passionate in pursuing change, "there's blood on the floor and it's exciting". Now is the time to emphasise practice-led research in the academy and insist that creative practice be recognised and valued.

There was considerable discussion about the shape of the creative PhD. At least one university is proposing a PhD based solely on creative practice with no exegesis, which raised questions about what exactly makes a PhD a PhD? A narrow definition of what a PhD should be has the advantage that it is a recognisable object held in high regard by the community at large. Parallels between art and science were noted with the singular difference that while science asks questions, then produces and tests a thesis, it is an individual and not a discipline that asks the question in creative and practice-led research.

Consideration was given to the shape of creative dissertations and the tensions that arise from practice being research as revealed in the bimodal exegetical/creative artefact model. Concepts such as parallel texts, dialogue and mutually supportive modalities, proof, defence and explanations were examined and a call was made for the reflective text to be a more critical evaluation and investigation of aesthetics rather than an analysis of the creative process and/or product. There were also calls for critical writing to be considered as a legitimate and desirable form of knowledge production in the arts.

Within the written form there is an emerging epistemology of poetics that should be seen as an appropriate articulation of our practice. We should own poetic language as both an expert and valid methodology and pedagogy because the language we use reflects our research. It has to be elusive, metaphoric and poetic because any explanation of the artwork immediately denies the validity of the artwork as an examinable component. The validity of poetic language is an example of how we, as creative practitioners, are finding the means to persuade academia to accept different ways of articulating who we are creatively. Theorists interpret practice and artists enrich this body of theory by adding their voices. The work itself remains because other people will want to talk about it well into the future. We need both theory and practice in the creative and practice-led research milieu and what is really interesting is how the two sit, and fit, together. Many of the major cultural shifts, it was asserted, were started by artists and explicated by others, with the point being that writing—whether poetic or academic—is just language and ultimately an act of interpretation. When two art forms talk together we are necessarily translating language.

Participants also challenged the notion that the research product has to be a written object. It is possible for creative theses to be produced in a variety of non-traditional shapes and forms that reflect the cultures from which they come. We should be open to producing creative dissertations in new technologies and formats such as an edited conversation with a supervisor, an audio product, or interactive DVDs and websites.

In terms of the creative dissertation we are in a transitional stage and in many instances paradigms with which to discuss some aesthetic objects being produced by our practice are yet to be framed. The emergence of Indigenous art into the forefront of critical and popular notice in the 1980s was put forward as an example of this phenomenon.

What became clear, however, in this discussion is the ultimate centrality of writing both in industry and academia. Everyone has to write in order to articulate their practice, so the argument about artists just doing their practice does not hold up. Artists who complete higher degrees for example, go back to their practice with improved writing skills, which is ultimately a critical factor when applying for funding or composing artist statements. Having a high-quality set of standards allows for better transferability into the marketplace/workplace beyond the academy. The creative PhD, with its inherent writing skills, qualifies graduates to undertake a range of activities working in industry and in the academy. The form of the thesis is immaterial because the definitive criterion is its transferability. The PhD essentially remains a dissemination of knowledge not just to other practitioners, but to a wider culture as well. It is, in itself, a form of translation. There is also another consideration that practicing artists who want to pursue a higher degree must transfer their knowledge and thinking into the academy.

Session two: The student context

Participants were asked to consider how the needs of creative practitioner HDR students differ from those in other research paradigms.

There are multiple creative practice paradigms for undertaking research and this has the potential to be both beneficial and detrimental for HDR students. While there are many different ways that research can be carried out, this can be daunting if students do not know what the best method is for their project. The practice-led PhD may employ new or unfamiliar methodologies, and it may be more difficult to justify and articulate an unconventional methodology. It is therefore important that practice-led students very consciously explicate their processes for their examiners to avoid misinterpretation. Even if we apply existing languages to describe research, whether it is described as “blue-sky”, “pure” or “highly esoteric” research, there still needs to be a field and a context in which to register it. The point was made that we already have a template for creative practice and experimentation as a form of practice from which we generate knowledge. Why, then, do we need a separate rubric for practice-led research? Can’t we just use some of the ones that already exist?

Students, particularly those undertaking higher degrees in unnamed research paradigms, may not appreciate the value of their own tacit knowledge in practice-led research and this can lead to a heightened sense of anxiety. Practice-led students need to develop a kind of resilience in dealing with anxiety and uncertainty both of which are unavoidable, particularly as uncertainty and curiosity are essential motivating factors in practice-led research. While the PhD, as a transformative experience, probably requires some degree of uncertainty, some of these ambiguities can be reduced by supervisors providing a solid sense of context about the field. This can be

both in determining the domain and the audience for the work, and in selecting examiners. Creative arts PhD students are often older than those in fields such as science and this can be another source of anxiety. Many explore deeply personal, and sometimes traumatic, experiences that are embedded in issues of grief, loss and suffering and these students need different kinds of support at different times throughout their candidatures. The research topics of mature age students may also be subject to other strictures which students in other fields may never experience. An example was given of a public servant who was writing a memoir about his time in a government department and who was restrained by the Official Secrets Act.

The current paucity of suitable examiners and an apparent disparity in examination results was also a matter of concern. The pool of supervisors and examiners in the creative arts in Australia is relatively small. This means a thesis may be examined by examiners who are not *au fait* with all the specifics of a particular practice. While this was viewed as being a temporary state of affairs, it might explain the current disparity often revealed in examiners' comments on the same thesis. It was suggested that consistency could be achieved by having a known context and a known field and being explicit about the research process. Being too insular was viewed as potentially detrimental and this could be overcome by examiners and supervisors having a system of highly interlinked peer networks in which to discuss these supervisory processes. It is also important when using examiners from overseas where different standards may exist, to clearly indicate what is expected of them.

Next, the issues of linkages to the professions/industry and commercialisation/IP were scrutinised.

Fears were expressed that universities are becoming more corporatized. Students are now viewed as clients who are somehow "serviced". This climate is indicative of other changes which impact on the kinds of research we do. Universities are now less inclined to undertake pure or unapplied research and, instead, shape their research to attract industry or other funding. The need for cash has led to fiscally productive agreements with private enterprise which can be problematic for HDR students and staff. Examples were given of work-in-confidence agreements that exclude staff from attending seminars and a military PhD where the supervisor could not obtain clearance for examiners to assess the work. This raises questions about the role of publicly funded institutions such as universities and whether it is appropriate to inhibit the dissemination of knowledge because of IP and other arrangements with industry, government and community bodies. On the other hand, some saw the current situation as an opportunity for universities to develop contacts and form relationships outside the university, with a view to leading, rather than following, industry and government.

The subject of ethics was raised because it can be quite a complex and confusing issue for creative practitioners and researchers. While ethics approval is an acknowledged part of the HDR research process there are many grey areas when it comes to deciding the ownership of creative research. Is it enough to work to industry standards by fulfilling required permissions and releases when, for example, you are making a film or documentary for public dissemination or holding a public exhibition of material emanating from a PhD, or do we need to adhere to institutional ethical standards as

well? At what point can a creative product still be considered to be university work or part of the public domain? In at least one State, prisoners writing exegetical material for postgraduate research are statutorily required to seek ethics clearance. We should remain mindful that students risk failure if they do not comply with ethics requirements. There is a need, it was also felt, however, to inform this debate rather than being led by it. Supervisors can ask, for example, for global fast track clearances for some projects or specific blanket clearances where appropriate. There is also a growing sense that we are not qualified to deal with these increasingly complex ethical issues and should call upon our universities' lawyers for help. More importantly, it is time to discuss and resolve this issue at a national level.

Session three: The supervisory context

In this session participants were asked to identify the key areas central to good research higher degree supervision in creative practice and what they thought the most important policy, supervision and research issues are in this area.

It was agreed that as well as creative practice specific skills, supervisors should possess generic attributes that apply across all creative fields and, indeed, across the majority of academic disciplines. These include managing expectations, overseeing the project and training candidates. In practical terms, this translates to being helpful and available to students, honouring appointments and having a quick turnaround on drafts. A good supervisor may be marked by their publishing record. There was some discussion about the desirability of supervisors co-publishing with their students. This would indicate that supervisors are willing to learn from their students and it also supports students to enter the field as authors. Comparisons were made with the science field where co-authoring is a more common practice. The point was made however, that this was typically done under the umbrella of large funded research projects, something that is unusual in the creative field.

The supervisor-student relationship is a shared enterprise and it is important from the beginning to spend time with students, not only to clarify the fundamental ideas and expectations arising from the relationship but also to plan the research and its outcomes. The importance of developing a good rapport with students was emphasised as not so much about being a friend as providing support and, if necessary, being prepared to be an advocate on the student's behalf. It need not be a "lonely road" for students, particularly if supervisors create a sense a community, but students too have a responsibility to choose their peer groups and their institutions wisely. Control was seen as a key issue with the point being made that supervisors must understand that it is not their PhD. Good supervisors are good decision makers. They will let their students grow by allowing them to take risks and to "go off on tangents" while knowing how to encourage them to focus, refocus and finish. Typically, each candidature starts with a structured period of intense support, after which candidates should be given space within a critical trajectory, often with a crisis point part way through their studies which should be dealt with flexibly and according to the needs of each individual.

Supervisors have an important mentoring role, which was described as a more intimate form of teaching. This was linked to the need for supervisors to impart a sense of the field, which for them may be a tacit, instinctual embodied accumulation of knowledge. Supervisors should connect their students to the discipline or field of practice by contextualising their work. It was also felt that supervisors are dependent on the quality of their students and the question was raised about how to recruit good students who are committed to the whole shape of the project. It was suggested that a good supervisor will be able to manage, guide and work with a broad range of students. Some may have different understandings and expectations of the creative thesis; they may be academics from different disciplines, or practitioners from outside the academy, and how these different inputs are supervised and managed is critically important. There was a general agreement that supervisors do not need to be experienced experts in their candidate's specific proposed area of research. Such shortcomings can be overcome in several ways. A supervisory panel may be one way of achieving a combination of academic and creative practice skills. Participants also felt that good supervisors will possess an immense curiosity that enables them to quickly and willingly acquire an understanding of the field. It was also felt that supervisors who work on multiple projects covering a diverse range of topics and methodologies are, in fact, privileged. The need to acquire new knowledge and constantly switch thinking between the theoretical and practical aspects of different projects creates an energy that generates and sustains a vibrant research culture. Finally, a good supervisor chooses appropriate examiners, one succinct description being those that "were not crazy and have a generous heart".

Again, comments were made that the existing pool of both supervisors and examiners was quite small. While a good supervisor will have guided many students to completion, there is a need to recruit new supervisors and examiners. This would not only reduce the workload on current supervisors and examiners, it would also ensure a continuing diversity in the range of skills and experience on offer to students.

It was noted that immense progress in terms of the creative thesis has been made by the academy in the past decade; however, the complex nature of the creative dissertation means there is an ongoing need to improve and refine it. There was considerable debate about the extent to which the exegesis is properly understood and the extent to which the two aspects may be integrated.

One view was that supervisors and examiners should avoid the separation of the creative and theoretical components of the creative dissertation. Instead they should aim to integrate them and create a new level of what is expected and build capacity to reach that level. Another view focussed on dis-integration. It was proposed that the two could be split with the exegesis being assessed not in association with the creative work, but on its own terms. An academic examiner could be used to assess the exegesis and a different examiner for the creative work. This raised the issue of how to separate "good art" from "a bad exegesis", and vice versa, and how such a thesis could be examinable. Perhaps this dilemma should, however, be seen as an opportunity for developing both parts of the thesis.

Others suggested that while the project should be an organic whole, it need not have one form and, again, this raised questions of how to examine such a work. It is possible, for example, for an exegesis to follow any of the models of historical, explanatory and creative, or a combination of these. Should the examiner look independently at both elements or consider instead the exegesis as a sophisticated refection on the creative piece? Current practice is for an examiner to write a report on the project as a whole, however, a report by Phillips, Stock and Vincs (2009), *Dancing Between Diversity and Consistency: Refining academic assessment in postgraduate degrees in dance,* contained an example of an innovative approach to examination.

While it was agreed that each discipline needs to consider its own research higher degree imperatives, it was equally clear that there are problems with the existing diversity of approaches to supervision, submission and examination. In terms of one object being presented, justified, categorised and examined, the question was asked why creative practice candidates should be treated differently to all other candidates. Certainly there are pressures at the PhD level, including on examiners who are aware that universities want to be credited for their completions. Globally, there is a dramatic increase in the PhD load, which is not just restricted to the creative arts. While this may contribute to variable standards (which worried some considerably), it was felt by others that there is a need in the creative field to remain open and to avoid an imperative to standardise.

In conclusion, Donna Lee Brien pointed to the *Australian Postgraduate Writers Network (APWN)* as an example of a growing online creative network that is a source of archival knowledge and active community engagement. It may seem trite to say that the symposium raised as many questions as it answered, but this was our experience on the day. While we have resolved many issues pertaining to creative- and practice-led research in the academy, the conversation is an ongoing one, a view that is supported by the papers in this special issue.

List of participants

Name	Position/Institution	Interests
Professor Josie Arnold jarnold@swin.edu.au	Professor in postgraduate writing courses, Faculty of Higher Education, Swinburne University of Technology	Creative writing, writing pedagogy, the impact of the cyber upon writing. Member of the *Australian Society for Computers in learning in Tertiary Education* (ASCILITE), managing editor Swinburne's online journal *Bukker Tilibul*
Associate Professor Stephen Barrass Stephen.Barrass@canberra.edu.au	Associate Professor of Digital Media, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Interactive design, sonification, generative art. Member management committees European COST initiative on Sonic Interaction Design, and ARC Network of Excellence on Human Communication Science (HCSnet)
Dr Greg Battye Greg.battye@canberra.edu.au	Associate Dean, Design and Creative Practice (Education), Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Media arts and Production , photography, photography, narrative theory and new writing technologies
Dr Eugenie Keefer Bell , RAIA Eugenie.Keefer.Bell@canberra.edu.au	Senior Lecturer in Architecture, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Architecture, crafts, design

Associate Professor Donna Lee Brien d.brien@cqu.edu.au	Head of School, Creative and Performing Arts & Associate Professor, Creative Industries, Faculty of Arts, Business, Informatics & Education (FABIE), CQ University, Australia	Creative writing, writing pedagogy, creative nonfiction, food writing, collaborative practice. Special Issues Editor *TEXT*, Immediate Past President, Australian Association of Writing Programs
Dr Barbara Bolt bbolt@unimelb.edu.au	Associate Dean of Graduate Research, Faculty of the VCA and Music, The University of Melbourne	Visual art, creative praxis, painting
Dr Enza Gandolfo Enza.Gandolfo@vu.edu.au	Senior Lecturer in Professional Writing, Faculty of Arts, Education and Human Development, Victoria University.	Fiction and non-fiction writing. Member Victorian Writers Centre, Fellowship of Writers Australia, Australian Association of Writing Programs, Association of Writing Programs, USA Narrative Network, Australia
Professor Ross Gibson r.gibson@sca.usyd.edu.au	Professor of Contemporary Arts, Sydney College of the Arts	Writing, film, installation art. Fellow of the Australian Academy of Humanities
Professor Lelia Green l.green@ecu.edu.au	Professor of Communications / Associate Dean, Research and Higher Degrees, Faculty of Education and Arts, Edith Cowan University	Applied research in media and the creative industries. Member editorial board the *Australian Journal of Communication*, Chief Investigator in the ARC Centre for Excellence for the Creative industries and Innovation, networking out of QIT, particularly in terms of supporting research into the Creative Workforce
Mr Chris Hardy Chris.Hardy@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer in Design, Faculty of Arts and Design University of Canberra	Design. Member management committee for CraftACT, and management group for the Gallery of Australian Design.
Dr Paul Hetherington phetheri@nla.gov.au	Director, Publications and Events Branch, National Library of Australia	Poetry, writing, publishing. Editor *National Library of Australia News*
Mr Geoff Hinchcliffe Geoff.Hinchcliffe@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer, Media & Graphic Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Design, architecture and planning, new media
Ms Susan Kerrigan Susan.Kerrigan@newcastle.edu.au	Lecturer in Communication, School of Design, Communication & Information Technology, The University of Newcastle	Film, video production, PhD candidate (University of Newcastle)
Professor Jeri Kroll jeri.kroll@flinders.edu.au	Program Coordinator Creative Writing, Department of English, Creative Writing and Australian Studies, Flinders University	Creative writing practice, research and pedagogy. Member Australian Association of Writing Programs, on the boards of *New Writing* (UK), *TEXT* and *Australian Book Review*
Dr Paul Magee Paul.Magee@canberra.edu.au	Senior Lecturer in Poetry / Convener, Writing Degrees, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Poetry, creative writing. Member Cultural Studies of Australasia Association
Mr Bob Miller Bob.Miller@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer, Media & Graphic Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Photography
Mr Eddi Pianca Eddi.Pianca@canberra.edu.au	Head of Industrial Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Industrial design
Dr Nicole Porter Nicole.porter@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer in Landscape Architecture, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Design, landscape architecture and planning
Mr Dominic Redfern Dominic.redfern@rmit.edu.au	Senior lecturer in Video Art / Studio Coordinator, School of Art, RMIT University	Media Arts, performative video art. PhD candidate (RMIT)
Dr Francesca Rendle-Short francesca.rendle-short@rmit.edu.au	Program Director (Creative Writing), School of Media and Communication, RMIT University	Creative writing, use of fiction or story in scholarly writing
Associate Professor Cheryl Stock c.stock@qut.edu.au	Associate Professor (Dance) / Coordinator postgraduate dance program, Creative Industries Faculty, Queensland University of Technology	Contemporary performance (dance-led and interdisciplinary), site specific installation, intercultural arts. Secretary General World Dance Alliance
Dr Mary-Jane Taylor	Senior Lecturer, Media & Graphic	Graphic design. Member Australian Graphic

Mary-Jane.Taylor@canberra.edu.au	Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Design Association (AGDA).
Mr Tim Thomas Tim.Thomas@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer, Media & Graphic Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Media production, photographic representation of space
Dr Jude Walton Judith.Walton@vu.edu.au	Senior Lecturer, Performance Studies, School for Communication and the Arts (SCATA), Victoria University	Dance, theatre and the visual arts
Mr Gowrie Waterhouse Gowrie.Waterhouse@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer in Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Researches and teaches interdisciplinary studies in design
Professor Jen Webb Jen.webb@canberra.edu.au	Associate Dean Research, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Creative writing. Executive member Association of Australian Writing Programs, co-editor online journal TEXT, co-editor Sage Publishers book series, *Understanding Contemporary Culture*
Professor Terri-ann White tawhite@uwapress.uwa.edu.au	Director, UWA Publishing / Director, Australian Institute of Advanced Studies, The University of Western Australia	Publishing, writing - including creative writing, fiction, autobiography and contemporary women's writing
Dr Mitchell Whitelaw Mitchell.Whitelaw@canberra.edu.au	Lecturer, Media Arts & Graphic Design, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	New media, complex generative systems, digital sound and music.
Dr Jordan Williams Jordan.Williams@canberra.edu.au	Associate Dean Writing, Faculty of Arts and Design, University of Canberra	Literature, writing, research methods, the use of technology in learning, teaching and practice
Alison Wotherspoon alison.wotherspoon@flinders.edu.au	Senior Lecturer Screen Studies / Coordinator, Screen Production, Department of Screen and Media , Flinders University	Screen production. PhD candidate (Flinders. Vice President ASPERA (Australian Screen Production Education and Research Association, Secretary CAPA (CILECT Asia Pacific Association), corresponding member CILECT (Centre International de Liaison des Ecoles de Cinéma et de Télévision).

Works cited

Australian Postgraduate Writers Network (APWN) at http://www.writingnetwork.edu.au

Stock, Cheryl F, Maggi Phillips and Kim Vincs 2009 *Dancing between diversity and consistency: refining academic assessment in postgraduate degrees in dance,* Mt Lawley, Western Australia: West Australian Academy of the Performing Arts, Edith Cowan University, at http://eprints.qut.edu.au/27955 (accessed 23 May 2010)

Strand, D 1998 *Research in the creative arts*, Canberra: Evaluations and Investigations Programme, Higher Education Division, Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs