

EDGE2 STRATEGIC PLAN 2008-2011



2010 REPORT ON PERFORMANCE AGAINST INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

The six Institutional Goals, listed below, arise from the four cornerstone aspirations of the **EDGE** agenda – **E**xcellence, **D**istinctiveness, **G**rowth and **E**ngagement. They are whole-of-institution goals, which encapsulate the pursuit of institutional excellence and distinctiveness, sustainable growth and meaningful engagement.

1. To be ranked in the top 10 Australian universities in terms of research performance.
2. To be ranked in the top 10 Australian universities in terms of teaching and learning performance.
3. To be ranked within the top 250 of the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities.
4. To increase the proportion of graduates in the Tasmanian workforce to at least the national average.
5. To achieve annual enrolment targets and to grow to approximately 16,500 EFTSL, ensuring a robust financial base with which to support UTAS' academic strategic objectives.
6. To maintain financial viability and achieve annual and longer-term budgetary targets.

Key Highlights for 2010:

- Research – while UTAS continues to perform moderately well on the key research benchmarks of income, Australian Competitive Grants, HDR enrolments and Research Block Grants, the overall picture is one of continuing deterioration in the University's position relative to its competitors.
- Teaching & Learning – in the 2010 AL&TC Citations and Awards, UTAS was successful with 5 Citations (from 7 nominations) and 1 Award for Teaching Excellence (from 1 nomination).
- Enrolment Growth – total enrolments were up by 1,061 EFTSL (7%) on 2009, to 16,257 EFTSL. Operating Grant load increased by 7.7% to a total of 11,623 EFTSL; onshore Full Fee Paying Overseas Students (FFPOS) load increased by 6.4% to 2,362 EFTSL, and offshore FFPOS load increased by 12.1% to 1,472.
- Finance – overall operating result of \$54.4 million, against a budget of \$66.9 million. The main variances related to the recognition of academic leave liabilities (\$4.9m) and net adjustments to Commonwealth student fee revenue for prior years (\$6.4m).

This report is made against the Institutional Goals included in the 2008-2011 UTAS Strategic Plan. A number of indicators, particularly external indicators from the ABS and DEEWR will only be updated for 2010 later in 2011. In those cases, the most recent data is used.

Institutional Goal 1:

To be ranked in the top 10 Australian Universities in terms of research performance

Performance Indicators –

Achieve top 10 status and improve rankings in key research performance indicators (individual and institutional) such as:

- **Total research income**
- **DEEWR publications**
- **RHD load as a proportion of total load**
- **RHD completion rates**
- **Research block funding income.**

Performance Against Goal –

- **UTAS ranked in top 10 in 2009 for Australian Competitive Grant Income and research block funding and CRC income.**
- **UTAS ranked 11th in total research income and RHD completions rates for PhD candidates.**
- **UTAS ranked lower than 11th for Other Public Sector Funding, Industry & Other Funding, DEEWR publications, student enrolments, student load and student completions (Masters).**

1. Research Performance Indicators

It is becoming increasingly clear that UTAS's relative performance as a research institution has been declining. Comparative national data (Table 1) show that the University's ranking declined in 2009 compared with 2008 on seven of 13 measures (and improved on four). Comparison over a longer period shows some disappointing trends, notably in DEEWR publications. It is evident that the University needs to lift its game if it is to achieve its high ambitions: that will be the focus of the 2011 research strategic plan.

Significant recent efforts to improve support for postgraduates and supervisors is beginning to pay off with an improvement in the HDR completions data. Note that the improvement in completions has a negative impact on the load figures. The University aims to achieve a balance between enrolment and completions which will, if achieved, smooth out the variations in load.

Publication outputs remain low compared with other Australian universities. The publications data analyses weighted publications only, which may significantly disadvantage UTAS authors who consistently publish with collaborators at other universities and research organisations, both within Australia and overseas. Over 50% of UTAS publications are co-authored with external researchers (both interstate and international), which reduces the weighting attributed to UTAS. The benefits of collaboration (reputation, quality of publications) counterbalances some of the disadvantages in publication statistics, but UTAS has a poor record in this area and improving this performance is another major focus of the strategic research plan.

Table 1 – UTAS National Ranking on Research Performance Benchmarks 2003-2009

Research Area	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Total research income	10	10	10	9	10	10	11
Australian Competitive Grants	9	9	9	9	9	9	10
Other public sector funding	13	13	10	11	12	15	16
Industry and other funding	22	21	18	10	14	15	12
CRC Income	6	8	8	9	6	4	6
DEEWR publications	21	21	21	22	21	22	21
Student Enrolments Masters (HDR)	18	17	16	14	13	13	15
Student Enrolments PhD (HDR)	18	18	16	16	15	15	17
Student Load Masters (HDR, EFTSL)	16	15	16	13	14	15	16
Student Load PhD (HDR, EFTSL)	20	17	17	15	18	17	17
Student Completions Masters (HDR)	16	16	21	15	16	15	13
Student Completions PhD (HDR)	14	18	15	15	22	20	11
Research Block Funding	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Total Staff Numbers (Academic and General)	19	21	20	20	19	17	17
T/R and RO staff	20	20	20	20	19	18	19

Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) 2010 Results

The ERA is a Federal Government initiative to assess the quality of research conducted in Australia's Higher Education Institutions. Assessments take place at the discipline level. In brief, disciplines were ranked on a 1-5 scale, a 1 being well below world standard and a 5 being well above world standard. We were ranked at both 2 and 4-digit Field of Research (FoR) discipline codes. Disciplines were divided into 8 Clusters. Of particular note is that the ERA assessed research activity over a Reference Period that spanned 2003-2008 for publications, and 2006-2008 for income. The ERA results are not, therefore, a reflection of current activity. UTAS was assessed in 19.5¹ of a possible 22 2-digit Field of Research (FoR) codes, and 54 of a possible 157 4-digit FoR codes.

Table 2: UTAS ERA Assessments

Rank	2-digit FoR		4-digit FoR		Combined	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
1	2	10%	4	7%	6	8%
2	3	15%	12	22%	15	20%
3	10.5	54%	26	48%	36.5	49%
4	4	21%	9	17%	13	17%
5		0%	3	6%	3	4%
Total	19.5		54		73.5	

We are meeting or exceeding world standard in 71% of the 4-digit code disciplines in which we were assessed. Our profile of results indicates that while we have a solid set of achievements, we will need to look closely at the potential to achieve a greater concentration of results at and above world standard in future iterations of the ERA.

The ARC has provided our results alongside the national average for that discipline in this ERA. It is worth noting in this context that our results are shown as whole numbers only², while national results are shown to 1 decimal place. This makes it impossible to know with any certainty whether we rank above or below the national average in those disciplines where we share the same whole number. What we can extract from the current data are those areas where we are at least a full rank distant from the national averages for the discipline, either above or below (Table 3). Note that in some cases, the national averages are very high (e.g. Geochemistry) and some are very low (e.g. Sociology).

Table 3: UTAS Disciplines with Significant Variation from National Averages

* Disciplines marked with an asterisk are 2-digit FoR codes. The rest are 4-digit.

Above the National Average	UTAS Rating	Australian Average	Below the National Average	UTAS Rating	Australian Average
Chemical Sciences*	4	3.5	Pure Mathematics	2	3.2
Analytical Chemistry	5	3.5	Geochemistry	3	4.1
Inorganic Chemistry	4	2.8	Ecological Applications	2	4
Oceanography	5	3.6	Ecology	2	3.3
Agricultural and Veterinary Science*	4	3.3	Evolutionary Biology	3	4.5
Animal Production	4	3.7	Microbiology	2	3.2
Horticultural Production	5	4.7	Zoology	2	3.5
Medical and Health Sciences*	3	2.9	Psychology and Cognitive Sciences*	1	2.5
Clinical Sciences	4	3.2	Architecture	2	3
Curriculum and Pedagogy	3	2.3	Cardiovascular Medicine and		
Studies in Human Society*	3	2.1	Haematology	3	4.5
Criminology	3	2.5	Public Health and Health Services	1	2.3
Human Geography	3	2.7	Applied Economics	1	2.1
Policy and Administration	3	2	Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services *	1	2.2
Political Science	3	2.3	Tourism	1	2.5
Sociology	4	2.4	Art Theory and Criticism	2	3.3
Journalism and Professional Writing	3	2.8	Performing Arts and Creative Writing	2	3.1
Visual Arts and Crafts	4	2.6			
Language, Communication and Culture*	3	2.8			
Cultural Studies	3	2.9			
Law and Legal Studies*	3	2.7			
Law	3	2.7			

¹ Three 2-digit codes were placed in 2 Clusters, hence the half.

² Rankings are rounded down, not up. If our rank was above 3 but below 4, we receive a 3.

Institutional Goal 2:

To be ranked in the top 10 Australian Universities in terms of teaching and learning performance

Performance Indicators –

Improve performance in the Commonwealth competitive funding system and in Australian Learning & Teaching Council citations and awards.

Performance Against Goal –

In the 2010 AL&TC Citations and Awards, UTAS was successful with 5 Citations (from 7 nominations) and 1 Award for Teaching Excellence (from 1 nomination).

2.1 Compacts and Performance Funding

In the 2009/2010 Federal Budget, the Australian Government announced a 10 year reform agenda for the higher education sector in response to the Bradley Review. The Government indicated that the reform agenda would require a new relationship with universities, which would be achieved through the introduction of mission-based Compacts, showing how each university's mission contributes to the Government's goals for higher education and research. UTAS signed an Interim Agreement with DEEWR and DIISR for 2010. In late 2010, DEEWR provided a draft Compact template to UTAS, covering the period 2011-2013; development of this document is currently in process and is expected to be finalised during the second quarter of 2011. Whilst Facilitation Funding under the compact will commence in 2011, Reward Funding will not commence until 2012.

2.2 Australian Learning & Teaching Council Citations & Awards

The Australian Learning & Teaching Council, via its Australian Awards for Teaching Excellence Scheme, aims to raise the profile and encourage recognition of the fundamental importance of teaching in higher education institutions and in the general community, and to foster and acknowledge excellent teaching in higher education. The Awards Scheme includes the following categories:

- *Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning:* recognise and reward the diverse contributions that individuals and teams (both academic and general staff) make to the quality of student learning.
- *Awards for Programs that Enhance Learning:* recognise learning and teaching support programs and services that make an outstanding contribution to the quality of student learning and the quality of the student experience of higher education.
- *Awards for Teaching Excellence:* celebrate the nation's most outstanding university teachers in their fields.

UTAS results in the Australian Awards for Teaching Excellence Scheme for 2010 are provided in Table 4.

Late in 2007 UTAS submitted a successful proposal for Australian Learning & Teaching Council Promoting Excellence Initiative funds to establish an Awards & Grants Office to provide intensive advice and mentoring support for potential awards, grants and fellowship applicants with a focus on early career and high potential academics. Since its inception in 2008, the Office has experienced a degree of staff turnover, with the first Academic Coordinator resigning in early 2009 and the second in mid-2010. However, the close cooperation and assistance of CALT staff together with ongoing administrative oversight and support from the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education) have ensured that the Awards and Grants Office has been able to continue provision of advice and assistance to UTAS award applicants.

Funding under the Promoting Excellence Initiative ceased at the end of 2010 and a final report to the Australian Learning & Teaching Council is currently in preparation. In 2011, the initiative will be funded internally by the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education) while options for future funding are investigated.

Table 4 - Australian Learning & Teaching Council Citations and Awards for 2010
(Nominations /Awards Received)

Citations		Programs		Teaching Excellence	
Nominations	Received	Nominations	Received	Nominations	Received
7	5	2	0	1	1

Institutional Goal 3:

To be ranked within the top 250 of the Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities

Performance Indicators –

Improve overall ranking and against all Jiao Tong core criteria.

Performance Against Goal – actual rank shown in brackets

In 2010, UTAS did not maintain its rank in any of the three categories – UTAS slipped from the 303-401 bracket [396] to the 401-500 [406] bracket in terms of world ranking, from the 43-67 bracket [66] to the 69-106 bracket [72] for the Asia-Pacific region, and from the 10-13 bracket [13] to the 14-17 bracket [14] nationally.

3. Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking

The 2010 Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU), issued by Jiao Tong University, was released on 15 August 2010. The rankings are based on six criteria –

1. Alumni of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals – weight 10%.
2. Staff of an institution winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals – weight 20%.
3. Highly cited researchers in 21 broad subject categories – weight 20%.
4. Articles published in Nature and Science – weight 20%.
5. Articles indexed in Science Citation Index-expanded (SCI), and Social Science Citation Index (SSCI) – weight 20%.
6. Per capita academic performance of an institution – weight 10%.

Table 5 provides a summary of our overall performance in the ARWU over the period 2004 to 2010. UTAS did not maintain any of its previous rankings in 2010:

- World ranking – UTAS has slipped from the 303-401 bracket [396] to the 401-500 bracket [406];
- Regional (Asia Pacific) ranking – UTAS has slipped from the 43-67 bracket [66] to the 69-106 bracket [72]; and
- Australian ranking – UTAS has slipped from the 10-13 bracket [13] to the 14-17 bracket [14].

Table 5 - UTAS Performance in ARWU 2004-2010

Year	World Ranking	Regional Ranking	National Ranking
2010	401-500	69-106	14-17
2009	303-401	43-67	10-13
2008	303-401	42-68	10-14
2007	403-510	65-100	12-17
2006	401-500	64-92	12-16
2005	401-500	66-93	11-14
2004	302-403	38-66	11-14

Table 6 provides a summary of the performance of Australian universities in the ARWU, for each of the six performance indicators, over the period 2008 to 2010.

Detailed analysis has been undertaken to better understand the Jiao Tong system and calculations; and to establish exact rankings and identify areas of improvement that will increase the UTAS ranking.

There were two significant changes in 2010. One was an increase in the cumulative score for *Nature* and *Science* publications – with an increase in score from 7.7 to 10.3. However, this very positive improvement was counterbalanced by a decline in our per capita performance in 2010, based on staffing profile changes in 2008. The underlying data for 2010 rankings, because of the timing, is based on 2008 staffing and performance data. In 2008 we added around 60 AMC staff and some additional State Government staff who were transferred to TIAR.

It should also be noted that the UTAS total score improved from 10.5 in 2009 to 10.67 in 2010. However, other universities improved at a relatively higher rate.

An interesting point is how little actually separates many universities - at least below the top 100 - and therefore how much a small adjustment might improve UTAS ranking. For instance, the total score ranges for each band in 2010 are as follows:

Rank 1 – 99	Score 100 – 24
Rank 101 – 200	Score 23.95 – 16.64
Rank 201 – 300	Score 16.62 – 13.32
Rank 301 – 400	Score 13.26 – 10.80
Rank 401 – 500	Score 10.79 – 9.02

The analysis of the performance indicators has shown that there are two areas where small improvements could result in a significant improvement in our ranking – Articles published in *Nature* and *Science*, and Highly Cited Researchers.

With the Nature and Science indicator, as the scoring is based on a rolling 5-year aggregate score, we can estimate the 2010 score for UTAS, and this shows an improvement in our overall score to 10.9 and a move to rank 391 [based on 2010 rankings]. There should be some opportunities to improve the UTAS score in future by establishing formal relationships with other researchers in Tasmania who are publishing in *Nature* and *Science*. Our analysis identified researchers at the Royal Hobart Hospital, CSIRO and the ACE CRC who had published over the past several years with either no link to UTAS, or UTAS mentioned as a second or third affiliation. One of the ways to improve our score in this indicator is to ensure that UTAS is the first affiliated institution for authors.

With regard to Highly Cited Researchers, an issue is that we only have one Highly Cited researcher. Our analysis has shown that there are some 24 Australian Highly Cited researchers without a university alliance, and there are 6 at Australian universities not currently in the top 500. In addition, there are even larger numbers of international industry-based non-university Highly Cited researchers. If we were able to encourage Highly Cited researchers to affiliate with UTAS, this could make a significant impact on our ranking. For example, if we were to increase our Highly Cited researchers to 2, our score for HiCi would increase to 10.2 and our overall score would be 11.29 – resulting in a rank of 375 and we would move above Flinders to rank 13 nationally.

Table 6 - UTAS Performance in ARWU Performance Indicators 2008-2010

	World Rank	Actual World Rank	Institution*	Regional Rank	National Rank	National Rank Actual	Score on Alumni	Score on Award	Score on HiCi	Score on N&S	Score on PUB	Score on PCP	Total Score
2010	59	60	The Australian National University	3	1	1	15.1	12.6	36	27.8	43.8	31.1	29.57
	62	62	University of Melbourne	4	2	2	19.9	14.1	22.8	18.7	63.1	27	29.33
	92	92	University of Sydney	9	3	3	16.9	0	20.4	18.4	61.4	25.1	25.01
	101-150	108	The University of Queensland	10-18	4-5	4	14.1	0	12.5	24	57.3	25.9	23.48
	101-150	112	The University of Western Australia	10-18	4-5	5	15.1	14.1	21.6	13.1	42.6	26.4	23.14
	151-200	159	University of New South Wales	19-26	6-7	6	0	0	19	11.3	52.2	20.9	19.18
	151-200	171	Monash University	19-26	6-7	7	0	0	10.2	16.2	52.4	20.7	18.40
	201-300	214	The University of Adelaide	27-43	8-9	8	16.9	0	10.2	11.1	37.4	22.7	16.20
	201-300	262	Macquarie University	27-43	8-9	9	0	0	16.1	13.2	29.3	22.1	14.37
	301-400	332	James Cook University	44-68	10-13	10	0	0	10.2	14.1	24.1	21.8	12.24
	301-400	346	University of Wollongong	44-68	10-13	11	0	0	12.5	7.3	28.1	19.9	11.94
	301-400	352	University of Newcastle	44-68	10-13	12	0	0	10.2	7.6	29.5	20.8	11.91
	301-400	379	Flinders University	44-68	10-13	13	16.9	0	7.2	4	24.8	19.6	11.19
	401-500	406	University of Tasmania	69-106	14-17	14	0	0	7.2	10.3	24.9	18.6	10.67
	401-500	422	Curtin University of Technology	69-106	14-17	15	0	0	0	12.2	29.5	17.4	10.40
401-500	458	La Trobe University	69-106	14-17	16	0	0	7.2	6.3	25.8	16.9	9.85	
401-500	459	Swinburne University of Technology	69-106	14-17	17	0	0	10.2	9.5	18.3	18.9	9.79	

UTAS Rank on each criterion in 2010

205 139 326 300 439 243

2009	59	59	The Australian National University	3	1	1	15.5	12.6	36.3	27.2	44.1	32.2	29.55
	75	75	University of Melbourne	6	2	2	13.4	14.1	22.9	17.2	58.5	26.7	27.24
	94	95	University of Sydney	9	3	3	17.3	0	20.5	18.4	57.4	27	24.30
	101-151	113	The University of Western Australia	10-16	4-5	4	15.5	14.1	20.5	11.9	41.1	27.6	22.39
	101-151	114	The University of Queensland	10-16	4-5	5	14.5	0	12.6	22.5	53.5	26.3	22.36
	152-200	166	University of New South Wales	17-22	6	6	0	0	19.2	12.1	47.8	22.2	18.51
	201-302	205	The University of Adelaide	23-42	7-9	7	17.3	0	10.3	11.7	36.6	25.3	16.39
	201-302	207	Monash University	23-42	7-9	8	0	0	7.3	14.9	47	20.5	16.30
	201-302	264	Macquarie University	23-42	7-9	9	0	0	16.2	14.6	26.7	23.7	14.23
	303-401	336	University of Wollongong	43-67	10-13	10	0	0	12.6	8.6	26.5	21.8	12.02
	303-401	363	Flinders University	43-67	10-13	11	17.3	0	7.3	5.1	23.4	21.3	11.30
	303-401	364	University of Newcastle	43-67	10-13	12	0	0	10.3	7.8	26.8	20.4	11.30
	303-401	396	University of Tasmania	43-67	10-13	13	0	0	7.3	7.7	25.1	22.2	10.50
	402-501	416	James Cook University	68-106	14-17	14	0	0	10.3	13.9	16	18.8	10.18
	402-501	457	La Trobe University	68-106	14-17	15	0	0	7.3	7.7	23.1	16.1	9.47
402-501	463	Curtin University of Technology	68-106	14-17	16	0	0	0	11.2	25.7	17.1	9.32	
402-501	498	Swinburne University of Technology	68-106	14-17	17	0	0	10.3	6.9	16.6	19	8.88	

2008	59	59	The Australian National University	3	1	1	15.8	12.6	35.7	30.5	43.4	32.2	30.00
	73	73	University of Melbourne	6	2	2	13.7	14.1	23.1	19.6	58.1	26.7	27.70
	97	97	University of Sydney	8	3	3	17.7	0	20.6	16.4	58	26.8	24.10
	101-151	118	The University of Queensland	9-16	4-5	4	14.8	0	12.6	22	54.5	26.3	22.51
	101-151	127	The University of Western Australia	9-16	4-5	5	15.8	14.1	17.9	10.5	41.2	26.7	21.55
	152-200	166	University of New South Wales	17-22	6	6	0	0	19.3	11.7	48.5	22.3	18.61
	201-302	219	The University of Adelaide	23-41	7-9	7	17.7	0	10.3	12.8	35.2	21.4	15.98
	201-302	224	Monash University	23-41	7-9	8	0	0	7.3	14.7	46.4	16.8	15.77
	201-302	283	Macquarie University	23-41	7-9	9	0	0	14.6	16.7	26	17.8	13.59
	303-401	346	University of Wollongong	42-68	10-14	10	0	0	12.6	7.7	26.3	21.3	11.75
	303-401	363	Flinders University	42-68	10-14	11	17.7	0	7.3	6.1	22.5	20.8	11.32
	303-401	374	University of Newcastle	42-68	10-14	12	0	0	10.3	7.4	26.3	19.8	11.07
	303-401	375	James Cook University	42-68	10-14	13	0	0	7.3	14	21.8	21.4	11.05
	303-401	382	University of Tasmania	42-68	10-14	14	0	0	7.3	8.5	25.9	22.8	10.90
	402-503	431	La Trobe University	69-100	15	15	0	0	7.3	9.5	23.1	16.3	9.87

Institutional Goal 4:

To increase the proportion of graduates in the Tasmanian workforce to at least the national average

Performance Indicators –

Improve performance against national graduate qualification average – evaluate post-school educational qualifications of all Tasmanians aged 15-64, as a percentage of total population, compared to national average.

Performance Against Goal –

The proportion of graduates in the Tasmanian workforce in 2010 was 16.6%, down from 17.1% in 2009 and the same level as 2008. In relative terms, Tasmania achieved an increase of 19.4% in its graduate qualification profile from 2004 to 2010, compared to a national increase of 21.7% for the same period.

4.1 Increasing the Graduate Qualification Profile within the Tasmanian Workforce

UTAS has been significantly increasing opportunities for Tasmanians over the past years, and has in fact increased total enrolments from 10,152 EFTSL in 2001 to 16,257 EFTSL in 2010 – a 60% increase.

The proportion of Tasmania's population with a bachelor degree or higher has increased in recent years, rising from 13.9% to 16.6% between 2004 and 2008, increasing to 17.1% in 2009, and dropping back to 16.6% in 2010 – overall a 19.4% improvement in relative terms from 2004 to 2010. Nationally the proportion has increased from 18.9% in 2004 to 23.0% in 2010 – a 21.7% increase. However the gap between the Tasmanian and national result has increased over the same period. There appears to be a pattern in the Tasmanian data since 2004, with the proportion increasing in 2005 and 2006, then dropping in 2007, increasing in 2008 and 2009, and falling again in 2010.

In terms of graduate qualifications within the workforce, from 2002 to 2010, employment levels in Tasmania grew by 40,500 or 20.7% - from 195,600 to 236,100. At the same time, there was a 62% increase in jobs for people with a Bachelor degree or higher. Of the 40,500 jobs created in Tasmania from 2002 to 2010, 44% went to people with a degree qualification.

Clearly there is a time lag of at least three years between increasing enrolments and producing graduates and it is expected that the Tasmanian graduate profile will continue to improve over coming years.

Table 7 - Post-School Educational Qualifications of All Aged 15–64, % of Population, 2004–2010

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Aust
2004									
Bachelor degree or higher	20.1	21.0	16.0	15.8	16.8	13.9	18.6	30.3	18.9
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	33.3	29.3	32.7	32.8	33.2	30.5	33.5	27.4	32.0
2005									
Bachelor degree or higher	21.2	21.0	16.6	15.7	18.4	15.3	18.1	32.6	19.6
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	32.9	29.6	32.9	31.7	33.8	29.5	34.1	26.2	31.9
2006									
Bachelor degree or higher	21.6	22.9	17.7	17.5	18.1	16.0	19.8	33.2	20.6
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	33.1	28.2	33.7	31.4	34.2	31.2	35.6	26.5	31.9
2007									
Bachelor degree or higher	21.5	22.9	18.0	18.5	19.1	14.9	19.3	35.4	20.8
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	32.7	29.4	33.0	30.6	33.9	32.7	30.6	26.2	31.8
2008									
Bachelor degree or higher	23.3	24.1	18.6	19.1	19.8	16.6	20.2	36.5	21.9
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	32.7	30.4	33.3	31.6	32.6	31.8	32.8	25.8	32.0
2009									
Bachelor degree or higher	24.7	26.1	18.5	19.0	20.9	17.1	19.8	39.3	23.0
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	31.4	26.7	34.5	31.8	32.3	32.0	32.1	22.1	30.8
2010									
Bachelor degree or higher	24.6	26.0	18.6	20.3	20.5	16.6	20.6	38.8	23.0
Advanced diploma and diploma or below	31.2	29.0	34.2	30.9	32.7	34.1	33.5	24.8	31.4

Source: ABS data

Table 8 – Employment Levels in Tasmania by Level of Qualification, 2002–2010

Tasmania					
	No. of Persons Employed in 2002 ('000)	No. of Persons Employed in 2010 ('000)	Change No. ('000)	Change %	Share of increase %
Bachelor degree or higher qualification	28.7	46.4	17.7	61.7%	43.7%
Certificate/Diploma/level not determined	69.4	87.0	17.6	25.4%	43.5%
No post-school qualifications	97.5	102.7	5.2	5.3%	12.8%
Total	195.6	236.1	40.5	20.7%	

4.2 Higher Education Participation Rate

This indicator is reported in the year following the year of study, so the latest estimate is based on 2009 enrolments. Overall the participation rate in Tasmania (5.1%) is a significant increase on the 4.7% of 2008; nationally, 2009 participation (5.4%) was only a slight increase on 2008 (5.3%).

Given our very high mobility rates, a significant number of Tasmanians study through other higher education institutions. If participation were measured by state of origin rather than state of study, Tasmania's rate at 5.2% is much closer to the national average of 5.3%. This demonstrates the importance of stemming the flow of Tasmanians to other institutions.

Table 9 – Higher Education Participation Rate

	NSW	Vic	Qld	SA	WA	Tas	NT	ACT	Aust
2009 15-64 population	4,766,361	3,680,799	2,974,516	1,080,213	1,530,476	328,147	160,039	250,350	14,772,528
Number of HE students by state of study	265,052	184,479	150,599	54,391	81,532	16,567	7,167	22,783	799,488
2009 Participation rate	5.6%	5.0%	5.1%	5.0%	5.3%	5.1%	4.5%	9.1%	5.4%
Number of HE students by state of origin	267,414	195,803	153,702	55,576	81,202	17,211	6,422	22,158	799,488
Participation by state of origin, 2009	5.6%	5.3%	5.2%	5.1%	5.3%	5.2%	4.0%	8.9%	5.4%
Student Load by state of study 2009	185,501	139,917	107,499	39,544	58,454	11,688	3,985	15,867	574,084
Participation by student load by state of study	3.9%	3.8%	3.6%	3.7%	3.8%	3.6%	2.5%	6.3%	3.9%
Average EFTSL per student	70.0%	75.8%	71.4%	72.7%	71.7%	70.5%	55.6%	69.6%	71.8%
2008 15-64 population	4,672,324	3,584,361	2,891,648	1,066,808	1,477,991	326,455	156,458	245,947	14,423,716
Number of HE students by state of study	250,507	178,655	142,517	52,412	75,992	15,361	6,549	21,346	758,507
2008 Participation rate	5.4%	5.0%	4.9%	4.9%	5.1%	4.7%	4.2%	8.7%	5.3%
Number of HE students by state of origin	252,069	187,857	145,400	53,586	76,017	16,299	6,232	21,047	758,507
Participation by state of origin, 2008	5.4%	5.2%	5.0%	5.0%	5.1%	5.0%	4.0%	8.6%	5.3%
Student Load by state of study 2008	174,092	134,597	101,045	38,314	54,403	11,142	3,712	14,892	542,503
Participation by student load by state of study	3.7%	3.8%	3.5%	3.6%	3.7%	3.4%	2.4%	6.1%	3.8%
Average EFTSL per student	69.5%	75.3%	70.9%	73.1%	71.6%	72.5%	56.7%	69.8%	71.5%
2007 15-64 population	4,616,064	3,524,411	2,826,612	1,056,219	1,439,308	323,860	152,638	243,654	14,184,469
Number of HE students by state of study	245,598	177,052	142,189	51,687	73,849	14,903	6,236	20,058	745,988
2007 Participation rate	5.3%	5.0%	5.0%	4.9%	5.1%	4.6%	4.1%	8.2%	5.3%
Number of HE students by state of origin	246,027	184,977	145,143	52,742	74,563	15,911	6,344	20,281	745,988
Participation by state of origin, 2007	5.3%	5.2%	5.1%	5.0%	5.2%	4.9%	4.2%	8.3%	5.3%
Student Load by state of study 2007	169,004	131,029	100,165	37,336	52,578	11,102	3,657	14,282	529,016
Participation by student load by state of study	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.5%	3.7%	3.4%	2.4%	5.9%	3.7%
Average EFTSL per student	68.8%	74.0%	70.4%	72.2%	71.2%	74.5%	58.6%	71.2%	70.9%
2006 15-64 population	4,572,911	3,435,452	2,740,653	1,033,020	1,401,575	320,724	145,799	234,098	13,886,056
Number of HE students by state of study	234,578	173,214	138,723	50,393	72,517	14,390	5,790	21,869	725,239
2006 Participation rate	5.1%	5.0%	5.1%	4.9%	5.2%	4.5%	4.0%	9.3%	5.2%
Number of HE students by state of origin	237,556	178,695	141,607	51,266	73,682	15,630	6,270	20,533	725,239
Participation by state of origin, 2006	5.2%	5.2%	5.2%	5.0%	5.3%	4.9%	4.3%	8.8%	5.2%
Student Load by state of study 2006	160,518	127,366	97,326	36,774	51,230	10,914	3,321	15,371	512,156
Participation by student load by state of study	3.5%	3.7%	3.6%	3.6%	3.7%	3.4%	2.3%	6.6%	3.7%
Average EFTSL per student	68.4%	73.5%	70.2%	73.0%	70.6%	75.8%	57.4%	70.3%	70.6%
2005 15-64 population	4,528,729	3,385,523	2,676,767	1,023,668	1,373,299	318,322	142,869	231,410	13,682,387
Number of HE students by state of study	234,020	172,125	134,684	49,072	70,373	13,893	5,662	21,952	715,115
2005 Participation rate	5.2%	5.1%	5.0%	4.8%	5.1%	4.4%	4.0%	9.5%	5.2%
2004 Participation rate	5.0%	5.1%	5.2%	4.8%	5.0%	4.7%	4.1%	9.8%	5.2%
2003 Participation rate	5.2%	5.2%	5.3%	4.7%	5.1%	4.6%	4.3%	9.4%	5.3%
2002 Participation rate	5.2%	5.2%	5.4%	4.7%	5.1%	4.6%	4.3%	8.8%	5.3%
2001 Participation rate	4.5%	4.8%	4.7%	4.3%	4.3%	3.9%	3.2%	7.4%	4.7%
2000 Participation rate	4.5%	4.8%	4.6%	4.3%	4.4%	3.7%	3.2%	7.9%	4.7%

Institutional Goal 5:

To achieve annual enrolment targets and to grow to approximately 16,500 EFTSL, ensuring a robust financial base with which to support UTAS' academic strategic objectives

Performance Indicators –

- Improve performance against annual enrolment load targets.
- Improve performance in comparison with total sector in terms of –
 - Proportion of students by broad level of course
 - Proportion of international students, both onshore and offshore.
- Increase higher education participation rates of Tasmanians to at least the national average.

Performance Against Goal –

With total load of 16,257 EFTSL in 2010, UTAS is well placed to achieve the EDGE2 goal to grow to approximately 16,500 EFTSL by 2011.

5.1 Performance Against Enrolment Load Targets

Overall enrolments were up by 1,061 EFTSL on 2009, an increase of 7%. Operating Grant load increased by 7.7% on 2009, with growth of 838 EFTSL.

The result in domestic research load represented a 6.5% decline on 2009 performance.

Domestic fee-paying load also declined to be 15.7% down on 2009, however this was largely due to the Graduate Diploma in Legal Practice transferring to Operating Grant load.

Onshore international student load grew to 2,362 EFTSL – an increase of 142 EFTSL or 6.4% on 2009 enrolments. Offshore load also grew to 1,472 EFTSL – an increase of 159 EFTSL or 12.1% on 2009 enrolments.

Table 10 – 2010 Load Compared to Target and 2009 Load

	2010 Target	2010 Actual (20/12/2010)	2009 Actual (31/12/2009)	% Increase 2010 - 2009 Actual
RHD (Domestic)	720	607	649	-6.5%
Operating Grant	11,648	11,623	10,785	7.7%
Domestic Fee-Paying	216	193	229	-15.7%
FFPOS – Onshore	2,287	2,362	2,220	6.4%
FFPOS – Offshore	1,326	1,472	1,313	12.1%
Total	16,197	16,257	15,196	7.0%

5.2 Student Load by Source of Funds

The overall growth in total enrolments over the past nine years has been significant as shown in the following table. Total operating grant load has grown by 3,130 EFTSL (34.4%) since 2001, with overall load growing by 6,105 EFTSL (60.1%) over that period.

Table 11 – Student Load by Source of Funds

	Operating grant (incl RHD)	Domestic Fee-paying	FFPOS onshore	FFPOS offshore	Non-award	Total
2001	9,100	105	820	123	5	10,152
2002	9,639	250	929	111	3	10,931
2003	9,768	284	1,110	266	3	11,431
2004	10,019	324	1,285	793	6	12,427
2005	9,788	295	1,506	1,116	4	12,709
2006	10,145	240	1,730	1,184	0	13,300
2007	10,314	166	1,745	1,242	0	13,467
2008*	10,891	207	2,156	1,210	0	14,463
2009*	11,434	229	2,220	1,313	0	15,196
2010*	12,230	193	2,362	1,472	0	16,257
% increase 2001–2010	34.4%	83.8%	188.0%	1096.7%		60.1%

* Includes AMC load - 728 EFTSL in 2008, 777 EFTSL in 2009, 861 EFTSL in 2010.

5.3 Students by Broad Level of Course

In terms of share of the total Australian higher education load, UTAS would expect to achieve approximately 2.4%, based on population share. As shown in Table 12 below, UTAS' proportion of total Australian load is within the expected range for Research Higher Degree and undergraduate study, but continues to be well below for postgraduate coursework load. To address this, UTAS continues to increase the range of postgraduate coursework program offerings, and increase the number of postgraduate programs available online/flexibly.

Table 12 – Load by Broad Level of Course: UTAS Share to Total Australian Load

		Doctorate / Masters by Research	Doctorate / Masters by Cwk / Other PG	Bachelor	Associate Degree	Other UG	Total UG	Enabling / Non Award	Total
2009	UTAS	792	1,696	11,355	561	315	12,238	446	15,173
	Total All Institutions	36,665	133,811	598,245	5,207	20,990	625,832	16,500	813,049
	UTAS %	2.2%	1.3%	1.9%	10.8%	1.5%	2.0%	2.7%	1.9%
2008	UTAS	811	1,425	11,074	470	290	11,834	393	14,462
	Total All Institutions	34,938	123,687	559,440	5,194	19,768	584,402	14,823	757,850
	UTAS %	2.3%	1.2%	2.0%	9.0%	1.5%	2.0%	2.6%	1.9%
2007	UTAS	823	1,048	10,868	302	46	11,216	369	13,457
	Total All Institutions	34,384	114,940	542,602	3,991	16,469	563,062	13,506	725,892
	UTAS %	2.4%	0.9%	2.0%	7.6%	0.3%	2.0%	2.7%	1.9%
2006	UTAS	835	813	11,049	167	67	11,283	336	13,267
	Total All Institutions	33,943	109,539	525,717	3,479	6,760	535,956	12,490	691,928
	UTAS %	2.5%	0.7%	2.1%	4.8%	1.0%	2.1%	2.7%	1.9%

Source: DEEWR data

5.4 International Students

Compared to 2009, 2010 saw an increase of 15.6% in commencing onshore international students, and an increase of 6.7% in total onshore international student load. In 2010, AMC, Business, Law, Education, Health Science and SET increased commencing enrolments. Apart from SET, all Faculties achieved a total onshore international load that was either equal to or greater than that achieved in 2009.

Revenue from International activities generated \$40.9 million for 2010 (budget \$40.4 million).

Table 13 - Onshore International Student Load 2006–2009 (EFTSL)

	31/12/2007		31/12/2008		31/12/2009		20/12/2010		Increase 2010–2009	
	Total	Comm	Total	Comm	Total	Comm	Total	Comm	Total	Comm
AMC			236	82	221	89	263	137	19.0%	53.9%
Arts	150	62	179	98	180	89	180	88	-	-1.1%
Business	588	280	669	306	720	330	787	373	9.3%	13.0%
Law	65	21	85	29	103	39	124	43	20.4%	10.3%
Education	44	16	47	29	44	16	45	26	2.3%	62.5%
Health Science	225	66	257	78	277	85	298	93	7.6%	9.4%
Science, Eng & Tech	669	278	675	349	663	279	625	293	-5.7%	5.0%
IMAS							27	16		
Menzies	5	1	8	4	7	1	12	6		
Total	1,745	722	2,156	976	2,214	928	2,362	1,073	6.7%	15.6%

(Note: Data is rounded)

The percentage of onshore international students at UTAS has been maintained at 16% for 2009 and 2010. National data for 2010 is not yet available.

Table 14 – International Share of Onshore Student Load (EFTSL)

	Actual student load for all non-overseas students	Actual student load for all students	Onshore international load	Offshore international load	Onshore total load	International share of onshore load
UTAS						
2010*	12,423	16,257	2,362	1,472	14,785	16.0%
2009*	11,666	15,190	2,214	1,310	13,880	16.0%
2008*	11,098	14,463	2,156	1,210	13,254	16.3%
2007	10,480	13,467	1,745	1,242	12,225	14.3%
2006	10,385	13,300	1,730	1,184	12,116	14.3%
2005	10,086	12,709	1,506	1,116	11,592	13.0%
2004	10,349	12,427	1,285	793	11,634	11.0%
Aust						
2009*	574,084	813,049	180,019	58,946	754,103	23.9%
2008*	542,503	757,850	160,574	54,774	703,077	22.8%
2007	529,016	725,892	145,725	51,151	674,741	21.6%
2006	512,156	691,928	132,051	47,721	644,207	20.5%
2005	501,853	674,092	127,555	44,684	629,408	20.3%
2004	498,985	661,206	118,604	43,616	617,589	19.2%

* Includes AMC.

Institutional Goal 6:

To maintain financial viability and achieve annual and longer-term budgetary targets

Performance Indicators –

Achieve annual operating margin targets as specified by annual budget process.

Performance Against Goal –

The operating result for 2010 was 11.5% of revenue compared to budget of 13.8% and target of 6.0%.

6. Operating Margins

The 2010 Budget was presented to University Council in October 2009. The overall Operating Result was projected to be \$66.9 million, including a significant component of capital revenue (\$54.4 million).

Continued growth in DEEWR funded load was planned for 2010 (target 11,589 EFTSL). Total projected revenue from the Commonwealth funded load and associated activity was \$184 million, with estimated total revenue of \$486 million.

Table 15 provides details on the forecast operating margin percentage budgeted for 2010 compared to the actual margin achieved.

Table 15 – 2010 Operating Margins

Operating Result	Target	2010 Budget	2010 Actual
Operating Result (excluding net contract/capital grants)	2% of Net Assets	2.0%	2.0%
Operating Result (including capital grants)	4% of Net Assets	10.8%	10.6%
Operating Result	6% of Revenue	13.8%	11.5%

2010 Summary Results –

Total Revenue	\$474.457 million
Result from General Operations	\$2.841 million
Movement in Restricted Funds	(\$5.711 million)
Investment Income (interest and dividends)	<u>\$12.715 million</u>
Result prior to capital and other items	\$9.845 million
Capital income	\$55.832 million
HECS and CGS timing adjustments	(\$6.372 million)
Realised gains/(losses) on investments	(\$10.151 million)
Unrealised gains/(losses) on investments	\$10.225 million
Take up academic annual leave	<u>(\$4.923 million)</u>
Result	<u>\$54.456 million</u>

The budgeted result for 2010 was \$66.9 million against an actual result of \$54.4 million. The main variations related to the one-off recognition of the academic leave accruals (\$4.9 million), and greater than expected DEEWR net recovery from the previous year (\$6.4 million). At the end of 2009, funds received from DEEWR in advance for EFTSL load targets not achieved was \$9.7 million. In 2010, despite getting close to load target, this amount is estimated to be around \$3.4 million in CGS and HECS, due to skewing to lower cost disciplines. The investment result was also down with a return of 4.7% versus target 6%.

Faculty/Institute Performance Indicators

Onshore Student Load

Australian Maritime College

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	29	584	30	195	838
Actual at 20/12/2010	29	549	21	263	861
Actual at 31/12/2009	28	508	20	221	777

AMC exceeded its overall 2010 target by 23 EFTSL (2.7%), and achieved an increase of 10.8% over 2009. The National Centre for Ports & Shipping performed extremely well again in 2010, exceeding its target by 8.8%. The other two National Centres fell just short of their overall targets – NCMC&RS actual load 144 EFTSL compared to target of 153 EFTSL; NCME&H actual load 227 EFTSL compared to target of 233 EFTSL.

Faculty of Arts

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	200	2,902	20	186	3,308
Actual at 20/12/2010	172	2,948	17	181	3,317
Actual at 31/12/2009	182	2,677	17	179	3,055

Faculty of Arts exceeded its overall 2010 target by 9 EFTSL, and achieved an increase of 8.6% over 2009. The Conservatorium of Music was 26.2% above target, the School of Government was 8.6% above target and the School of Sociology & Social Work was 7.3% above target. In terms of those Schools who failed to meet target, Riawunna was 22% below target, Visual & Performing Arts -19%, Asian Languages & Studies -9%, Philosophy -7%, Art -4%, English Journalism & European Languages -2% and History & Classics -1%.

Faculty of Business

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	28	974	140	777	1,919
Actual at 20/12/2010	28	860	126	787	1,802
Actual at 31/12/2009	24	875	109	721	1,729

Faculty of Business fell below its overall target by 117 EFTSL (-6.1%), but the result was a 4.2% increase on 2009. Whilst the Faculty was just ahead of target for Onshore FFPOS load, it was below target for Operating Grant and Domestic Fee Paying load.

Faculty of Education

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	65	1,570		56	1,691
Actual at 20/12/2010	41	1,685	1	45	1,772
Actual at 31/12/2009	45	1,462	2	44	1,553

Faculty of Education exceeded its overall 2010 target by 81 (4.7%), and achieved an increase of 14% over 2009. The Faculty has continued to build on its close relationship with the Department of Education and is developing programs to support initiatives under the State Government Partnership Agreement.

Faculty of Health Science

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	49	2,648	23	276	2,996
Actual at 20/12/2010	39	2,621	26	298	2,984
Actual at 31/12/2009	47	2,428	19	280	2,774

Faculty of Health Science fell just below its 2010 target by 12 EFTSL (-0.4%), but the result was a 7.6% increase over 2009. The School of Health Science was 5.8% above target, and Rural Health was 8.3% above target. Medicine and Pharmacy fell just short of target (Medicine -2 EFTSL, Pharmacy -6 EFTSL); the School of Nursing & Midwifery was 2.4% below target, but achieved 6.7% growth over 2009.

Faculty of Law

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	12	530		108	650
Actual at 20/12/2010	12	481		124	616
Actual at 31/12/2009	11	430	59	102	603

Faculty of Law fell 5.2% (34 EFTSL) short of its overall target. Operating Grant load was significantly below target, whilst onshore FFPOS load exceeded target. The 2010 result was a 2.2% increase over 2009.

Faculty of Science, Engineering & Technology

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	263	2,011	2	654	2,930
Actual at 20/12/2010	208	1,988	2	625	2,823
Actual at 31/12/2009	281	1,972	3	663	2,918

Faculty of SET fell short of target by 107 EFTSL (-3.7%). Four Schools within the Faculty met or exceeded target – Architecture & Design was 9% above target, with Psychology, Earth Sciences and Engineering meeting target. In terms of those Schools which failed to meet target, Zoology was 17% below target, Agricultural Science -16%, Geography & Environmental Studies -13%, Plant Science -7%, Maths & Physics -6%, Computing -5%, Chemistry -3% (note – some Schools were impacted by the move of load to IMAS: the 2010 Faculty target was not adjusted to reflect the transfer of load from Schools within SET to IMAS). The actual overall result for 2010 was also 3% below the 2009 result of 2,918 EFTSL.

Institute for Marine & Antarctic Studies

	RHD	Operating Grant	Domestic Fee Paying	Onshore FFPOS	Total
2010 Target	42	37		28	107
Actual at 20/12/2010	39	59		27	126

IMAS exceeded its overall 2010 target by 19 EFTSL (17.8%).

Research Outputs

Australian Maritime College

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	67.66	28.68	7.50	1.00	2,953,487	56.26
2008	76.96	27.01	9.00	0.00	1,739,086	52.11
2007	69.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	753,965	31.79
2006	32.00	13.60	0.00	0.00	781,401	16.02
2005	21.00	16.75	1.00	0.00	1,092,613	15.28
2004	22.00	22.00	0.00	0.00	382,184	18.51
2003	11.00	19.50	0.00	0.00	509,645	19.66
2002	8.00	15.65	0.00	1.00	624,997	4.49
2001	12.00	16.65	0.00	0.00		

Note: 2008 results include the former School of Aquaculture

Faculty of Arts

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	138.62	186.88	29.50	13.00	2,014,755	137.41
2008	134.85	181.02	22.25	18.00	2,571,060	142.60
2007	139.52	166.76	18.30	14.75	1,961,837	131.68
2006	137.21	213.48	23.75	16.50	1,314,479	134.37
2005	143.80	204.25	23.00	8.00	1,955,036	117.69
2004	139.03	185.02	17.00	20.00	1,867,387	115.70
2003	131.20	172.95	20.00	13.00	1,330,134	109.07
2002	129.69	153.58	18.00	12.00	593,256	105.34
2001	129.63	141.56	15.00	10.00	1,008,734	107.78

Faculty of Business

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load (ex Intl)	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	61.93	24.08	6.00	1.00	1,334,941	42.80
2008	58.62	23.13	5.25	0.00	879,971	64.16
2007	69.50	31.04	2.25	1.00	620,723	65.58
2006	63.80	41.16	1.20	1.00	159,534	79.08
2005	63.95	34.64	2.25	0.00	304,083	59.45
2004	54.20	31.14	3.00	0.00	250,772	53.75
2003	53.30	27.68	5.00	0.00	273,073	54.91
2002	52.70	27.29	2.00	2.00	149,442	51.01
2001	50.30	27.84	7.00	0.00	660,199	38.50

Note: Includes School of Information Systems for 2001-2007

Faculty of Education

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	50.10	46.10	15.20	1.00	296,218	54.35
2008	51.80	49.12	7.00	0.00	257,770	49.58
2007	52.45	59.23	5.70	0.00	712,110	78.48
2006	57.95	60.83	6.90	0.00	588,283	53.37
2005	51.18	50.56	15.75	0.00	443,581	46.59
2004	45.10	50.20	6.25	1.00	240,970	48.88
2003	43.60	50.74	6.00	2.00	539,546	45.48
2002	44.30	50.57	2.00	1.00	762,778	41.16
2001	41.90	43.54	5.00	1.00	1,104,769	55.93

Faculty of Health Science

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	118.20	47.80	6.80	1.00	4,218,434	75.03
2008	112.15	48.98	7.33	2.00	3,634,365	51.47
2007	104.29	45.81	3.95	3.00	2,698,508	73.50
2006	125.09	80.45	10.23	4.00	4,132,958	74.07
2005	117.40	64.74	9.75	4.00	5,698,224	71.59
2004	121.11	65.05	8.75	1.00	6,943,559	66.81
2003	118.02	54.84	5.00	4.00	4,619,210	68.11
2002	131.27	48.25	11.00	1.00	5,421,657	68.46
2001	101.15	46.91	7.00	1.00	6,026,570	59.31

Note: Includes Menzies Research Institute for 2001-2004

Menzies Research Institute

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	52.04	29.19	8.00	1.00	10,843,117	50.23
2008	42.53	29.82	5.67	0.00	11,862,299	43.09
2007	34.70	31.95	5.00	0.00	7,977,908	44.36
2006	19.10	10.07	3.00	1.00	12,061,288	16.98
2005	11.45	8.44	1.00	0.00	4,609,586	22.56

Faculty of Law

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	17.70	11.31	0.75	3.00	524,020	15.10
2008	18.66	9.12	1.75	1.00	661,003	17.03
2007	17.56	8.11	3.00	0.00	339,542	23.20
2006	17.40	11.68	4.00	0.00	364,895	17.88
2005	18.10	13.32	5.00	0.00	205,704	19.67
2004	17.00	13.23	2.75	0.00	420,075	14.67
2003	17.00	9.75	0.00	0.00	368,623	12.12
2002	15.50	11.88	1.00	1.00	232,008	23.67
2001	15.50	11.62	1.00	0.00	94,592	16.50

Faculty of Science, Engineering & Technology

Year	Staff (T/R, RO)	HDR Load	PhD Completions	Research Masters Completions	Research Income \$	Publications (Weighted)
2009	303.69	299.05	87.75	9.00	37,752,540	355.59
2008	329.88	317.42	49.30	10.60	41,091,867	386.01
2007	310.40	359.18	61.70	10.25	41,927,721	381.41
2006	301.60	447.76	76.92	10.50	35,312,391	365.33
2005	285.06	408.62	63.25	10.00	27,760,715	365.75
2004	285.25	373.89	61.25	8.00	23,192,047	421.81
2003	286.03	364.49	80.00	17.00	20,393,975	363.65
2002	284.77	366.97	69.00	13.00	20,002,563	312.49
2001	262.64	345.76	60.00	15.00	19,242,916	344.61

Note: Includes School of Information Systems from 2008; includes School of Aquaculture for 2001-2007

Notes

T/R Teaching & Research Employment Contract

RO Research Only Employment Contract

HDR Higher Degree by Research

Load data is at Census One (31 March) of each year