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Executive Summary

The University College Program Pilot

The University College Pilot Program (UCP) began in 2008, as part of the University of Tasmania’s EDGE2 2008 – 2010 strategic plan, to “Develop the UTAS college model, in partnership with the State Government, to provide an integrated year 11 to PhD educational framework for Tasmania.”

It is a joint venture between UTAS, the Tasmanian Academy and senior secondary schools/colleges which allows capable and motivated students to undertake university study either in conjunction with (extension) or alongside (full UTAS units) their studies towards the Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) or the International Baccalaureate (IB).

Students undertake a TCE subject extension where the TCE subject curriculum closely aligns to a UTAS first year or Foundation unit. TCE extension is available in selected language, visual and performing arts, arts and business studies.

Students complete UTAS units undertaken either through the High Achievers Program or with a college or campus based facilitated class. These units are best suited to high achieving students whom the Academy or college assesses as capable of completing work at first year university level.

The UCP Evaluation Methodology

The UCP evaluation involved:

- A scan of the literature and approaches taken by other universities to increase participation and social inclusion
- Quantitative analysis which examines student participation and outcomes and the destination and performance of UCP students who have articulated to UTAS
- A range of questionnaires including a survey of the UCP Languages students in 2009; and an online survey of Principals, UTAS Heads of School, Senior Secondary Staff and UTAS staff.
- Qualitative analysis of three focus groups of students who have articulated from the UCP to UTAS as full time students (Ethics approval number H11280)
- An analysis and discussion of a range of meetings interviews symposia and reports during the two and a half years of the three year pilot program

The context for the program

The current Australian Government Higher Education reform agenda places an emphasis on participation and social inclusion based on the knowledge that education is a key determinate of individual and community wellbeing. The low socio-
economic status and low level of educational attainment of many Tasmanians means that, like other rural and regional areas of Australia, Tasmania needs to increase the number of people staying in school and progressing onto higher education in order to maximize individual opportunity and ensure regional sustainability. Universities nationwide have implemented a variety of programs which aim to do this. It has been shown that these programs are most successful when developed and delivered in partnership.

**Initial Surveys Reports and Feedback**

Throughout the pilot program a range of developmental processes have been conducted including the establishment of a Quality Assurance Plan, the conducting of two Symposia with involved staff from the secondary sector and UTAS, a range of meetings with key discipline and administrative groups, interviews with Deans and Heads of School and an online survey of UCP language students. The outcomes of these processes as documented have been summarised to track the developmental process of the UCP.

The issues of quality assurance procedures in relation to unit approval; student engagement; communication; examining the role of college teachers; and student services are all canvassed and the two annual reports identify student and college participation and student outcomes.

Information provided by the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority (TQA) demonstrates that students who undertake full UTAS units whilst in senior secondary school perform better than Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) students in general students although they are more likely to be from mid to high socio-economic status (based on geo coding) and more likely to be female.

**Survey responses**

UCP Languages student survey of forty one students (35% French, 57.5% Japanese) indicated that most students were satisfied and that the program benefited their language learning. The main issue of concern is that students did not identify strongly with UTAS.

**Quantitative Analysis**

Information in this section is divided into three sections: student participation and outcomes with data derived from annual extraction and reporting over three years

**Student participation and outcomes**

Student unit participation and outcome data and senior secondary school of origin has been compiled from UCP annual reports with data derived from annual enrolments and academic results.

The annual data capture demonstrates that numbers of units offered and student participation has increased over the three years of the UCP Pilot. Withdrawal numbers have fallen and student performance overall has improved with the
percentage of students performing at credit level or above rising from 50% in 2008 to 58% in 2009.

These data however must be treated with caution given the limited scope of the units offered and the short time the program has been offered.

The 2008 – 2010 summary demonstrates the growth in the program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCP Summary 2008 - 2010</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students:</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unit Enrolments:</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Participating Schools/Colleges:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units Offered:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Enrolments till end of semester one only.
** From 2010 language units have been converted into one 25% unit instead of 2X12.5% units as in previous years.

UCP students- summary histories

Admissions and enrolment data shows that UCP students were overwhelmingly female (67.8%) and domestic Australian (98.7%) students. Students typically did two units and undertook these units within one year (89.1%). As the program continues it is expected the number studying for two years will increase. Students typically also studied within one discipline areas (94.5%).

Two hundred and forty-two UCP students have articulated to UTAS. A detailed analysis of destination and outcomes for 227 was undertaken.

Overall, up to now, only 32.9% of students have or are currently taking units with the same unit prefix as their UTAS College discipline(s). However, 57.9% took or are taking at least one unit in the same school.

A total of 88 students have completed at least one UTAS unit subsequent to their UCP participation (on average 1.9 UCP units). The grade point average (GPA) of students' UCP units were compared with their GPA for their subsequent UTAS units. The mean grade point average for this group was 5.44 for their UCP studies an 4.78 for their UTAS studies. While the UCP and UTAS grade point averages are positively and moderately correlated (Pearson product-moment correlation, r=0.328, p=0.00018), the $r^2$ is 10.8 which means that the two have only about 11% of shared variance, which is low. However, because withdrawals (genuine fails and those who did not complete) are removed from the administrative data statistical comparisons need to be treated with caution.

The analysis of admissions and enrolments data suggests that UCP students do successfully articulate to UTAS and are likely to study in the same School as for their UCP units. However caution must be taken in drawing any conclusions at this stage.
because of the short time frame which necessarily limits the time in Degree programs for UCP articulants and thus the analysis of their performance at UTAS. As also noted the number of students who have articulated at this stage is also limited. A complete picture may not be possible for some years when longitudinal data will be available. Ongoing monitoring is recommended.

Online survey (Principals, Heads of School, Senior Secondary Staff, UTAS staff)

Seventy-eight people attempted the survey (36 senior secondary staff, 18 principals, 18 UTAS staff, 6 Heads of School). All respondents bar one indicated that they thought the program should continue. The detailed analysis of responses provided in the report provides a guide to key issues of concern and future development opportunities

A range of benefits and limitations were identified by the respondents (asked for three each). Responses from school/college staff centred principally on the benefits previously canvassed, focusing on the opportunity to challenge capable students and introduce them to university-level life and study. There were a range of comments which had not previously been identified as benefits of the program, these were that the UCP:

- Provided students opportunities to interact with native speakers in language courses
- Provided an opportunity to get credit for a first year language unit where previously they would have just gone into a 2nd year unit without the first year credit
- Enabled students to study subjects not available or discontinued in the TCE
- Introduced students to online learning through MyLO
- Provided professional development opportunity for school/college teachers
- Increased the standard of performing arts in Tasmania

Response by UTAS staff focuses strongly on the benefits of interaction between school/colleges and UTAS and the role of UCP in breaking down barriers and creating shared understandings of the higher education environment by the school/college sector.

Issues identified in this section by school/colleges staff centred around the difficulty of fitting this program in with the already high demands on both teacher and students in the year 11/12 environment. Issues of adequate resourcing both physical and human were raised. Other comments include that the connections between UTAS and school/college staff could be better; the opportunity to participate in the decision making process could be increased; and a greater variety of units could be offered, particularly those outside the arts area.

School/college principals identified issues relating to access for non-metropolitan based students, a lack of differentiation between the standard of Year 12 courses and first year UTAS units offered in UCP, low points recognition in TCE, enrolment and timetabling issues, particularly that they did not always suit the school/college environment. One principal felt that the UCP was a thinly veiled marketing attempt by UTAS. Other principals, however, expressed the view that the program was useful
in extending students’ knowledge and skill and in familiarising them with university level learning.

UTAS staff members were also concerned about ensuring the program was adequately supported and resourced and that UTAS was sending out a mixed message with the program if it failed to do so. There was also concern about proper support for staff from their relevant departments and the difficulties working with schools/colleges who systems did not necessarily mesh with those of UTAS. There was concern expressed about the organisation and coordination of the program. One respondent felt that Year 11/12 students were not emotionally or cognitively mature enough for the content and self-directed learning required by UTAS study.

UTAS Heads of School comments also included concerns about organisational issues, the net benefit to UTAS in terms of student impressions and enrolments if the program is not delivered properly, inequities with other first year students (HECS feels, withdrawing without penalty), flow-on enrolments and general confusion about a range of issues associate with the program. Seventeen recommendations were made by respondents.

Student Feedback

Generally most focus group participants felt that the early exposure to the University of Tasmania, through the various program activities and interchanges, facilitated an easier and less stressful transition to university and gave them a starting advantage over other students. The impact of the program seems to have: expanded their learning opportunities; ‘demystified’ University; and facilitated the first steps in building a relationship with the institution and the people – both lecturers and fellow students – they would encounter when they began their first year of tertiary studies.

Students studying Languages appreciated the opportunity to speak with more advanced and/or native language speakers. The students who undertook units of study with the School of Visual and Performing Arts were particularly enthusiastic about the colloquium. They seemed to really enjoy the on-campus experience. It provided them with an opportunity to interact with students from other schools with similar study interests; provided a broad exposure to different aspects of visual and performing arts; and enabled feedback from people other than their teachers at school.

The students who studied Critical and Creative Thinking found the unit of study challenging but valued being stretched intellectually and could see how the skills learned could have wide application:

Most students, participating across the range of UCP units studied, valued the positive impact on TCE scores and the acquired credit for UTAS units upon enrolment in an aligned UTAS Degree

Before beginning the University College Program most students had already formulated ideas about future studies and many students used the UCP units to explore these interests. Others used the UCP to explore new areas or undertake units they thought would assist with general academic development

Although most UCP students already intend to come to university, there is some evidence of the UCP assisting in the raising of aspirations to attend university. One
student in the Launceston focus group indicated that she had not thought of going to University but after participating the School of Visual and Performing Arts UCP she is now enrolled in the Bachelor of Contemporary Arts. One participant indicated that participating in the UCP meant that she came to UTAS rather than an interstate university as she had originally intended.

The complex pressures on year 12 students and uncertainty about tertiary education can create unnecessary anxiety for students who intend to progress to University. The University College Program appears to have bridged a gap in knowledge about UTAS/University for many of the focus group participants; and provided useful experiential learning that may have alleviated some of the transitional stress for some of these students. Some students would have liked more on-campus activities and others were focused on workload—either too much (Critical and Creative Thinking), or not enough (some of the Arts and Language programs).

There was also some uncertainty regarding unit guidelines and assessment criteria that confused a number of students involved in the Conservatorium and SVPA.

For some students the learning is significant, others tend not to have reflected on their learning experience at all. This situation is most likely when their university unit has been delivered entirely distant from the university and they have little connection to university lecturers. The more frequent the interaction with the university (face-to-face or online) the more students appear to have been connected to the learning.

Regardless of the apparent issues and challenges encountered in the University College Program all of the students said they would do the program again and/or recommend it to prospective students. They have indicated areas where changes/improvements could be made but overall they expressed a belief that the program had been of benefit to their ongoing education, and eased the transition to university.

**Discussion and Conclusion**

The UCP pilot has had many positive outcomes including student participation and performance, developing relationships with the secondary sector and broad support from involved staff.

The evaluation research has shown that further development in regard to the UCP student experience, curriculum and overarching program development is required. It has also demonstrated that some administration, communication, equity and quality assurance issues need to be addressed.

In particular issues for further and priority consideration relate to:

- Social inclusion and participation given the current participant demographic;
- Working in partnership - acknowledging the developing role of senior secondary staff and establishing a strong professional development program for UTAS staff and college staff;
- More equitable statewide provision of the UCP the maintenance of HECS scholarships and the sanction free opportunity;
- Overarching consideration of the number and discipline areas of the units offered through the UCP
- The mapping of TCE and UTAS first year units and clarification of standards; and
- Strengthening University preparation and the student connection to UTAS

Understanding of the collaborative environment has grown within UTAS and much has been learnt through trial and error, but it is clear that any ongoing development needs be underpinned by UTAS Policy that puts the UCP in the context of the wider collaborative UTAS participation and social inclusion agendas.
Background

The University College Pilot Program (UCP) began in 2008, as part of the University of Tasmania’s EDGE2 2008 – 2010 strategic plan, to “Develop the UTAS College model, in partnership with the State Government, to provide an integrated year 11 to PhD educational framework for Tasmania.”

It is a joint venture between UTAS, the Tasmanian Academy and senior secondary schools/colleges which allows capable and motivated students to undertake university study either in conjunction with or alongside their studies towards the Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) or the International Baccalaureate (IB).

Program offerings in 2008, initially extension Language Units only, were negotiated through the Office of the Executive Director Planning and Development who also negotiated the initial Memoranda of Understanding with individual Senior Secondary Colleges (Appendix 1).

From 2009, students may undertake units in the UCP in either of the following ways:

1. Students undertake a TCE subject extension where the TCE subject curriculum closely aligns to a UTAS first year or Foundation unit. TCE extension is available in selected language, visual and performing arts, arts and business studies. Extension units have extra work completed online and at university workshops or colloquia and are assessed by university staff. These results are moderated with the student's TCE result to determine their final UTAS assessment;

2. Students complete UTAS units undertaken either through the High Achievers Program or with a college or campus based facilitated class. These units are best suited to high achieving students whom the Academy or College assesses as capable of completing work at first year university level. These units may be predominantly delivered by distance mode supported by college staff and by visits from the lecturer and online feedback. Assessment for these units is the same as assessment for other UTAS students which will often mean taking an exam at a University campus. Results for UTAS units count towards the student's Tertiary Entrance Ranking.

The program has to date run in conjunction with the following UTAS Schools:

- The Conservatorium of Music (Prelude and Overture program)
- The School of Asian Languages and Studies and the School of English, Journalism and European Languages (Language Program)
- School of Visual and Performing Arts
- The Tasmanian School of the Arts
- School of Philosophy
- School of Business and Accounting
- School of Computing an Information Systems (HITlab)

Key features of the UCP include:

- The opportunity to complete UTAS units while in Year 11/12
- Support by UTAS lecturers through assignments and workshops
• No HECS (Higher Education Contribution Scheme) charges – a saving of around $650 per unit of study (international student excepted)
• Access to UTAS Library and other on-campus facilities
• Students may withdraw without academic penalty at any time

Students are recommended for the program by their school/college according to their previous academic success and their ability to fit the UTAS extension studies into their existing TCE studies. Enrolment forms must be signed by parent/guardians and by the College/School Principal.

Tertiary Entrance Ranking (TER) and Unit award procedures:

1. For TCE subject extension:

To receive an award for a UTAS unit, students need to successfully complete mandatory assignments and workshops and achieve a TCE result of CA or better. UTAS receives TCE results from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority in mid December. Results are moderated and combined with the results for their UTAS unit assessment at that time, and students receive advice of their UTAS result in mid/late January. A summary of student results are also provided to relevant schools/colleges. On successful completion of the program and the respective TCE subject, students are awarded results in UTAS units of study in the relevant Associate Degree, two units being equivalent to 25% of a first year load. UTAS results do not contribute additional points to the Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR).

2. For standalone units:

An arrangement has been negotiated with the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority (TQA) such that units undertaken in the University College Program via this method are included in the calculation of ATAR scores. On successful completion of a university unit, results are assessed for eligibility for inclusion in the calculation of students’ ATAR. 12.5% university semester units are deemed to be the equivalent of half the proportion of a full year Level 3 pre-tertiary subject. In order to provide for the inclusion of the university units in the calculation of ATAR, all Level 3 subjects completed have the ATAR score halved. Each half score is then the equivalent of a university unit. The best 10 half scores (with at least 6 in Year 12) are then selected to determine the ATAR.

UCP Governance

UTAS College is an entity within the Division of Pro Vice Chancellor (Students and Education). UTAS College has oversight of the UCP in collaboration with individual UTAS Schools. Program outcomes are reported to Academic Senate via the Preparations and Pathways Committee established in January 2010 and the University Teaching and Learning Committee. Monthly UTAS College reports are made to the PVC Students and Education via the Divisional Managers Meeting.

Initially, the UTAS College initiative reported to the Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic and Provost. A senior level Pathways and Preparations Steering Group which reported directly to Academic Senate was created to oversee the establishment of UTAS College. The responsibility for UTAS College moved to the PVC Students and Education and this committee was disbanded in April 2009.
The role of UTAS College in facilitating the University College Program has been to co-ordinate the program, liaising with Faculties and Schools and administrative departments within the University, monitor outcomes and reporting and manage the partnership with senior secondary Colleges.

Student and Academic Administration has managed the High Achiever Program (HAP) whilst Marketing and Recruitment has provided student support. UTAS College has reported on HAP results. HAP student participation and outcomes have not been included in this evaluation.

It is noted that the relationship with senior secondary staff in specific discipline areas has been developed in differing ways. Most notably, the School of Visual and Performing Arts has established a formal review and Advisory committee with representation from every college involved in the UCP.

Individual unit development, delivery (including organisation and staffing), assessment and quality assurance is handled directly by School and Faculty.
Context
The emergence of the UTAS University College Program comes within the broader context of the low higher education participation rates in Tasmania, the associated effects of lower educational attainment on a range of social and economic indicators for the population as a whole and the growing importance of social inclusion in the Australian Higher Education debate.

Education is seen as a key determinant in socio-economic status. Those with lower standards of education fall behind in a range of key areas including income, employment, health and democratic participation. Studies into the benefits of university education for both individuals and the community contend, for example, that higher education fosters democratic participation (Harper cited in Benson, Harkavy & Hartley, 2002; Kezar Chambers and Burkhart, 2005). They find that graduates are more likely to participate, and accept diversity, hold positive attitudes to race and gender equality and are over three times more likely to be members of voluntary organisations than non-graduates (Purcell et al., 2004).

In addition graduates will have better overall health and wellbeing (Hillman & McMillan, 2005; King, 1999; Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993; and others) and are less likely to be involved in crime (Chapman B, Weatherburn, Kapuscinski, Chivers & Roussel, 2002). Graduates live healthier lifestyles, are less likely to smoke, less likely to be obese, 40% less likely to suffer from depression and more likely to report “excellent” health (Wilberforce, 2005). Higher education qualifications are associated with less physical decline, depression, loneliness, social loss and positively associated with continuous growth in ageing people (Steverink, Westerhoff, Bode & Dittman-Kohli, 2001; Miech & Shanahan, 2001). The benefits of higher education are intergenerational. Graduates are more likely to take an interest in their own children’s education and to be involved with their children’s school – factors which are predictors of schooling success (Purcell et al., 2004).

However for many the headline benefit of higher education is vocational, with graduates having significant advantages in gaining employment, job satisfaction and income generation. According to the 2006 Census, for example, just under half (48%) of all lower income unemployed people had Year 11 or lower as their highest qualification, or had no qualification at all, compared with a little over one quarter (27%) of all employed people (2006 Census Cat. No. 2070.0).

By lagging behind the other states in terms of educational retention, participation and attainment Tasmanians also lag behind in the benefits afforded by higher education. According to the 2006 Census approximately 54% of the Tasmanian population had completed only year 10 or below. Despite significant improvements since 1998, in 2008 Tasmania still remains around 7% behind the national average in terms of Year 7/8 to Year 12 retention (Australian average – 62%, Tasmania 55%). A smaller proportion of the Tasmanian workforce has post-school qualifications than that of any other State or Territory (ABS Social Trends 2008).

The UTAS College Senior Secondary Report 2010, found that articulation from year 12 into higher education remains low in Tasmania, with only 40% of students completing year 12 proceeding to higher education, and 50% of those with ATAR ranking doing so (Langworthy & Jarvis, 2010).
Table 1: Tasmanian Year 12 participation 2006-2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students counted as completing year 12</td>
<td>3003</td>
<td>2883</td>
<td>2961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with a Tertiary Entrance Rank</td>
<td>2162</td>
<td>2105</td>
<td>2161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Enrolling at UTAS</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrolling in other universities</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrolling at university</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>1189</td>
<td>1306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students completing year 12 articulating to university</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% student completing year 12 articulating to UTAS</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students with a Tertiary Entrance Rank articulating to university</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% students with a Tertiary Entrance Rank articulating to UTAS</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a number of contributing factors in Tasmania’s lower higher education participation rates. While access and proximity to university campuses play a role, research has shown that it is education, occupation levels and socio-economic factors are the most significant determinants (Stevenson, Evans et al. 2001). James found that students from lower socio-economic backgrounds must overcome more inhibiting barriers to participate in higher education than those from higher socio-economic backgrounds (James 2005). Tasmanian consistently ranks at or near the bottom on a range of socio-economic indicators. For example, Tasmania ranked in the most disadvantaged 5 per cent of all Census Collection Districts (CDs) in Australia on the ABS SEIFA Index of Relative Disadvantage (ABS 2006a). As such low educational attainment becomes a central component in a cycle of disadvantage.

Indicators of access, participation, success and retention in higher education show that since the mid 1990s, progress has been made for some groups such as students from non-English-speaking-backgrounds, but despite more than a decade of concerted equity activity, low SES groups, Indigenous Australians and people from rural and isolated areas remain significantly under-represented relative to their share of the population (Ferrier and Heagney, 2008).

The 2008 Review of Australian Higher Education asserts that social inclusion must be a core responsibility for all institutions that accept public funding, irrespective of history and circumstances (Bradley, Noonan et al, 2008). This view is reinforced by the 2009 Federal Government policy, Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System, which has as one of its principle focuses, the raising of higher education participation rates in lower-socio-economic groups as a means of creating greater social inclusion and equity (Commonwealth of Australia, 2009).

At the State level, the need to increase participation and educational outcomes has driven strategies which include raising the school leaving age to 17, and providing for increased vocational programs and pathways in the senior school years. The persistent low participation rates in Tasmanian education beyond Year 10 led to the Tasmanian Government’s Tasmania Tomorrow educational reforms which in 2008 established the three post compulsory educational institutions, the Tasmanian Academy, the Tasmanian Skills Institute and the Tasmanian Polytechnic.

Also at the heart of the drive to increase participation is a shared understanding that education is a key indicator of regional sustainability. It is particularly important for regional communities facing structural adjustment where old industries, often reliant
on routine and semi skilled process work, are in sharp decline and it is clear that the future survival will rely on a more educated general community and a more highly skilled workforce.

The impact of skills shortages in regional and non-metropolitan areas has been significant and the body of recent research concerned with the skill requirements and deficits in regional areas attests to this (DVC, 2006; DOTARS & BTRE, 2003 & 2006). It is the lack of human capital that is the greatest barrier to regional progress (Garlick, Taylor and Plummer, 2007; Taylor et al., 2008); an educated population contributes to a more equitable, cohesive, economically successful and environmentally aware society, capable of addressing the problems that communities face and this is a challenge universities and the education sector must meet.

Regionally success breeds success and thus regions where the 'requisite skill and knowledge capacity are in place are more likely to attract viable and dynamic industries' (NIEIR, 2004 cited in Langworthy & Brunt, 2005).

For Tasmania this is a challenge when a significant proportion of the population has no education qualification beyond Year 10. Within Tasmania regional differences are similar to those experienced generally in regional and rural Australia where there is a growing disparity socio–economically, socially and in higher education participation – up to seven times more students engage in higher education in metropolitan areas than outer urban and regional areas (Langworthy, 2003).

**University Approaches to Increasing Participation**

A range of strategies are employed by universities to address the issues of participation and equity both in general and in under-represented groups in particular (see Appendix 2 for a desktop scan of some of these programs). Creating links between exiting school students and universities is one strategy commonly adopted and can include a range of programs such as school visits, extension challenges and events, mentoring programs and assisted entry packages for disadvantaged students such as portfolio entrance. The Schools Outreach Collaborations workshop hosted by the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) 2005 highlighted different strategies employed by a number of Australian universities (Andreadis and Thompson, 2005).

UTS itself runs a range of programs spanning years 7 – 12 which include one-day taster programs, the UTS inpUTS Educational Access Scheme, peer mentors in orientation and tasters days and specifically targeting disadvantaged school communities and creating working partnerships with them.

UniSA has introduced the Aspire bonus entry points scheme to increase access to school leavers who have been under-represented at university. It also runs a first-generation orientation program offered to select northern Adelaide schools. The program runs over six weeks and introduces students to a range of aspects of university life, including introductory activities, campus tours, lectures and tutorials across academic disciplines and a career session. A group of Uni SA student mentors support the program, working with secondary students and answering their questions about university study. In 2011 UniSA is opening UniSA College, amalgamating these programs with a foundations study course, creating a delivery model similar to that of UTAS College.

Griffith University, considered one the models of good practice in this area, has a unified model for encouraging social inclusion which includes pre-university activities, preparation programs and orientation on mentoring for enrolled students. It runs specific, targeted activities for students in year 8 – 12 under the banner of 'Uni-Reach' including a drama program for year 8 students, an information resource for year 10
students called ‘Griffitti’ and a range of activities including a mentor program and on-campus experiences for year 11 and 12 students.

In 2006 a collaboration led by Swinburne University of Technology explored the educational aspirations of year 10 students living in outer eastern Melbourne. The study involved 21 secondary colleges, and 245 students (Langworthy, Mawson & O’Connor, 2007). Findings from that study indicated that most students planned to go on to study at university; however other research (Centre for Post Compulsory Education and Lifelong Learning 2006) indicated that actual participation rates were inconsistent with this aspiration. The study concluded that, although the majority of year 10 students in the outer east of Melbourne may aspire to university, not all will actually turn that aspiration into reality’ (Langworthy, Mawson and O’Connor 2007).

The practice of offering programs whereby school students undertake university units for credit was found to be common throughout Australia, though uneven (Figgis, Parker, et al, 2002 vii). The ‘University Credit for School Students’ study found that universities and schools are increasingly interested in developing arrangements where students have access to university units both as a means of furthering goals of lifelong learning, and as recognition of the fact that able students need and deserve the stimulation provided by advanced study. Of the 39 universities contacted in the study, 37 indicated they had at least one such program. The main purposes of these programs were found to be:

- provide a mechanism for recruiting very able students
- deliver a community service through sharing the university’s intellectual resources with capable students;
- create better relationships with schools;
- ease the eventual transition of selected students to full university study
- meeting equity objectives

It was found that the first of these objectives – recruiting of very able students to their university – was rarely achieved (Figgis, Parker et al, 2002). School priorities in participating in such programs centre around the opportunity to challenge the brightest students however, other motives include raising first-in-family student aspirations and confidence; providing additional resources to schools and students (eg libraries, online learning, sport facilities), and furthering the development of relationships between the school and higher education sector (Figgis, Parker et al, 2002).

Figgis et. al. found that the motivation for students to participate in such programs fell into two main areas: to be stimulated and stretched in an area of study they enjoyed, and to gain benefit from any ‘incentives (HECS wavering, university credits) that the program offered (Figgis, Parker et al, 2002).

Most schools thought carefully about which students were suited to participating in the program, including not only that they were capable, but also that they were motivated and were mature enough to cope with the different learning context required by university level study, particularly focusing on the need for students to develop independent learning strategies (Figgis, Parker et al, 2002).

The 2000 Senate enquiry into ‘The Education of Gifted and Talented Children’ identified the practice of allowing high achieving students to undertake university units as one of the roles universities play in this field, along with allowing early entry and other enrichment activities (Senate Enquiry, 2000). Attitudes to early entry vary, but the report repeated the concern found above, that academic ability alone was not all that needed to be factored in and that younger students required special
consideration and often extra resources to enable them to manage the different
environment university represents (Senate Enquiry, 2000).

A series of good practice guidelines for the development of university credit for
school student programs were developed by Figgis et. al. as a result of their
investigations. They found that whilst it was still 'early days' that, “if 'university credit
for schools' is to have a productive future, there needs to be sustained conversation
and information sharing between higher education and school education sectors
(Figgis, Parker et al, 2002). It concluded that, overall, carefully constructed programs
were of demonstrated value but needed further development to ensure equitable
access, consistency in outcomes and adequate resourcing (Figgis, Parker et a, 2002).

An internet scan of current programs in 2010 (Appendix 2) indicates that whilst a
wide variety of operational differences continue to exist, some common conditions
emerge, including, that programs:

- are offered to year 12 students;
- provide HECS scholarships;
- give university credit for units completed successfully;
- provide units from within the existing first year pools; and
- allow students to complete a maximum of 2 units per year.

Arrangements may or may not include withdrawal without academic penalty, and the
capacity for results to be included in year 12 certificates and ATAR scores.

Universities Operating in Partnership

It is useful to contextualise the sustained conversation between the higher education
and school education sectors identified as a critical success factor by Figgis, Parker
et al (2002) as a partnership. A partnership is a voluntary collaboration between two
or more parties. The term can be applied to wide variety of forums, relationships and
arrangements, where one or more parties agree to share and exchange resources
and information and to produce outcomes that one partner working alone could not
achieve. Partnerships can be formal or informal and cover a broad range of agreed
resources sharing and cooperation. Brown and Waddell (1997) indicated that it is
useful to think about partnerships as a process rather than an outcome:

Gray (1989:5) defined collaboration as “a process through which parties who see
different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search
for solutions that go beyond their own limited vision of what is possible.”

Much work has been done in identifying the elements of successful partnerships
(Koteinikov and Ten3 East-West, 2003; Cave, 1999; Hamer, 2002; Brown and
Waddell, 1997; Walker, 2000). Successful partnerships usually include the following
characteristics:

- they are developed from identified needs and priorities;
- they have shared goals, objectives and responsibilities;
- there is a clear understanding of the constraints and capabilities of each
  partner, the resource commitment (information, human, financial and
  technical) and the need to engage the whole of organisation rather than just
  individuals;
- there is regular, open, transparent communication and accountable structures
  for joint decision making and conflict resolution;
• the relationship has been developed in a way that engenders trust between all partners, effective informal networks and strong working relationships which underpin formal agreements (and support the evolution of the partnership in response to learning and change);

• there is a focus on the need to achieve results and not be just a “talk fest”; and

• there is evaluation and celebration of success.

Universities partner in various ways with schools, industry and the community - in informal networks, formal committees, specific Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with organisations and in curriculum development and projects (research and consultancy). These arrangements vary hugely in effectiveness and implementation. Vic Health (2005) developed the partnerships continuum below to describe this range from informal to formal collaboration.

**Figure 1: Partnership Continuum:**

![Partnership Continuum](image)

The model of developing a business plan, rather than generic MOUs or agreements, has proved effective in achieving focused outcomes. This model begins with a purpose and shared mission

1. Works back from the outside (where the community is at)
2. Suits the respective agendas of the partners
3. Has clear and specific goals and objectives
4. Has clear and efficient governance
5. Builds in an action review process
6. Is developed for a timeframe that allows achievement of objectives
7. Has clear strategies, actions and responsibilities
8. Has adequate resourcing (Vic Health, 2005)

This model can be of use to universities establishing partnerships with schools and other community organisations in order to increase participation and social inclusion.
Methodology
Methodology

Initial Surveys, Reports and Feedback

Throughout the pilot program a range of developmental processes have been conducted including the establishment of a Quality Assurance Plan, the conducting of two Symposia with involved staff from the secondary sector and UTAS, a range of meetings with key discipline and administrative groups, interviews with Deans and Heads of School and an online survey of UCP language students. Advice from the Tasmanian Qualifications Authority in relation to the translation of University units in the calculation of Australian Tertiary Admission Ranks (ATAR) and in relation to the socio-economic status of students undertaking full University units of study is also included. The outcomes of these processes as documented have been summarised and used to inform ensuing brief discussion section.

Student participation and outcomes

Student unit participation and outcome data and senior secondary school of origin has been compiled from UCP annual reports with data derived from annual enrolments and academic results.

UCP students- summary histories

Dr Jane Rienks, Research Fellow (Transition & Pathways), used admissions and enrolment data to produce a demographic analysis of the sex, citizenship and age of participants. The same data have been used to identify the number of units undertaken per student.

Admissions and enrolment data was similarly used by Dr Rienks to identify University College Program students who have articulated to UTAS. The data were extracted on May 18, 2010. A detailed analysis of the destinations and outcomes for all these students was undertaken. Comparison of the students’ UCP Grade Point Average (GPA) and subsequent UTAS GPA was analysed through a paired T test and repeated with a non-parametric alternative, the Wilcoxon Signed Rank test.

Student unit participation and outcome data and senior secondary school of origin has been compiled from UCP annual reports with data derived from enrolments and academic results.

Online Survey

An online survey was used to gather views from four key stakeholder groups involved with the University College Program. These groups were senior secondary school or college teachers who have had students involved with or who have themselves taught in the UCP; senior secondary school or college principals of schools who have had students participating in the UCP; UTAS staff who have taught and/or been involved in the development or delivery of UCP units; and UTAS Heads of Schools who have had units delivered in the UCP.

The survey questions were developed in response to questions and issues identified throughout the project and were tested with an internal and external stakeholder sample before being finalised.
As the four stakeholder groups had different types and levels of involvement, a generic survey was altered to accommodate these differences, resulting in four separate surveys being distributed.

The survey was created using the Qaltrics online survey tool and requests to participate were sent via an email which included a unique login pathway for each individual respondent. Participants were given 10 days (8th - 17th May, 2010) in which to reply, at which point the surveys were closed. Responses were confidential.

The surveys sent to College/School teachers (Appendices 3) and College/School principals (Appendix 4) were essentially the same, with minor differences due to the level of involvement. Similarly the surveys sent to UTAS staff (Appendix 5) and UTAS Heads of School (Appendix 6) were essentially the same, with minor difference according to roles. As such, it has been possible to combine the responses from these two groups into unique survey summaries; one for college/school staff and principals (Appendix 7) and one for UTAS staff and Heads of School (Appendix 8).

In addition, there were common questions and themes within all four surveys, and where these have occurred responses have been tallied and a combined survey summary report produced (Appendix 9) which forms the basis for data presented in the Survey Outcomes section of this report.

In producing the graphs for the summary reports, two methods have been used. Where a Likert scale has been used for survey question responses, the response scale 0-4 has been used. In questions where participants have been asked to indicate a preferred preference from a given number of options, scores have been totalled and represented as a percentage of total responses.

In total 36 College/School staff attempted the survey. Responses to individual questions varied from 15 – 29.

A total of 18 College/School principals attempted the survey. Responses to individual questions varied from 6 – 11.

A total of 18 UTAS staff attempted the survey. Responses to individual questions varied from 7 - 12.

A total of 6 UTAS Heads of School attempted the survey. Actual responses to individual questions varied from 3 - 5.

College/school staff with students involved in the following areas responded to the survey: Asian Languages and Studies, Conservatorium of Music, European Languages, HITLab (Human Interface Technology Laboratory in the School of Computing and Information Systems), Philosophy and Visual & Performing Arts (North). No responses were received from college/school staff with students in: Aboriginal Studies, Business/Accounting, and the Tasmanian School of the Arts (south).

UTAS staff from the following areas responded to the survey: Asian Languages, Business/Accounting, Conservatorium of Music, European Languages, Philosophy, Asian Studies, Visual and Performing Arts (north), School of the Arts (south).

Ethics exemption was granted for this research.
Focus Groups

In order to provide some understanding of the student experience of the UTAS University College Programs (UCP) a student focus group was conducted at each UTAS campus; Burnie, Launceston and Hobart (n=3).

Using UCP enrolment lists a researcher made telephone contact with up to 15 students from each campus and invited them to participate in a focus group as part of a program evaluation process. The researcher explained that the focus groups sought to understand student experience of the program and any other feedback that the students thought was relevant.

An email was then sent to consenting students providing details about time and location for the focus group, and requesting confirmation by return email of their willingness to participate. A total of 14 students returned confirmation emails (Burnie n=2; Launceston n=6; Hobart n=6). A total of 11 students attended the Focus Groups (Burnie n=2; Launceston n=5; Hobart n=4). Nine of these students were female and two were male (Burnie F=2; Launceston F=5; Hobart F=2, M=2).

Students who had indicated they would attend the focus groups but who were ultimately unable to attend were given the opportunity to provide feedback online. A UCP researcher sent a modified focus group questionnaire to these students and those who indicated an interest in participating but could not attend the focus group session (n=21) and six students provided responses.

At arrival at Focus Group venues students were provided with verbal information about the evaluation research, given an information statement and asked to fill in a participation consent form and a demographic information form. The use of voice recording was explained and they were advised they could withdraw from the discussion at any time if they did not wish to proceed.

Secondary Colleges represented by Focus Group participants included: Elizabeth College, Guilford Young College, Hobart College, Launceston College, Marist Regional College, Rosny College, St Patrick's College, Tasmanian Academy - Don Campus, Tasmanian Academy - Hellyer Campus.

Fifteen students were studying UCP units whilst in Year 12 and one whilst in Year 11 during the years of 2008 (n=3) and 2009 (n=9).

The range of UCP units studied by these students included: Accounting and Financial Decision Making; Creative and Critical Thinking; Foundation Musicianship and Foundation Theory; Foundation Practical Studies; French; German; Japanese; Chinese; Prelude Program; Theatre Skills; Theatre, Photography, Production; Theatre, Production and Visual Arts.

UTAS locations where these students are now studying include: The Conservatorium, Hobart; Cradle Coast Campus, Burnie; Sandy Bay Campus, Hobart; The Medical Sciences Campus, Hobart, and Inveresk and Newnham Campuses Launceston.

UTAS Degrees currently being studied by these students include: Associate Arts Degree; Bachelor of Arts; Bachelor of Business; Bachelor of Business (Accounting); Bachelor of Contemporary Arts - Theatre; Bachelor of Contemporary Arts - Visual Arts; Bachelor of Economics & Bachelor of Law; Bachelor of Education - Early Childhood; Bachelor of Music; Bachelor of Primary Education; Bachelor of Medicine.
Demographic information provided by participants indicated the students live in the following postcode areas: 7052, 7248, 7248, 7250, 7300, 7307, 7310, 7322, and 7325.

The Focus Groups facilitator was Associate Professor Anne Langworthy, Director of the UTAS College Programs. Ethics approval was granted for this research by UTAS Human Research Ethics Committee, approval no. H11280.
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Initial Surveys, Reports & Feedback

Throughout the pilot program a range of developmental processes have been conducted including the establishment of a Quality Assurance Plan, the conducting of two Symposia with involved staff from the secondary sector and UTAS, a range of meetings with key discipline and administrative groups, interviews with Deans and Heads of School and an online survey of UCP language students. The outcomes of these processes as documented have been summarised as follows.

2008 Annual Report: Key Points

The UCP 2008 (Appendix 10) report highlighted the following:

There was significant learning on the part of university staff involved that will help shape continuation of the pilot in 2009.

The following comments were derived from meetings with Languages, Performing Arts and Visual Arts staff, three written reports from French, Asian Languages and Performing Arts and written feedback sent to the Arts Faculty.

Students

College students who enrolled were 16 years of age and over, many in Year 11. These young people are:

- much more immature than their university counterparts, and unlikely to have a holistic view of their educational direction. Subject choices are often made on the basis of what is easier and “where my friends go”;
- used to having a closer relationship with their teachers. Remote tutors cannot easily establish such rapport;
- unused to distance, self-paced learning, but rather expect to be chased for work as a matter of course (an example was given of one student who failed Japanese for no other reason than she did not hand in a culture assignment, despite frequent reminders from her teacher on the spot); and
- a significant number of students failed to complete set tasks and were withdrawn without academic penalty as can be seen by the results table above. Student and parent feedback highlighted their ignorance of university systems and disappointment at an apparent lack of support, particularly when they thought they would be facing academic penalty for late withdrawal.

The number of language students who did not complete the second unit is perhaps an indication of workload and timing issues to be addressed in 2009.

Student preparation varied but most received guidance only in relation to the unit undertaken. The need for on campus experience and university orientation has become clear. Additional information on the gender of students can be found in the appendix.
Communication

Communication was an issue during 2008. Contact with students and colleges varied. There was some confusion about point of contact and the UTAS "message" and technical difficulty with online access.

There was an inherent expectation that, given access to a UTAS email address and MyLO, communication would take place. This was not the case and communication was a major stumbling block of the program. Students who did not sign on had to be contacted through their teachers. Some students admitted at the end of the year that they had trouble with MyLO or computer problems, but made no attempt to contact the UTAS facilitator directly or through their teacher (all of whom knew the facilitator professionally).

Results in the languages were delayed due to the need to moderate with TCE results and although this was expected, a clear indication of when results would be available was not communicated to students until late December. In addition, there was an expectation that students would know to access their results online.

Formal letters were sent out to inactive students to encourage their involvement. Text messages were sent to encourage workshop participation or to urge withdrawal with no penalty. These often went unanswered.

Students did not appear to attempt to negotiate time off from part-time work to attend the workshops. When they couldn’t get time off, they did not inform the university facilitator or seek to find out what alternate work might meet the requirement.

Inactive students failed to appreciate that the administration of their enrolment was separate from the online teacher and expected that their decision not to sit the TCE exam would automatically remove them from UTAS enrolment. This was despite a letter of encouragement that was sent out advising the course of action for withdrawal without academic penalty.

College teachers

College teachers responded in varying ways to the program. In the best case, teachers have worked with students to ensure assignments are done. Anecdotally, in one particular case, a teacher has already planned her 2009 timetable based on having College Language Program Year 12 students able to work alongside her Year 11 TCE class so she is accessible for advice. In one institution a teacher of Japanese allocated time for College Language Program student consultation, whilst the French colleague categorically refused to do so. In the worst case, some individuals have been actively talking down the program and UTAS staff.

The partnership with, and recognition of, teachers will be an important component of the ongoing pilot.
2008 Quality Assurance Plan

A Quality Assurance Plan was accepted by Academic Senate in May 2009 (see Attachment 11 for the complete plan). This plan identified six areas of focus: enrolment; unit approval; student support/services; teaching staff; assessment; and evaluation. It also identified the existing relevant policy and procedures and responsibility.

Issues and action areas identified for the six areas of focus with a brief comment regarding progress follow.

**Enrolment**

- Common information to be developed across all UTAS College offering available in hard copy and on the UTAS College website.

- Student Centre staff will accompany academic staff on initial visits to Colleges. These staff members will outline rights and responsibilities and facilitate enrolment procedures.

  *Note: Both of these processes have occurred 2009/2010*

- Enrolment forms will include College Principal and Parent/Guardian permission signatures and student permission to disclose results to their College.

  *Note enrolment forms provide for the signature of the school who provide all liaison and communication with parent.*

- Formal sign-off of UTAS enrolments as the “other” category by the Dean.

  *Note: it has been determined although senior secondary students do not meet General Entry Requirements, they are eligible to be enrolled in the Associate Degree created as a pathway for students in this category.*

- Other issues to be resolved with student admissions and Associate Deans Teaching and Learning and TQA where relevant:
  
  - The level of award program into which students enter- *Note: most students are enrolled in the Associate Degree Arts Science or General Studies.*
  
  - Which units can count towards TCE: *Note: The results of full, accredited first year units contribute to the student’s TCE ATAR score.*
  
  - How many units can count towards TCE.
  
  - What is an appropriate load for students to attempt and maximum numbers of units.
  
  - Mutually exclusive programs or units.
  
  - The limit to HECS waivers.
  
  - Guaranteed withdrawal without academic penalty and the consumption of SLE.
  
  - Release of results given the differing timelines for programmes.
Unit approval

Process for determining the equivalence of units offered through the UTAS College Programme and those offered to UTAS online and on campus first year students to be established with the Associate Deans Teaching and Learning including but not limited to an analysis of unit outlines and assessment. Appropriate format of documentation to be determined as part of the process.

*Note currently unit equivalence is determined at the UTAS School level although there has been no consistent UTAS-wide approach determined.*

Student services

Appropriate level of students services offered to UTAS College students identified by UTAS Student Services Staff in collaboration with College staff

*Note: the senior secondary school has been identified as the prime pastoral carer of students in the program*

UTAS College student orientation and transition support programme to be piloted with at least one College in 2009.

Evaluation of the programme to be used to develop recommendations for second phase piloting in 2010

Teaching Staff

Point of contact for College staff to be advertised in all information, hard copy and online - *actioned*

The position of Associate Professor UTAS College will be responsible for establishing a process to manage and maintain relationships - *actioned*

Initial development of College staff duties from the University perspective and recommended induction process established with Associate Deans Teaching and Learning

Proposal for honorary appointment will be developed (including identifying/distinguishing paid work)

Consultation with College staff to address:

- Their role in the UTAS College Program;
- Recognition through honorary appointment or alternative;
- Induction/Staff development required;
- Access to facilities and resources.

*These issues were addressed in the 2009 Symposia but have not been subsequently resolved.*
Assessment

Process for determining the equivalence of units offered through the UTAS College Program and those offered to UTAS online and on campus first year students to be established with the Associate Deans Teaching and Learning including but not limited to an analysis of unit outlines and assessment. The appropriate format of documentation should be determined as part of the process.

The model for moderation of grades developed in 2008 to be documented and tested in 2009 by individual UTAS Schools.

Consultation with College staff to address:

- Assessment of units where extension of TCE is used (including appropriateness of additional exams);
- Criterion referenced assessment (College assessment and UTAS assessment).

Note: Mapping of units against TCE subjects has been completed by relevant UTAS Schools and a moderation process involving comparison with TCE exam scripts agreed with the TQA but an overarching model has not been agreed or documented as yet.

Evaluation

Required amendments to the standard SETL format will be discussed with University and College teaching staff. The form of SETL to be piloted with UTAS College co-delivery unit, which may involve a different or revised instrument, will be approved by the Associate Deans Teaching and Learning.

Note: Some student survey has been undertaken but not in the standard SETL format.

The Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) will consider development of documented QA standards for co-delivery using the Standards for Online Delivery as a model.

Overall Program evaluation and key research questions will be developed collaboratively with UTAS and College Teaching Staff.

Summary: Most of these issues and action areas have been addressed in 2009 and 2010 as identified. However, a number of issues identified here are still to be resolved as further discussed in the Discussion section of this report.

2009 Annual report: Key Points

Although in operation less than 3 years, the program has already shown considerable growth. The UCP 2009 (appendix 12) report highlighted the following achievements:

- Over double the number of students and over double the number of units offered;
• improved quality processes in both teaching and learning and administration (including timely reporting to Colleges);
• a reduction in the withdrawal rate from 29% to 17%;
• an 83% pass rate with 59% of students receiving a credit or above;
• systematic resolution of many academic issues with our senior secondary colleagues; and
• high levels of participation and cross sectoral collaboration evidenced by engagement in the two Symposia held in June 2009, the establishment planning and review committee with involved school/college representation in the School of Visual and Performing Arts and the process for teacher accreditation and collaborative assessment being developed by the Conservatorium, for example.

UCP Language Program

The UCP Language Program is a collection of languages offered by the School of Asian Languages and Studies and the School of English, Journalism and European Languages under the University College Language Program banner.

Languages have proved a popular offering in the UCP, both from UTAS schools and participating student perspectives.

Table 2: Units offered 2008 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMC 101 Chinese</td>
<td>HEF101 French 1A</td>
<td>HEF101 French 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC 102 Chinese</td>
<td>HEF102 French 1B</td>
<td>HEF102 French 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMN 101 Indonesian</td>
<td>HEG101 German 1A</td>
<td>HEG101 German 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMN 102 Indonesian</td>
<td>HEG102 German 1B</td>
<td>HEG102 German 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ 101 Japanese</td>
<td>HMC101 Chinese 1A</td>
<td>HMC101 Indonesian 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ 102 Japanese</td>
<td>HMC102 Chinese 1B</td>
<td>HMN102 Indonesian 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF 101 French</td>
<td>HMJ101 Japanese 1A</td>
<td>HMJ101 Japanese 1A</td>
<td>HMJ102 Japanese 1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF 102 French</td>
<td>HMJ102 Japanese 1B</td>
<td>HMJ102 Japanese 1B</td>
<td>HMC101 Chinese 1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HMC102 Chinese 1B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Participation 2008 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. Language Units Studied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unit enrolment</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University College Language Program Student Survey

UCP languages students were canvassed using a Survey Monkey on October 23, 2009 (with a reminder sent on November 23 and the survey closing on November 30, 2009) to gauge student satisfaction and to identify areas for improvement. A total of forty-one students responded to the survey. Survey questions are available Appendix 13.

Table 4: UCP Languages Survey Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey results indicate that generally the students were satisfied with the University College Program languages program and saw that it benefited their language learning. Most significantly, most remain ambassadors for the program in their colleges.

The main issue of concern to students arising from the survey is that students did not identify strongly with UTAS when participating in the program.

A full copy of the survey report is available Appendix 14.

University College Program Symposium June 2009 – Key Findings & Recommendations

Two symposia/forums were held at the University of Tasmania, one in Hobart, June 23, and one in Launceston, June 30, for involved University of Tasmania staff and invited senior secondary staff in order to promote collaboration and collegiality around the UTAS College Pilot Program and wider University preparation and pathways agenda.

The objectives of the Symposia were:

- To provide a forum for the wider discussion of University preparation and pathways including raising aspirations of school students to attend University;
- As part of this, to provide a framework for discussing and further developing the University College Program;
- To provide for consultation with senior secondary teaching staff to address:
Their role in the University College Program;
- Recognition through honorary appointment to UTAS or alternatives;
- Induction/staff development and support required;
- Access to facilities and resources.

- To provide a forum for the discussion of curriculum issues including:
  - Assessment of Units where extension of TCE is used (including appropriateness of additional exams);
  - Criterion referenced assessment (College assessment and UTAS assessment).

- To collaboratively establish research and evaluation questions for the University College Program Pilot and University preparation and pathways;

- To establish a methodology for ongoing contact and collaboration between the University and secondary sectors.

The following major themes were discussed in the symposium:

- Marketing of UTAS pathways within year 10-12 sector;
- Mechanisms for two way sharing of information, knowledge, skills and ideas;
- Appropriate support & resourcing;
- Articulation of procedures, expectation, roles and moderation.

Key Questions raised in the symposia:
1. Can the university play a greater role in informing parents, students and teachers about the range of programs available – eg via Information Sessions?
2. How is the UTAS college model being financially supported?
3. How can the year 11/12 sector (college) prepare students better for university? What role can the university play in supporting college teachers in this?
4. How can UTAS support teachers in other ways – resources, professional development?
5. Can college staff contribute to university teaching skill development?

Key Recommendations from the Symposia:
1. Access & Equity
   - Increase marketing activities and information sharing around UTAS College, university enrolment requirements, enrolment options, alternative pathways, special assistance available, aspiration-raising and success stories.
   - Establish mechanisms for accessing existing knowledge and skills of those schools and teachers currently working with disadvantaged students and for creating an on-going dialogue between interested parties both at college level, university level and in the wider community.
   - Mentor targeted students.
   - UTAS to continue to develop and publicise flexible study options.
2. Quality Assurance & Co-delivered Units
   • UTAS College to be represented at years 10-12 Information Sessions for students/parents and that information re UTAS College be included in College handbooks.
   • UTAS College link to moderation required.
   • Formalise roles, resourcing and recognition processes for participating staff.
   • Establish mechanisms for cross-pollination between sectors.

3. Teaching & Learning Development
   • Establish exchange and dialogue mechanisms.
   • Develop flexible models of support and exchange to enable broad participation in the above that maximise efficiency and participation. Suggestions include:
     o Mentoring
     o Secondary teacher secondments to UTAS
     o University Liaison officers in colleges
     o UTAS staff assisting in professional learning activities
   • Resource appropriately.

4. Learning Pathways
   • Clearly articulate for college staff the skills and qualities students need to succeed at university level.
   • Publicize alternative entry pathways to university study.
   • Develop cross-sector understanding and dialogue.

For the full Symposium Report see Appendix 15.
Student & Academic Administration (S&AA) Submission

A submission received for Student and Academic Administration (Appendix 16) focuses on issues related to the enrolment of students and delivery of units in the UCP. Key points include:

- S&AA have adopted a ‘program model’ for the provision of service to the UCP, which involves obtaining various academic approvals from the relevant UTAS School and Faculty including an information sheet detailing the course, unit, assessment requirements (assignments, workshops and examination arrangements; mode; delivery; locations; semester and whether it is a standard UTAS unit or co-delivery. The process often involves discussion with the TQA concerning the impact on the TCE, in order to determine the TQA reporting requirements and how the final UTAS result will be derived.

- As the number of programs and participants has grown this approach has become increasingly resource intensive and demands for delivery at short notice, have, similarly, become difficult to resource resulting in a less than optimal service for Colleges and students.

- In terms of positioning and promoting the UTAS College Programs there has been quite a bit of confusion amongst College staff on the various programs, and the nuances between the different types of Programs (eg full UTAS units, co-delivered units, on-campus versus off-campus delivery and particularly around results and the TCE/TER). There has also been some confusion about UTAS College and the University College Program amongst students, Careers Advisors, parents and teaching staff in the senior secondary sector.

- S&AA notes the demand for ongoing language enrolments arising from student participation in the College Language Program (CLP) in year 11. There is a gap of language offerings for year 12 students who have completed the TCE and CLP in year 11. This year we have seen an increased number of students (enquiries and applications) for entry to HAP for the purpose of continuity in their language studies.

- The academic administration of Programs involves a range of administrative and academic staff including Faculty, School, Student Recruitment & Marketing, Student & Academic Administration. To ensure appropriate administrative arrangements are in place and to ensure students receive accurate and consistent information and advice, it is essential that the academic administration arrangements are developed early and include all the relevant parties, particularly those who need to approve particular elements of the process. These then need to connect with the information and advice conveyed to students and other stakeholders.

- The multiplicity of programs and the various arrangements each has in relation to the way in which results contribute (or not) to the TCE and TER has been confusing for many. The process of moderation has also been problematic at times.

S&AA include in their submission a number of recommendations in relation to the operation of the UCP.
TQA Information

The TQA has provided data relating to pre-tertiary students who undertake approved University units whilst they are engaged in senior secondary studies. A number of these units are undertaken through the UCP (units are also taken through the High Achievers Program). A brief analysis of the of the SES and remoteness of students who have a TER (ATAR) and UTAS units and students who have a TER and no UTAS units is provided in Appendix 18.

The tables below demonstrate that students who have a TER are more likely to be mid to high SES and live closer to a population Centre. Those students who have a UTAS student a more likely than the TER only group to have mid to high SES and less likely to live in a remote area.

Table 5: SES quartile percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have TER but no approved UTAS units</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have TER and approved UTAS units</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Remoteness quartile percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Far</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have TER but no approved UTAS units</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have TER and approved UTAS units</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance and ATAR Scores

A paper, Using results in University units in the calculation of Australian Tertiary Admission Ranks (Appendix 19)

The paper makes the following observations:

- 2009 is the first year in which there are sufficient numbers for an informative analysis of the data
- there is growing tendency to take a university subject in the year before receiving an ATAR
- there are students in Year 12/13 who are participating in a university subject without being eligible for an ATAR (these are often, but not always, students taking Music related studies)
- the number and proportion of students with the highest possible result is low
- there is an increasing proportion of ‘Pass’ results.
• in most areas other than music there is a clear tendency for students with higher ‘average ability’ (ie those who do better in senior secondary studies) to do better in their results in university units – this is not so for students with High Distinction in Music – they tend to have lower ability estimates

• students with high results in university studies in Maths/Science/Business areas have much higher overall ‘ability’ (= are higher achieving overall in senior secondary studies) than students with high results in other course areas

The paper raises a number of issues in relation to ATAR score translations related to the assumption of equivalence of all university results, the perception of overlap between senior secondary ad first year units and comparability of quality assurance - issues currently being addressed through the HAP Review and S&AA.
Quantitative Analysis
Quantitative Analysis

Student Participation & Outcomes

Introduction

Information in this section is divided into three sections: student participation and outcomes with data derived from annual extraction and reporting over three years; UCP students-summary histories based on UCP administrative data extracted on May 18, 2010 as analysed by Dr Jane Rienks; and outcomes of the online survey conducted from 8th to 17th May 2010.

It should be noted that administrative datasets change annually so differences will be observed between the first two sections of this section. Annual UTAS College reports have included enrolments and results including withdrawals for the same UTAS College units offered to the community thus there are missing values when participation by College/senior secondary school is identified. The data extraction used by Dr Rienks omitted withdrawals. In addition attempting to understand UTAS pathways, the destinations and performance of UTAS College students; and any relationship between performance in UCP units and UTAS units is necessarily constrained for the following reasons:

1. The pilot has involved 11-26 units of study over three years. Some units are being offered for the first time in 2010. Two units were only offered for a single year.

2. The majority of units offered are from the Faculty of Arts. One Faculty offered a single unit in 2009 and 2010 and another offered a single unit in 2010. This may necessarily limit pathways.

3. Because of the relatively limited time and lower number of students in 2008, what needs to be borne in mind is that first year course structures that require a diverse enrolment may slow the rate at which students can take further units in their UTAS College discipline.

4. The unit prefix has been used as a proxy for discipline. This has limitations because a student may do no units with the same prefixes as their UTAS College units, but may do other units with different prefixes that are offered by the same school, or the same faculty. The proxy being used here is very narrow but the only one readily available for analysis.

Student participation and outcomes

Participation

Table 7 below demonstrates the growth in the UCP over three years whilst the following. Tables 8, 9 and 10 detail the number of units by enrolments and College participation for each of the three years of the pilot. These tables demonstrate the continuing dominance of the visual and performing arts including music in relation to both and numbers of units offered student participation. By 2010 there are fewer units due to the increase in 25% or full year units that align more closely with the TCE year-long subjects and an increase in the breadth of offering through the introduction of Business and Computing units.
Table 7: UCP Student UTAS Destination and Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCP Summary 2008 - 2010</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students:</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Unit Enrolments:</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Participating Schools/Colleges:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units Offered:</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Enrolments till end of semester one only.

** From 2010 language units have been converted into one 25% unit instead of 2X12.5% units as in previous years.

2008 Program

Table 8: UCP 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Participating Colleges/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCP110 Foundation Practical Study</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>Elizabeth College, Rosny College, Newstead College, Launceston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA111 – Core Studies in Art and Design</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hobart College, Elizabeth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSE 120 Introduction to Digital Imaging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hobart College, Elizabeth College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC 101 and HMC102 Chinese</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Elizabeth College, Hobart College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMN 101 and 102 Indonesian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Elizabeth College, Hobart College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ 101 and HMJ 102 - Japanese</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Claremont College, Elizabeth College, Guilford Young College, Hobart College, Marist Regional College, Rosny College, Scotch Oakburn College, St Mary’s College, St Michael’s Collegiate School, St Patrick’s College, The Don College, The Friends’ School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF 101 and HEF 102 French</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Elizabeth College, Guilford Young College, Hobart College, Launceston Church Grammar School, Launceston College, Marist Regional College, Newstead College, Rosny College, Scotch Oakburn College, St Michael’s Collegiate School, The Don College, The Fahan School, The Hutchins School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 11 units                      | 473        | 17 Colleges                                                                                   |
## 2009 Program

### Table 9: UCP 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Participating Colleges/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Financial Decision Making</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hellyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Ensemble 1A</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Claremont, Guilford Young, Hellyer, Hobart, Launceston Grammar, Newstead, Rosny, St Michaels, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Ensemble 1B</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Claremont, Rosny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Ensemble 2B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hutchins, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Musicianship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Guilford Young, Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Practical Study</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>Don, Elizabeth, Newstead, Launceston, Rosny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Practical Study</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Newstead, Launceston, Rosny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonal Theory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Claremont, Friends, Rosny, Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Two-Dimensional Studies</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Launceston, Launceston Grammar, Marist, Newstead, Scotch Oakburn, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Three-Dimensional Studies</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Launceston, Launceston Grammar, Marist, Newstead, Scotch Oakburn, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre Skills 1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Launceston, Marist, Newstead, Scotch Oakburn, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Theatre</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Launceston, Marist, Newstead, Scotch Oakburn, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Dance: Composition and Performance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Launceston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble A</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Launceston, Launceston Church Grammar, Newstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Studies in Art and Design 1B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Hobart, Rosny, St Marys, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Indigenous Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Guilford Young, Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French 1A</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Fahan, Friends, Guilford Young, Hobart, Hutchins, Launceston, Launceston Grammar, Marist, Newstead, Rosny, Scotch Oakburn, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French 1B</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Fahan, Friends, Guilford Young, Hobart, Hutchins, Launceston, Launceston Grammar, Marist, Newstead, Rosny, Scotch Oakburn, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Enrolments</td>
<td>Participating Colleges/School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Financial Decision Making (Semester 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Project</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>Rosny, Newstead, LC, Hobart, Elizabeth, Collegiate, Claremont, Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Practical Study (25% unit)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Calvin, Collegiate, Don, Elizabeth, Fahan, Friends, Guilford Young, Hobart, Hutchins, LC, Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Practical Study</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Don, Elizabeth, Friends, LC, Rosny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Two-Dimensional Studies (Winter School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Three-Dimensional Studies (Summer School)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals, Concepts and Reviewing</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Marist, St Brendan Shaw, Scotch, St Patrick’s, Grammar, LC, Newstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice, Presentation and Documentation</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Don, Hellyer, Marist, St Brendan Shaw, Scotch, St Patrick’s, Grammar, LC, Newstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Studies in Art and Design 1B</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Hobart, Rosny, St Michaels, Calvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia: Enduring Traditions</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Don, Guilford Young, Hobart, Grammar, Rosny, LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (25% unit)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Collegiate, Don, Elizabeth, Hobart, Hutchins, LC, Grammar, Marist, Scotch, Rosny, St Michaels &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (25% unit)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Collegiate, Friends, Hobart, Grammar, Newstead, St Michaels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (25% unit)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hobart &amp; Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2010 Program
Table 10: UCP 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
<th>Participating Colleges/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German 1A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hobart, Launceston, Newstead, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German 1B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Hobart, Launceston, Newstead, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese 1A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Hobart, Scotch Oakburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese 1B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Elizabeth, Hobart, Scotch Oakburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners Japanese 1A</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Don, Elizabeth, Guilford Young, Hobart, Launceston, Marist, Newstead, Rosny, Scotch Oakburn, St Marys, St Patricks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginners Japanese 1B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Don, Elizabeth, Guilford Young, Hobart, Launceston, Marist, Newstead, Rosny, Scotch Oakburn, St Marys, St Patricks, St Michaels Collegiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Units</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>18 School/Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student outcomes

Tables 11 and 12 following detail student results by unit for 2008 and 2009.

#### Table 11: UCP Outcomes 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Study</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>DN</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCP110 Foundation Practical Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA111 – Core Studies in Art and Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSE 120 Introduction to Digital Imaging</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC 101 Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC102 Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMN 101 Indonesian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMN 102 Indonesian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ 101 Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ 102 - Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF 101 French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF 102 -French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: UCP Outcomes 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Study</th>
<th>NN</th>
<th>PP</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>DN</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>WW</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFA103 Accounting and Financial Decision Making</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCE141 Small Ensemble 1A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCE142 Small Ensemble 1B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCE241 Small Ensemble 2B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCM111 Keyboard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCG110 Foundation Musicianship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCP110 Foundation Practical Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCP120 Advanced Practical Study</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT110 Tonal Theory</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFE102 Introduction to Two-Dimensional Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFE103 Introduction to Three-Dimensional Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPB103 Theatre Skills 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPB105 Technical Theatre</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPB107 Contemporary Dance: Composition and Performance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPM111 Ensemble A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSA112 Core Studies in Art and Design 1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB102 Contemporary Indigenous Australia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPA103 Critical and Creative Thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF101 French 1A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEF102 French 1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEG101 German 1A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEG102 German 1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC101 Chinese 1A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMC102 Chinese 1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ101 Beginners Japanese 1A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMJ102 Beginners Japanese 1B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>872</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 following summarises the overall outcomes. In 2008 there was a high proportion of withdrawals (27%) and a high proportion of high distinctions (18%). In 2009 the number of withdrawals fell to 17% and high distinctions to 7% although the number of distinctions rose to 23% in the same year.
Withdrawals

Student destinations at UTAS are more fully discussed in the following section but
the analysis does not include withdrawn students. A separate analysis undertaken
by S&AA in August 2010 has identified seven students in total who have withdrawn
and progressed to UTAS from UCP. Two students withdrew in first year of UTAS
College, completed units in the second year UCP and progressed into Bachelor
Courses (13A & 13J)
Two students withdrew in both first and second year of UCP and progressed into
Bachelor Courses (33A & 63C)
3 students completed units in the first year of UCP and withdrew in the second year
before subsequently progressing into Bachelor Courses (63C, K3E & N3A)

Conclusions

The annual data capture demonstrates that numbers of units offered and student
participation has increased over the three years of the UCP Pilot. Withdrawal
numbers have fallen and student performance overall has improved with the
percentage of students performing at credit level or above rising from 50% in 2008 to
58% in 2009.

These data however must be treated with caution given the limited scope of the units
offered and the short time the program has been offered.

Table 13: Awards Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Distinction</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn/withheld</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCP students - summary histories

This section reports data on the 1000 students who have completed or were currently enrolled in units in UCP at the time of data extraction, May 18, 2010. Withdrawn enrolments (including failed-withdrawn) were not used in the production of these summary histories. The data presented in this section was produced by Jane Rienks.

Demographic data

Participants in UCP were overwhelmingly female (67.8%) and domestic Australian students (98.7%) (Table 14). Approximately half of students were 17 in their first year of study with just under a third younger than this (Table 15). The wide range of ages is partly due to people in older age groups, including existing and former students, studying languages through the UCP.

Table 14: Citizenship categories of students who studied under the UCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ residing in Aus during term</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International students</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian visa</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Age distribution in first year of study of students who studied under the UCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age as of June 30 in first year of UCP study</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+*</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Age range is 20 to 77 years.

UCP study

The following describes summary information on the number of units, discipline area of study and outcomes for students. While students would normally take only one or two units in the UCP, analysis showed that some students have taken surprising numbers of additional units, a result of participation in multiple Programs (College and Community) across multiple semesters a combined with the lack of a process to monitor such enrolments. While the majority of the 1000 students should take and did take one (55.9%) or two (36.5%) units in the UCP, 76 students took more than
this, with three students taking five or six units each, and one student completing seven units (Figure 1).

![Bar chart showing the distribution of units taken by students.]

**Figure 1: Number of units taken by students**

The majority of current and past students have taken units over one year (89.1%) to a maximum of two years. As numbers in the UCP have increased over the years (Table 16) and 416 students are studying under the UCP now, it is likely that the proportion of students studying over two years will increase.

**Table 16: Year student started study under the UCP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First year in the UCP</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total students</strong></td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are Prelude and Overture students whose study retrospectively came under the UCP.*

The areas under which UCP units fall includes music, languages, computing, philosophy, music, visual and performing arts, arts, and business (see Appendix * for how individual units have been classified. Note that individual units may be classified in more than one area depending upon the program under which it is taken). The numbers of students who have studied in each area are given in Table 17. The majority (94.5%) of students studied in a single discipline area, with a total of 55 students taking units in two areas.
Table 17: Area of study of students in the UCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of study in UCP</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority (95.7%) of students took UCP units under an associate degree, with the remainder taking them under a degree code or both. While most (93.5%) of students took UCP units under one POE, 6.3% had two and 0.2% took UCP units under three POE’s. Of the 1000 students, 59 also took up to four units through community programs in the area of arts (24 students), language (2) and music (33).

Performance in the UCP

At the time of data extraction 641 students had completed between one and seven units under the UCP (mean 1.58, median 1.0). The grade point averages were relatively evenly divided between passes, credits and distinctions/high distinctions (Table 18). It should be noted that the grade point average was based on a single unit for 53.7% of the 641 students, and that due to the removal of fail grades it is potentially biased.

Table 18: Grade point average of students who have completed units under the UCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCP grade point average</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range between the lowest and highest grade for students who had completed more than one unit varied between zero and four (lowest a TP and highest an HD) (Table 19). Approximately two thirds of 297 students achieved the same grade for their units, and in 89.2% of students the range between the highest and lowest result was zero or one grade band, suggesting that achievement across UCP studies is relatively consistent in most students.
Table 19: Range between lowest and highest grade for students with more than one completed unit in the UCP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range* between lowest and highest grade</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td>297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The range is the number of grade bands separating the highest and lowest result

Progression to UTAS

Because Year 11 and Year 12 pre-tertiary students can take units under the UCP and are not distinguished in UTAS’s student data systems at least two years should be allowed for UCP students to progress to UTAS. Table 20 shows the number of students progressing to UTAS, by the final year the student was in UCP studies.

Table 20: Final year in UCP by first year at UTAS for students with a UTAS enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final year in UCP</th>
<th>Year started at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Percent who commenced at UTAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at UTAS</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This student has an unusual non-program enrolment

In total 242 students have been enrolled at UTAS, and 207 were enrolled in 2010. Of these 15 students withdrew completely prior to census date. The remaining 227 students are 67.0% female and 97.8% Australian citizens, and have completed between 0 (63.6%) and 16 units. The majority of these students had studied music or languages in UCP (Table 21). In total, 88 students have completed units at UTAS, and 68 were enrolled in 2010, which suggests that 22.7% of students have ceased study before completing their course of study at UTAS.
Table 21: Number of students who progressed to UTAS by area of UCP study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of UCP study</th>
<th>Number of students with past or current enrolments at UTAS</th>
<th>Number of students with completed UTAS units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destination at UTAS

Figure 2 shows the enrolments of these students by the Faculty offering the unit. Unit faculties are used instead of student POE as students may enrol in more than one POE. The majority of enrolments are in the Arts Faculty, which is consistent with the dominance of Arts in offerings through the UCP.

![Figure 2: Enrolments of former UCP students at UTAS by owning Faculty](image)

Table 22 shows the destination faculty of the 227 students who continue to UTAS. Where a student has enrolments across two or three POEs, the faculties owning the POE’s with the most units are shown in combination. In UCP discipline areas with more than 30 students who have progressed to UTAS, the proportion studying in the
same faculty ranges between about 46% and 80%. For all Arts areas, the overall figure is 59%, that is, over half of all students who studied a UCP unit in the Arts continued to study in that faculty after progressing to UTAS. A breakdown of UCP area by POE is provided in the Appendix 17.

Table 22: Faculty of student’s UTAS study by area of UCP study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major faculty of student’s UTAS study</th>
<th>Broad discipline area of UCP study</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArtsBus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ArtsSET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HealthLaw</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in same faculty</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**This number exceeds 227 because students are counted in each UCP area in which they study.

Performance at UTAS

Of the 227 students who progressed to UTAS, 88 have completed at least one unit. The grade point average (GPA) of students’ UCP units were compared with their GPA for their subsequent UTAS units. Withdrawal without academic penalty provisions for UCP students who do not pass UCP units means that fail results (genuine fails and did not completes) are removed from the administrative data and so are not included in this analysis. Because fail grades are removed UCP grade point averages are potentially biased so statistical comparisons need to be treated with caution.

Students had on average 1.9 UCP units (median 2, range 1-6) and 6.4 UTAS units (median 1, range 1-16). The mean grade point average for the entire group of 88 was 5.44 (median 5.25) for UCP studies and 4.78 (median 5.0) for UTAS studies. Students’ UTAS grade point average was on average significantly lower than their UCP grade point average(paired t-test, t=1.53, p<0.0001, 87df, mean difference 0.65). The two grade point averages were also significantly different when tested with a non-parametric alternative (Wilcoxon signed rank test, S=712, p=0.0006, median difference 0.33). This result is not unexpected because of the grading practices in UCP. Table 23 shows the frequency distribution of students’ UCP grade point average by their UTAS grade point average.
Table 23: Grade point average of UCP and UTAS study for students who have progressed to UTAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCP grade point average</th>
<th>UTAS grade point average</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
<th>Percent who failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bad fail*</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High distinction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of students</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Grade point average less than 2.

While the UCP and UTAS grade point averages are positively and moderately correlated (Pearson product-moment correlation, r=0.328, p=0.00018), the $r^2$ is 10.8 which means that the two have only about 11% of shared variance, which is low.

Because of the high incidence of low numbers of completed units contributing to the UTAS grade point average, analyses were repeated for 57 students with more than 4 completed units. Results were similar for the pair t-test but with smaller differences between grade point averages (t=2.21, p=0.0314, 56df, mean difference 0.336), but the non-parametric alternative became non-significant (S=198.5, p=0.0965, median difference 0.22). The correlation results improved slightly (Pearson product-moment correlation, r=0.381, p=0.0035, r^2=14.5).

Continuation in the same discipline(s) taken in the UCP

The question of whether students who progress to UTAS continue within the same discipline area of their UCP study is complicated by the relatively narrow range of unit offerings through UCP and the overall dominance of Arts. A further issue is that many first year programs require a diverse enrolment so limiting the pace at which students can add units within the same area. Because of the relatively low number of students and the limited time that most have studied at UTAS, the actual number of units in the same discipline area at the time that this data was extracted may have little relationship to the final total when their study is completed. Two proxies are used as an approximation for discipline area:

- unit prefix—this is a narrow proxy as individual schools may offer units with different prefixes, so this proxy operates at a sub-school level in at least the Arts Faculty.
- first letter of the unit prefix—this proxy is wider in scope and operates more or less at the level of school (an exception is the Business Faculty). This is subsequently referred to as 'school'.

In order to determine whether there is discipline continuation the unit prefix and first letters within the student’s UTAS College enrolment were recorded and the number of units within the UTAS enrolment which matched the UTAS College unit prefixes or first letters were counted.
Overall, up to the time this data was extracted, a third (33.0%) of students have, or are currently taking, at least one unit with the same unit prefix as their UTAS College unit(s) (Table 24). However, using a broader definition of discipline, over a half (58.1%) took or are taking at least one unit in the same school (Table 25).

### Table 24: Number of UTAS College unit prefixes taken by a student in their UTAS studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of unit prefixes in UCP study</th>
<th>Number of these unit prefixes represented in units taken at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 25: Number of UTAS College unit schools taken by a student in their UTAS studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of schools in UCP study</th>
<th>Number of these schools represented in units taken at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of total</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bearing in mind what has been said previously about students having relatively little time to accumulate large numbers of units, of the 75 students taking units with the same unit prefixes (see Table 24), 36 (48%) have taken between four and eight units with matching prefixes (Table 26). The 132 students taking units in the same school as their UCP studies have taken between one and nineteen units (mean 6.0, median 5.0) in one school represented in their UCP studies. Of these, 83 (62.9%) have taken four or more units in the same school.

For the 200 students who have completed or are enrolled in 4 or more units at UTAS, 15 students (7.5%) have over half their units with the same unit prefixes as their UTAS College units (Table 27), and 76 (38.0%) have over half their units in the same school as their UTAS College units (Table 338).
Table 26: Number of UCP unit prefixes matching with UTAS units, by number of matched UTAS units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of unit prefixes of UCP units matched by units at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of UTAS units whose prefixes match those of units taken in UCP</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Proportion of UTAS units with same unit prefixes as UCP units, by total number of UTAS units for that student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of student's UTAS units whose prefixes match those of their UCP units</th>
<th>Number of units taken or currently enrolled in at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No units with same prefix</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with units with same prefix</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Proportion of UTAS units in the same school as UCP units, by total number of UTAS units for that student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of student's UTAS units in same school as their UCP units</th>
<th>Number of units taken or currently enrolled in at UTAS</th>
<th>Total number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>4-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No units in same school</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-25%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-100%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage with no units in the same school</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3 summarises the major UCP disciplines for the 227 students and the proportion of those who came on to UTAS who continued studying in the discipline, and the proportions with 4 or more, or 8 or more units in the same area. Unit prefixes were grouped into disciplines for the analysis for this figure. Numbers of students were 108 for music, 75 for languages, 38 for visual and performing arts and 18 for philosophy. Languages and visual and performing arts in UCP had the highest proportion of students continuing to study in the discipline at UTAS.

Figure 3: Discipline area of UCP study by proportion of students who have studied any units, 4+ or 8+ units in the same discipline

Conclusion

The analysis of enrolments data suggests that UCP students do successfully articulate to UTAS and a good proportion go on to study in the same school as their UCP units. However, caution must be taken in drawing any conclusions at this stage because of the short time frame which necessarily limits the time in Degree programs for former UCP students. As also noted the number of students who have articulated at this stage is also limited. A complete picture will be possible in several years when longitudinal data will be available for more students and for longer periods. Ongoing monitoring is recommended.
Online Survey Outcomes

Introduction

An online survey was used to gather views from four key stakeholder groups involved with the University College Program. These groups were senior secondary school or college teachers who have had students involved with or who have themselves taught in the UCP; senior secondary school or college principals of schools who have had students participating in the UCP; UTAS staff who have taught and/or been involved in the development or delivery of UCP units; and UTAS Heads of Schools who have had units delivered in the UCP.

The survey questions were developed in response to questions and issues identified throughout the project and were tested with an internal and external stakeholder sample before being finalised.

As the four stakeholder groups had different types and levels of involvement, a generic survey was altered to accommodate these differences, resulting in four separate surveys being distributed (Appendices 3, 4, 5& 6).

The survey was created using the Qaltrics online survey tool and requests to participate were sent via an email which included a unique login pathway for each individual respondent. Participants were given 10 days (8th-17th May 2010) in which to reply, at which point the surveys were closed. Individual responses are confidential.

It has been possible to combine the responses from these two groups into unique survey summaries; one for college/school staff and principals (Appendix 7) and one for UTAS staff and Heads of School (Appendix 8).

In addition, there were common questions and themes within all four surveys, and where these have occurred responses have been tallied and a combined survey summary report produced (Appendix 9) which forms the basis for data presented in the Survey Outcomes section of this report.

In producing the graphs for the summary reports, two methods have been used. Where a Likert scale has been used for survey question responses, the response scale 0-4 has been used.

In questions where participants have been asked to indicate a preferred preference from a given number of options, scores have been totalled and represented as a percentage of total responses.

Seventy-eight people attempted the survey (36 senior secondary staff, 18 principals, 18 UTAS staff, 6 Heads of School).

College/school staff with students involved in the following areas responded to the survey: Asian Languages, Conservatorium of Music, European Languages, HITLab (Human Interface Technology Laboratory in the School of Computing and Information Systems), Philosophy and Visual & Performing Arts (North). No responses were received from college/school staff with students in: Aboriginal Studies, Business/Accounting, and the Tasmanian School of the Arts (south).

UTAS staff from the following areas responded to the survey: Asian Languages and Studies, Business/Accounting, Conservatorium of Music, European Languages, Philosophy, Asian Studies, Visual and Performing Arts (north), School of the Arts (south).
Survey Responses

UCP value

The majority of respondents from both college/schools and UTAS agreed or strongly agreed that the program was valued by both students and staff of colleges/schools.

College/school staff and principals both felt that the program was valued slightly less by UTAS than by the college/schools themselves and their students.

![Figure 4: Value of the University College Program (n=57)](image)

UCP Awareness

There was consistently less support for how well the UCP was known and understood by all survey respondents. UTAS staff was more confident than college/school staff about how well the program was known by college/schools and their students.

One UTAS respondent commented that “Faculty administration were very enthusiastic about the UCP but most schools and academics much less so”.

![Figure 5: Awareness of the University College Program (n=57)](image)
**Satisfaction with elements of the UCP**

This question had differing response options for the college/school teachers and principals and for the UTAS staff and HOS.

Whilst the majority of responses for individual elements of this question from school/college teachers and principals (n=39) fell within the Very Satisfied or Satisfied range, there were areas where multiple Dissatisfieds were recorded. These areas include: opportunities for you to be involved in the program and decision making; relationship with TCE (n=7), relationship with TCE (n=7), opportunities for you to collaborate with UTAS colleagues in your discipline (n=6); assessment methodologies and processes (n=6); and information and communication about student outcomes (n=8).

The overall scores and comments from college/school staff reflect that there are still areas of the program that need improving, including student difficulties with using MyLO, slow communication of results, administrative procedures problems, a lack of clarity about UTAS assessment requirements and unit evaluation processes. One learning area leader suggested that key learning area staff be briefed each year by UTAS staff at the beginning of the year to ensure better communication.

**Figure 6: School/college satisfaction with elements of the UCP (n=39)**
UTAS staff and HOS were generally satisfied with unit evaluation, organisation and delivery but were less satisfied (dissatisfied or strongly dissatisfied) with enrolment and administration (n=6), resourcing (n=5) and support for UTAS staff teaching in the program (n=4) and students (n=4). One UTAS staff noted that problems with enrolment and administration had been extremely detrimental to their program. Another commented that dissatisfaction was “self induced” arising out of the need to fit the UCP in with other commitments.

Figure 7: UTAS satisfaction with elements of the University College Program (n=15)
No. of Units

The majority (n=35) of all respondents favoured students being able to take two UTAS units per year in the UCP. One unit was the second most popular choice. No principals recommended that students should do more than 2 units per year.

![Bar chart showing the number of pre-tertiary students who believe a student should be able to undertake one semester unit per year in this program.]

**Figure 8: How many one semester units do you believe a pre-tertiary student should be able to undertake per year in this program? (N=51)**

The majority (n=29) of respondents also favoured students being able to count two units from the UCP towards their TCE results.

![Bar chart showing the number of pre-tertiary students who believe students should count two units towards their TCE results.]

**Figure 9: How many one-semester units do you believe pre-tertiary students should be able to count towards their TCE results in this program? (n=43)**
Student selection method

Teacher/college recommendation was favoured by both school/college and UTAS respondents as the preferred method of student selection for the UCP although one college/school respondent noted that this could be difficult with year 11 students as they had not yet had the chance to get to know them well.

![Figure 10: Ranking of preferred student selection methods (n=51)](image)

Responsibilities

The majority preference for all the tasks listed was for joint responsibility to be taken by both the college/school sector and by UTAS as shown in the table below:

**Table 29: Who do you think should be responsible for the following tasks? (n=51)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who do you think should be responsible for the following tasks?</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School/College</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding which students are eligible for the program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding which and how many units a student would do</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing pastoral care to students in the program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining which units would be offered as part of the program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum content of units offered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication with students about the program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication with parents about the program</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and running information sessions about the program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, in all but one case (Deciding which and how many units a student would do) which showed an even preference, there were clear distinctions shown in second preferences as follows, perhaps indicating which organisation should take a lead role in the task:

Table 30: Second preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>Responsible organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciding which students are eligible for the program</td>
<td>College/school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing pastoral care to students in the program</td>
<td>College/school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determining which units would be offered as part of the program</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum content of units offered</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication with students about the program</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating communication with parents about the program</td>
<td>College/school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling and running information sessions about the program</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit evaluation</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>UTAS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Program Elements

There was general agreement about the importance of various elements of the program, with ‘Challenging and extending high achieving students’ coming out on top for both college/school and UTAS respondents. ‘Encouraging students to go to UTAS’ and ‘Encouraging students to pursue a particular area of study at university’ were seen by both groups as the least important aspects of the program.

Figure 11: Importance of key program elements (n=49)
Student Motivation

The top four motivating factors were consistent across all respondent groups. The only significant difference shown between school/college respondents and UTAS respondents is that 'Improving TCE performance' was 4th on the UTAS list, but 9th on the school/colleges list.

Figure 12: Key student motivation factors (n=48)
Understanding of program elements

Both school/college respondents and UTAS respondents believed that they had a good understanding of the UCP aims and objectives. Program rules and regulations Assessment processes were less well understood by both school/college and UTAS staff and Assessment processes were the least understood element according to school/college staff.

Figure 13: Understanding of identified program elements (n=56)

Withdrawing without Academic Penalty

This element was seen as important or very important by a clear majority of both school/college and UTAS respondents (n=41). However, there were several comments made both for and against the practice, including that it was sensible to allow this practice given that UCP students were still young and exploring this level of study and that the main focus for students at this level should be their TCE studies not UTAS commitments. Reservations included that this practice did not encourage students to value their UTAS experience and that it was inequitable with other first year UTAS students. Several comments indicated there was some confusion about the rules regarding students’ withdrawals in this program.
Figure 14: Importance to students of the current practise of allowing withdrawal without academic penalty at any point or when students do not meet a minimum standard of achievement (n=49)

UCP Unit Outcomes

Degree awards were favoured as the most desirable outcome for successful UCP participation. Support was strongest by UTAS staff for this option. Several respondents felt that if students were doing courses equivalent to first year degree students, then they should receive equivalent credit. There was also comment that UCP units should be eligible for any of the options listed.

Figure 15: Success in a UCP unit should count towards (n=49)

Degree + Diploma

There was general support for the idea of the UCP encouraging students to undertake a Diploma along with their main degrees. One UTAS respondent commented that whilst this was a good idea, it would take a serious commitment to raise awareness and understanding of this option to ensure year 11 and 12 students adopted it going forward with their UTAS studies.
Figure 16: Response to the idea that UCP has the potential to encourage students to undertake a Degree plus a Diploma to ‘add value’ to their university studies. (n=49)

Importance and satisfaction levels with program elements

On campus workshops, interaction with lecturers and school visits were seen by both respondent groups as key elements of the program. Colloquiums were more highly valued by school/college respondents than UTAS respondents.

Figure 17: How important are the following elements to the UCP? (n=50)

Current provision of these elements indicates a generally lower sense of adequacy than the equivalent importance of the element. MyLO access and support and interaction with other university students both fell below the ‘neutral’ line. Comments from school/college staff included that the Colloquium was too long and that interaction between university lecturers and college staff should be further developed. The Step-up program was not known by 13 of the 35 school/college respondents.
UTAS staff and Heads of Schools were asked some questions in relation to the program which had no corresponding question to school/college staff or principals.

UTAS staff only (n=10) (not Heads of School) were asked whether they found working the program rewarding. Seven responded that they did, two were neutral and one indicated they did not find it rewarding.

Staff members were also asked if they found the program of benefit to participating students. Nine responded that it was of benefit and one response was neutral.

Heads of School (n=4) were asked if they found it beneficial to their school. Two replied that they did, one found it of limited benefit and one found it neutral.

All UTAS staff were asked which format they felt worked best in the program, with results as below:

---

**Figure 18: How adequate is the current level of provision in the following elements of the UCP? (n=35)**

**Figure 19: Which format works best for the delivery of the UCP? (n=14)**
Benefits of the University College Program

Participants were asked to indicate three main benefits of the University College Program. Responses were provided by UTAS Heads of Schools (n=4); School Principals (n=9); University Staff (n=10); and School Staff (n=25).

Survey responses indicated that the program:

- provides an opportunity for students to improve their Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR);
- offers coursework that is assessed as a contribution to students’ TCE score;
- offers coursework that earns credit points for University courses;
- provides HECS savings
  - HECS scholarships / HECS free credit points towards University courses;
- provides inspiration, encouragement, motivation and extension for bright / high achieving students;
- encourages students to consider tertiary education as a realistic future option – provides students with an experience that enables them to “see that they have the ability to study at university level”;
- demystifies university life and culture – introduces students to university learning and teaching methodologies and expectations;
- creates links/pathways between School and University – coursework, the conservatorium, campus familiarisation, procedural processes – MyLO;
- builds relationships between School and University – lecturers, teachers and students – professional and social interaction;
- provides professional development for school teachers in the HIT Lab (Human Interface Technology Laboratory Australia);
- provides an extension to school language programs and possible exposure to native speakers of other languages. It provides continuity in a language subject where there may be a 12 months gap because of TCE restrictions;
- the creative arts program develops useful career skills and knowledge;
- enables students to continue with studies at college since their courses have been withdrawn by TQA (Tasmanian Qualifications Authority);
- enables shared (course) content, teaching and assessment practices;
- increases the standard of performing arts in Tasmania;
- connects UTAS to the community in very “real and meaningful ways”; and
- supports learning into the future and breaks down barriers between the pre-tertiary and tertiary sectors making UTAS more a part of the general learning community – a collaborative focus on student engagement and learning.
Responses from school/college staff centred principally on the benefits previously canvassed, focusing on the opportunity to challenge capable students and introduce them to university-level life and study. There were a range of comments which had not previously been identified as benefits of the program, these were that the UCP:

- Provided students opportunities to interact with native speakers in language courses;
- Provided an opportunity to get credit for a first year language unit where previously they would have just gone into a 2nd year unit without the first year credit;
- Enabled students to study subjects not available or discontinued in the TCE;
- Introduced students to online learning through MyLO;
- Provided professional development opportunity for school/college teachers;
- Increased the standard of performing arts in Tasmania.

Response by UTAS Staff focuses strongly on the benefits of interaction between school/colleges and UTAS and the role of UCP in breaking down barriers and creating shared understandings of the higher education environment by the school/college sector.

Limitations of the University College Program

Participants were asked indicate three main limitations of the University College Program. Responses were provided by UTAS Heads of Schools (n=3); School Principals (n=9); University Staff (n=10); and School Staff (n=23).

Issues raised as program limitations are as follows:

- inequitable access to courses – schools not within commuting distance of a university campus (Hobart, Launceston or Burnie) are disadvantaged;
- lack of efficient coordination between schools and university – enrolment procedures, course information, assessment procedures, results notifications;
- time constraints and workloads for both university and school staff that preclude adequate development of curriculum and course materials;
- inconsistent pedagogy and assessment criteria / processes;
- limitation to the ‘optional’ learning areas – Maths, English, History – if included world provide a powerful support;
- College students may view the program as a very easy means of obtaining credit for a full first year UTAS subject with very little work/effort involved on their part;
- low TCE point allocation for some courses (e.g. Arts program) is a disincentive;
- “a thinly veiled marketing strategy” to get “bums on seats” – may increase numbers in first year units but no evidence of flow through to enrolments;
- pre-tertiary courses are taught at a similar level to university courses - demonstrates a ‘dumbing-down’ of University;
• little evidence that the UTAS College Program creates better outcomes for students than similar school-based courses;
• units often poorly organised or at too low a level which puts good students off attending UTAS;
• limited access to UTAS staff, limited on-campus opportunities, limited range of offerings;
• problems with access to MyLO and Library facilities;
• time management – students often have a complex range of commitments; study, work, travel, sport and social – additional weekend workshops and on-campus study can be difficult to organise;
• lack of support within schools for program establishment – additional pressure on teachers with already heavy teaching loads;
• timetabling difficulties;
• lack of collaboration with School personnel – teachers need to have common understanding and goals – need professional development opportunities – need better development of course materials;
• poor feedback mechanisms to schools re student progress;
• lack of scholarships for deserving international students;
• inequitable funding arrangements and accreditation outcomes for students – first year university students pay HECS and have failures recorded on academic transcripts, but for school students UTAS College Programs are HECS free, and failure or withdrawal are not recorded;
• insufficient infrastructure and resources to fulfil a function that has become increasingly more complex – needs better funding and staffing to achieve best outcomes.

Issues identified in this section by school/colleges staff centred around the difficulty of fitting this program in with the already high demands on both teacher and students in the year 11/12 environment. Issues of adequate resourcing both physical and human were raised. Other comments include that the connections between UTAS and school/college staff could be better, the opportunity to participate in the decision making process could be increased; and a greater variety of units could be offered, particularly those outside the arts area.

School/college principals identified issues relating to access for non-metropolitan based students, a lack of differentiation between the standard of year 12 courses and first year UTAS units offered in UCP, low points recognition in TCE, enrolment and timetabling issues, particularly that they did not always suit the school/college environment. One principal felt that the UCP was a thinly veiled marketing attempt by UTAS and, quoted a UTAS staff reference to the ‘bums on seat’ aspect of UCP. This principal also felt that school/colleges were able to offer more enriching learning opportunities for students than UTAS and felt overall that there was little evidence that the UCP had created beneficial outcomes in those subject areas.

UTAS staff members were also concerned about ensuring the program was adequately supported and resourced and that UTAS was sending out a mixed
message with the program if it failed to do so. There was also concern about proper support for staff from their relevant departments and the difficulties working with schools/colleges who systems did not necessarily mesh with those of UTAS. There was concern expressed about the organisation and coordination of the program. One respondent felt that year11/12 students were not emotionally or cognitively mature enough for the content and self-directed learning required by UTAS study.

UTAS Heads of School comments also included concerns about organisational issues, the net benefit to UTAS in terms of student impressions and enrolments if the program is not delivered properly, inequities with other first year students (HECS feels, withdrawing without penalty), flow-on enrolments and general confusion about a range of issues associate with the program.

**Recommendations for the future of the University College Program**

Participants were asked for their recommendations about the future of the University College Program. Responses were provided by UTAS Heads of Schools (n=3); School Principals (n=3); University Staff (n=6); and School Staff (n=12).

A summary of recommendations is listed below:

- Expand the program to provide equitable access for all schools;
- Attend to the TCE points/score problem;
- Improve central administrative processes and support – enrolments, course information dissemination, student services, timely publication of results;
- Facilitate more effective collaboration and communication between UTAS staff and college/academy teachers;
- Enable/encourage joint development of coursework and assessment criteria – review current assessment processes;
- Establish a database of College teachers and units taught;
- Establish QA standards and framework – appoint QA administrative support;
- Provide more on-campus experiences for students – a second colloquium, more workshops – better delivery;
- Offer a wider range of courses;
- Target publicity to year 10 level;
- Increase opportunity for informal engagement with schools to facilitate long term relationships and enculturation (rather than just enrol students) e.g. encourage school formals, debates or other events to be held on-campus; enable access to library; organise academic visits to schools.
Future of the UCP

Respondents to this question indicated a high level of support for the program continuing and/or expanding, but with minor modifications (n=40), some favoured continuing only with major modifications (n=7) and only one respondent felt that the programs should not continue at all.
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Figure 20: Recommendation for the future of the University College Program (n=48)

Additional Survey Comments

Participants were asked to add any further comments or suggestions they may have on how UTAS and the senior secondary sector might further the aims of UTAS College as outlined in the preamble of the online survey. Responses were provided by UTAS staff (n=3) and school staff (n=2).

One UTAS staff member thought the College Program to be ‘visionary’ aiming for “increased retention and participation rates, demystifying UTAS as an institution and strengthening relationships with the education profession. It is REAL for young people, supported by educators and valued by students.” Another staff member thought that students should be made aware that the College Language Program can articulate through to a Diploma of Language at UTAS even if they go on to study other degrees, e.g. Law/Science, “so that the students don’t consider the College Program as a one-off involvement.” The third comment essentially focused negatively on the length of the survey and the anticipated diversity of responses given the range of participants targeted by the survey.

One school staff member suggested that “it would be very helpful if a committee of representatives from UTAS and schools and colleges was formed to oversee this program.” Another staff member suggested more opportunities for school students to undertake units from the university programme with the combined support of school and university staff and cited the Philosophy unit as a model.
Qualitative Analysis
Qualitative Analysis

Student Focus Groups
The student experience of the UTAS College Program (UCP) was explored through four broad themes: overall experience; skills and abilities; learning; and future development of the program. Findings from the analysis cannot be generalised because they represent the views of a very small cohort of students. Also, given the range of study units offered within the University College Program this cohort is not a representative sample. None-the-less the views expressed do reflect themes that have emerged in other research and information gathered throughout the three year pilot phase of this program.

Background information for UTAS programs undertaken by Focus Group participants

By definition the students participating in UCP ‘are capable and motivated students [who] undertake university study either in conjunction with or alongside their studies towards the Tasmanian Certificate of Education (TCE) or the International Baccalaureate (IB)’ (Langworthy & Jarvis, 2010, p. 13).

When the university unit is taken in conjunction with TCE, students are enrolled in a TCE pre tertiary level 3 subject the curriculum for which correlates directly with the UTAS first year unit. To satisfy the requirements of the correlated UTAS unit the student undertakes extension work which is provided by and assessed by the university. Students must achieve a minimum CA result in their TCE study to be eligible to pass the UTAS unit. When the university unit is taken alongside the TCE the students study a complete UTAS unit either through the High Achievers Program (HAP) or with a school or campus based facilitated unit (Langworthy & Jarvis, 2010, p. 13).

The students who participated in the Focus Groups studied UCP units in the following categories:

- **The School of Visual and Performing Arts (SVPA) - Faculty of Arts**
  
  The School of Visual and Performing Arts is located at the new Academy of Arts at Inveresk. The SPVA offered an ‘extension program for selected gifted high achieving students studying visual arts, drama or theatre performance at pre-tertiary level in Year 11 or 12; or who were participating in major College Productions or Theatre Performances including conventional theatre, performance and hybrid arts throughout the year’ (UTAS, 2010a).

  Units undertaken by Focus Group participants included: **Theatre Skills 1 (FPB103)** – ‘Students explore their potential for performance through the application of various techniques drawn from contemporary approaches to acting, voice production and movement’ (UTAS, 2010b); and **Technical Theatre (FPB 105)** – ‘Focuses on stage management and involves workshops, discussions and seminars concerning: responsibilities and channels of communication within each department and the overall production; duties and skills required by support staff, and organisational skills appropriate to the preparation and execution of each theatrical department. Each workshop/discussion session explores one or more facets of stage management. Students gain practice in the safety procedures of responsible theatre operation. Each student selects a technical role within a production and oversees all associated duties in the execution of that department’ (UTAS, 2010c).
Four students in the Focus Group discussions undertook units offered by the SVPA.

- **The Conservatorium of Music - Faculty of Arts**

Units undertaken by Focus Group participants included: *Foundation Musicianship (FCG110)* ‘is designed to develop musicianship skills for tertiary music students. The unit introduces foundational level keyboard techniques (non-piano majors), accompaniment (piano majors) and musicianship skills: sight-singing/reading in treble and bass clefs, melodic, rhythmic and harmonic dictations, error detection and rhythmic sight-reading’ (UTAS, 2010d); *Foundation Theory (FCG120)* ‘introduces the fundamentals of music theory; Recognition of notes in four clefs, key signatures, intervals, chords and tonal harmony, simple and compound rhythmic concepts as well as an introduction to simple diatonic voice-leading are the fundamentals covered in this unit. It introduces students to elements of theory that will allow for further advanced study of the development of tonal and non-tonal theory in Western music’ (UTAS, 2010e); and *Foundation Practical Studies (FCP110)* ‘provides a course of vocal, instrumental or compositional study, covering both technique and repertoire. Composition students will be guided in the development of an individual style of composition in a variety of musical genres. A program of study will be established on an individual basis with regard to the needs and stage of development of each student, a wide range of styles and idioms being introduced. Emphasis will be placed on progressive development throughout the duration of the course (UTAS, 2010f).

Three students in the Focus Group discussions undertook units offered by the Conservatorium.

- **The School of Philosophy - Faculty of Arts**

*Critical and Creative Thinking (HPA103)* was offered as a single UTAS unit during 2009. This unit has subsequently been withdrawn from the UCP program. The unit aims were ‘to equip students with practical skills for evaluating arguments, explanations and assertions.’ The focus of the unit was on ‘contemporary examples from everyday life’ and students were encouraged to apply learning to situations outside the classroom (Coady, 2010).

Two students in the Focus Group discussions undertook this unit. Both found the unit to be challenging but also very useful in assisting with critical thought and the application of this skill to a range of intellectual activities.

- **Languages Programs - Faculty of Arts**

First Year UTAS language units in Japanese (HMJ101), Chinese (HMC101), French (HEF101) and German (HEG101) were included in the UCP program.

Four students in the Focus Group discussions undertook units offered in the Language Programs. One of these students undertook four language units.
Student Focus Groups Outcomes

Overall experience of the University College Program

The focus group discussion opened with a conversation about the positive aspects of the program. Generally most participants felt that the early exposure to the University of Tasmania, through the various program activities and interchanges, facilitated an easier and less stressful transition to university and gave them a starting advantage over other students. The impact of the program seems to have: expanded their learning opportunities; ‘demystified’ University; and facilitated the first steps in building a relationship with the institution and the people – both lecturers and fellow students – they would encounter when they began their first year of tertiary studies.

Question 1a: ‘What would you identify as the most positive aspects of your participation in the University College Program?’

The students who undertook units of study with the School of Visual and Performing Arts were particularly enthusiastic about the colloquium. They seemed to really enjoy the on-campus experience. It provided them with an opportunity to interact with students from other schools with similar study interests; provided a broad exposure to different aspects of visual and performing arts; and enabled feedback from people other than their teachers at school.

I found at the colloquium learning about the different [aspects of] theatre [production was really interesting] – like doing some stuff with the lighting and seeing how the costumes are effected by different lighting. All of that...side of things that you don’t usually...get to look too much into – you don’t look into all the technical stuff behind it when you are doing a theatre course at school. You’ve got to focus too much on the performance side of things. So it was interesting to have a look at that. Useful sort of knowledge to put away for future reference (Burnie FG, Line 143-148).

 Probably the most positive thing for me was...we participated in a colloquium at Inveresk and so for me...I, we got to experience a lot of different areas of theatre. I’d already done a lot of performing and backstage but for a lot of the other students I think that was beneficial for them because...a lot of them hadn’t done backstage stuff so they started to learn about that as well. But...I guess it was good for me because I got to...get to know and bond with some of the people I knew I’d be working with [even though] not all the students that participated in that went through to do the course this year but I got to know some of them and also some of the lecturers that I’d be working with. ...I think that it was like a stepping stone into how it works (Launceston FG, Line 73-81).

Yes mine [positive experience] was the colloquium as well – it just gave us a good head start to see what was expected, and what we were going to do, and just a little taster of all the studios that we can work in (Launceston FG, Line 87-88).

For one student the experience of being involved in the school production seemed more important than the overall mark she achieved on completion of the unit with the Conservatorium:

I didn’t get that high a mark but I wasn’t really expecting it [because] I wasn’t doing anything really sort of major in the production (Burnie FG, Line 63-64).

Students studying Languages appreciated the opportunity to speak with more advanced and/or native language speakers. One student thought that the cultural aspect of the Chinese program was really interesting and ‘fun’ but the unit did not increase her language skills; and a German student learned a lot of English grammar that he thought would be very useful but was not happy with the structure of the course (see later comments):
[French] It was really beneficial to TCE French at the same time [because] when [you are studying] a language you need as much practice as you can get - it is all beneficial – so having the extra - we did weekend workshops and extra assignments – it was just putting more effort into the language I guess (Launceston FG, Line 56-59).

[Chinese] I think it is a good idea to have those fun cultural things that we did have because it does help motivate you to learn. You think this is a cool place I want to learn the language to go there – [but] more of the things [language skills] you need to help you get to second year would be good (Hobart FG, Line 520-523)

[German] I think also that [the benefit of] learning German was – it is a Germanic language just like English - so I actually learnt a lot of how the grammar works in English...(Hobart FG, line 721-722)

The students who studied Critical and Creative Thinking found the unit of study challenging but valued being stretched intellectually and could see how the skills learned could have wide application:

I suppose there are a lot of positives out of it [the UCP] and the unit that they offered to us - the Critical and Creative Thinking unit was actually really helpful for a lot of other stuff as well like essay writing and all that sort of thing – learning how to argue properly and learning how to pick up the fallacies and arguments and all sorts of stuff – it was really interesting (Hobart FG, Line 94-97).

We actually used to get together outside of the online sort of learning as a group once every couple of weeks to talk through stuff ourselves...we’d organise that ourselves...we actually had...a teacher at Guilford and I believe [he] was the one that sort of organised it to begin with at the university with the Philosophy School and everything but he actually left at the end of last year but he was coming back intermittently to meet with us at Hobart campus to do it with our group which was good was really good (Hobart FG, Line 186-196).

I found that with the critical thinking part of it I could relate it back to my studies in year 12 as well...so the methods that we learnt we could relate them back to our actual studies. I was able to do that last year and then only do three subjects first semester this year. I had a bit of leeway so I could focus more and then just gradually work myself into the whole full semester. [Interviewer: And has that worked for you?] Yes it has been less stressful. [Interviewer: So you think you have an advantage over other students by only doing three units instead of four?]. Well in some ways yes [because] it is less stress and you’ve got less to focus on and you can put more effort in to those three instead of the four (Launceston FG, Line 89-94).

Indeed many of the students, across the range of UCP units studied, valued the positive impact on TCE scores and the acquired credit for UTAS units upon enrolment in an aligned UTAS Degree:

Well I think for example with German they say that you have to get a HA for college standard to get into second year and I think with the College junior program like if you don’t get that HA but still get a pass or something you at least get into second year because I must admit if I had to do first year German this year I would have been really bored out of my mind doing all the basics stuff again. So I think it just gives you a safety net if you kind of go really badly in the exams for College - it gives you just a safety net just to be able to get into second year still (Hobart FG, Line 65-70).

It was sort of a little bit of extension as well during the first half of the year when really my TCE studies hadn’t ramped up yet so it was something I could put my energy into – and at the end of the day I also got a unit which is HECS free and I can use in my degree now – I’m actually going afterwards up to the Economics building to find out how to get it fitted into my degree or if they can (Hobart FG, Line 90-94).
Well I knew I wanted to do music so having done the two foundation subjects just made it easier to go into the Bachelor otherwise I would have taken an extra year to do those two subjects [because] they were only in semester one semester two (Hobart FG, Line 100-102).

It was just putting more effort into the language I guess – so greater outcomes for TCE French as well as getting a good mark for the University program (Launceston FG, Line 56-59)

Well I auditioned for our school production before I knew about this and we were told about half way through rehearsals that we could count it as a uni subject and I just basically did it because some time in the future I can do only three subjects instead of four and I will be able to work more instead of just study full time (Launceston FG, Line 62-64).

Currently it’s given me the opportunity to not have to do one of the units for either this year or the coming year which I’m gonna find really helpful next year during first semester because we’ve got a major production on and lots of other work so having that chance for a bit if time off will be really good already having done one unit (Burnie FG, Line 109-112).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

As a musician, it allowed me to spend more time practising and less time doing a heavy load of year 12 subjects, which allowed me to improve more throughout the year than if I hadn't done the course.

The chance to improve my French and extend my skills further than what my course at college could accommodate for.

As we were not required to partake in any extra activities, we were able to simply enjoy the experience within rehearsal and performing. It also provided us with feedback and a performance score, which allowed us to reflect on our performance and possibly improve in the future.

That it gave me the opportunity to gain a head start in my studies for university.

Getting the chance to 'try before you buy'. This experience was a good first hand look at UTAS life and extremely advantageous when I was deciding where and what to do after college.

Question 1b: ‘What would you identify as the most challenging aspects of your involvement in the University College Program?’

For many of the focus group participants the challenging aspects of the University College Program seem to coalesce around a lack of clarity regarding course guidelines/information, assessment tasks, and assessment criteria. Some also had issues with workshop content and/or the structure of the workshops. Other issues raised as challenging were workload and transport.

Journal writing was a task that caused quite a lot of uncertainty for students. It appears that initially they were not well instructed/informed about the process of writing journals and/or the assessment criteria:

Probably the journal because we’'d been told about it in April but like the whole year up until probably September/October we hadn’t been given any guidelines and I don’t know if that was the general program, or if it was just the theatre people out at Inveresk unorganised, or even if it was just LC not communicating information to us, but we had no idea what was meant to be included in these journals or how they were meant to be...
presented or written or whatever - that was quite challenging - we just kind of all winged it (Launceston FG, Line 133-138)

We had no idea what was expected of us (Launceston FG, Line 140)

The journal – I’m not very good at keeping journals [nervous laugh] – and just trying to think of things to write and that without trying to do it regularly – I think was my main problem (Burnie FG, Line 66-67)

Well our teachers like at school told us what we should like be looking at [with the journal] but not from the Uni we didn’t really have much help with it (Launceston FG, Line 147-148)

For students in the Performing Arts the assessment process caused some anxiety and/or uncertainty:

I don’t know I found with my theatre one it was a little bit nervy sort of having other people come in from university to...watch you for your exam and stuff. ...I found that a bit challenging – it was sort of my first year doing a theatre sort of subject and along with having the examiners and stuff there and we also had people assessing and something else too so it was a bit like – well! (Burnie FG, Line 71-76)

[Interviewer: So the idea of being assessed by the university staff and so on wasn’t a problem for you?] Not really we only really saw the University people [three times] in the whole thing...they came to two rehearsals and they came and watched one show - and I sort of thought well they have only been here three times they don't actually know who I am so I didn’t know how they were assessing me or like anyone else. They didn’t ask questions of us so I don’t know how they went about their assessment. [Interviewer: So you didn’t understand how they were doing that?] Not really I just sort of filled out some forms. [Interviewer: So how did you go in the unit?]. I think I got a pass but pretty much everyone else who I talked to said they got passes too - so I don’t know if that was just what they gave everyone (Launceston FG, Line 153-164)

For one Language student the Chinese unit she undertook in 2008 was quite unsatisfactory. She did not feel it gave her the necessary language skills to progress to second year Chinese and saw no value in the credit she was given after completing the UCP. She insisted the University allow her to do the first year unit when she enrolled in her Degree course:

It was a lot of cultural things and that was good but that wasn’t enough to prepare me to go into second year Chinese and it actually gave [me] a bit of trouble [because] this year I went back into first year Chinese (and back in 2008 we didn’t really realise that that was counted towards university)...[and] they said you can’t do that so I had to go to five different people and I was about to go to the Dean but luckily my Head of School said 'no, no I’ll get you in it’s ok’ - so it was good but it was more trouble than what it was worth (Hobart FG, Line 111-119).

For a German student the structure of the weekend workshops was exhausting:

I think the most challenging thing really was that on each Saturday it was just really full on for about six hours of German just in one hit. I just found that really in a way tiring to do just six hours just full on but I guess at the end of the day I guess I didn’t mind it but when I was there I was thinking when will this end.....Yes it just felt too long...[because] you really became quite tired after five hours and then you had to do a test and when you’re thinking will I be able to even pass this test because I’m just so tired (Hobart FG, Line 166-173).

Not being able to continue French at UTAS Launceston was disappointing for one student; and for another the weekend workshops were challenging because the language proficiency of participants was too divergent.
...the fact that you can’t do French in Launceston...and if I can do first year French while studying at TCE level and still pass it with flying colours then turn up at University and not be able to do it by distance – because I did the whole first year via distance – yet they say no I’m sorry you can’t do anymore via distance – that’s finished. That’s my rant for today (Launceston FG, Line 176-181).

There wasn’t really any challenges, perhaps if anything when we had our weekend workshops they were the slightly dysfunctional because of the varying levels. There were people who had just come into pre-tertiary French and people who had been studying it for three or four years at the same high level so it was a bit hard to sort of engage in class activities with so many varying levels but that...wasn’t like a huge part of it (Launceston FG, Line 169-173)

The structure of the Critical and Creative Thinking unit also seemed to create particular difficulties for students wanting to connect and discuss course content. Both students who passed this unit felt the challenging aspect was the online delivery and difficulties with MyLO:

The fact that the unit was 100% online and that really needed a lot of discipline to sort of keep up with everything and it was really easy to say ‘ah I’ve got a lot on this week I’ll do two weeks next week’ but you end up not being able to do that. ...we actually used to get together outside of the online sort of learning as a group once every couple of weeks to talk through stuff ourselves so we’d organise that ourselves (Hobart FG, Line 180-184, 186-187).

The discussions I found [were the most challenging] because it was a bit hard because everyone was trying to get the thing started but you get started and then kind of drop off – and...[Interviewer: Was that online?] That was online and also we had afternoon tutes and not a lot of people turned up so it was a bit hard to get a really good discussion going about the focus questions and everything when not many people were there. ...[Interviewer: so actually engaging in the discussion when students mightn’t necessarily turn up for the after things but and online was problematic as well?] Yes [Interviewer: Do you thing that was because you were distant?] In some ways yes and our school computers had trouble getting online. [Interviewer: With MyLO?] With MyLO [because] half the things we couldn’t actually access because of the policies and that. [Interviewer: so you haven’t found the same experience on campus?] No it’s like completely different – on campus is better. (Launceston FG, Line 102-120).

Transport was an issue for one student travelling between Hobart College and the Conservatorium. It seemed that bus transport was not reliable and the student had not yet obtained her driver’s licence.

Workload issues were a challenge for some students and may account for many student dropouts where feedback has not been possible:

I had to drop out of my second semester one because I had that and I also had my exam on top of that – so I found it really hard to be able to put enough effort and keep up with all the readings so maybe if...you did one in one year and then the second in the second year more so – so that it was more spread out (Launceston FG, Line 415-418).

Well I know a lot of people were really interested in doing it and a lot of did have to drop out because they had so much work from their normal subjects but they really wanted to keep going with it (Launceston FG, Line 420-422).

However it seems some students might not have found course content challenging enough:

This is probably going to sound really strange but probably if we were given more readings or a bit of more work to do [because] all we had was one assignment per
semester and the one workshop so it really wasn’t a lot of effort put in on our behalf – one day per semester and one assignment (Launceston FG, Line 443-445).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

It was hard being between two places - I wasn’t at school enough to see people all the time and be part of the group as much as I had been the year before. Also it was lots of work and a bit stressful sometimes.

Managing my time to complete the UCP and manage my other studies at college.

The most challenging aspect was simply understanding what the program involved, it was not clearly explained, this resulted in some students not participating.

Balancing this study with my study for college.

Having to work on our Trans/it journals with so little supervision and such open criteria. I know now that that is an important transition between college and uni but it was something I really wasn't expecting. More details or more explanation would have really helped me and the other students I was working with at the time.

*Question 1c: ‘Did participation in the program change the way you thought about university and/or the desire to continue to attend university?’*

All but one of the Focus Group participants had intended to enrol in University Degree courses and had undertaken UCP units as an extension or addition to the areas of study they had an interest in continuing. Many students were influenced by family members who had been to University. UCP units that provided an on-campus experience were favoured but the additional benefit of credits was also a motivating factor (as discussed previously):

It helped like you know reaffirm that I really wanted to go and do it but it wasn’t so much that it would have made me change my mind completely (Burnie FG, Line 89-90).

I don’t know really if the UCP made a difference because like at the time, because I was doing three pre-tertiary subjects as well as the vet course, I was sort of just focusing more on that and then just trying to get that journal and everything done at the same time - and they came in and marked our end of year monologues...that we did for examination but I honestly didn’t really think about Uni I was just focusing on getting through year 12. [Interviewer: So what made you make the call to actually go to the School of Visual and Performing Arts?] Well since I was twelve I have wanted to be a film director but then when I got to college it sort of went more into technical theatre and I just had this idea that if I went to Inveresk campus that I might be able to do a little bit of both and I didn’t want to be one of those people who just sat and did nothing so I just thought I’m going straight to uni – and I’m just going to see how it goes and I wanted to get more experience in technical theatre and I guess I've done more of that. I haven’t done much film stuff lately but I’m doing a film unit in second semester so I’m just going to see where it takes me. I’d like to get into events management – like Arts Business kind of stuff (Launceston FG, Line 211-223).

It was enjoyable and aside from like always knowing I always wanted to do teaching it gave me a chance to have a bit of feel around with some other areas too because I love to dance and so I was able to do a couple of things relating to Arts as well that are not necessarily are going to come into my course as much (Burnie FG, Line 91-94).

Well I mean I'd always had a desire to attend university I think it was basically just a given that I would continue on and go to university but there was a lot less worry at the beginning of last year knowing that I’d already done one unit and it wasn’t – well it
didn’t put me through hell – I mean I’d got a good mark and it wasn’t terribly difficult (Hobart FG, Line 204-207).

I did [always intend going to university] but having the program it really – you know going to a new institution, and new friends, new group, new teachers, new way of learning – the subjects that I did they were in quite small groups and there was interaction between other students and staff were really friendly so it was just a friendly environment (Hobart FG, Line 219-222).

I think it’s not necessarily the way you have been brought up but the way you thought like all throughout school – like my group of friends ever since high school there’s been no doubt that we wouldn’t go to university – we’ve always known that we would go to university so it didn’t seem like – it’s a big deal – the transition (Launceston FG, Line 245-248).

I wasn’t planning [to go to university] - over my two years of 11 and 12 I’d only done three pre-tertiaries all up so I was like ‘oh I can’t get into uni anyway’ but with the Arts one we only we had to do the interview and stuff and I went really well with that ...the colloquium thing changed my ideas on it and I was like oh wow uni can actually be really fun and not as bad as I thought it would be (Launceston FG, 238-242).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

No, but it was part of the reason I decided to stay at UTAS, whereas before I had been planning to go interstate.

Yes I have always intended on going to university.

No I had always wanted to study medicine at university, doing French through the UCP did make me wish I could continue my studies in French at university however this was not possible while studying medicine. I do think I will extend my French studies at some point in the future however.

It did, I found that I understood the ways of assessment easier.

No

Not really, but the colloquium was a great way to see and experience some of the school and people and get a fair idea of what to expect.

**Question 1d: How important has participation in the program been to your current success at university?**

Some students went on to do Degree courses not related to the UCP units they completed and therefore saw little direct relevance to their current success at university. Others considered the unit credits they were allocated gave them more time to focus on other aspects of their university studies and therefore they felt less stressed. Whilst performance was stressful, one student found that performing actually increased their confidence—a useful experience to build upon.

Again with my monologue and stuff I sort of was trying to push myself a lot knowing that I had so many people sort of watching me and assessing me; and knowing that it was going to be assessed at University level sort of made me try and push [Interviewer: Push yourself more?] Yes. [So do you think your performance was better because of that?]. I like to think so I – I was told it was ok but I don’t remember much about it – on the day I was really nervous – I came off shaking – I was told it was ok (Burnie FG, Line 134-139).
It was a pretty different field to what I am studying now so I can’t really say that doing...it definitely benefited me last year, but it hasn’t really had any impact on what I am doing this year (Launceston FG, Line 319-321).

Not really [because] I’m doing business now – it’s not really related in any way to musicals (Launceston FG, Line 313)

I haven’t come across any of the units as such I mean we’re coming up to do Art and Music this next semester and then later dance and drama - so I think that will be useful when I get to those subjects and particularly as I am wanting to be an early childhood teacher, Arts become very important to the things for the young children because there’s lots of creative sort of activities happening and all that sort of thing so I feel that little bit will probably help my understanding a bit more when we do actually come to these other subjects and develop more than it was.(Burnie FG, Line 377-382).

Currently it’s given me the opportunity to not have to do one of the units for either this year or the coming year which I’m [going to] find really helpful next year during first semester because we’ve got a major production on and lots of other work so having that chance for a bit if time off will be really good - already having done one unit (Burnie FG, Line 109-112).

I’ve done a few of them [UCP units]. I only have four electives in my teaching course and I don’t have to do any of them because they’re all covered already which, particularly fourth year, will be really helpful [because] I’ll have one off in both semesters and I’ll be able to focus more on other work [because] I’ll have heavier pracs and stuff happening then (Burnie FG, Line 113-116).

[German] I think it was very important to... learn grammar that I wasn’t able to learn in College so that was pretty good – so I enjoyed doing that – so I really believe that it was a really important course for me to attend  (Hobart FG, Line 264-266).

It helped with time management because I was doing five pre-tertiaries and then also the uni course on top of that and so I learnt to manage everything out of sheer being able to set enough time and get everything done before due dates and proof read and everything handed in...(Launceston FG, Line 276-278).

For one student studying at the Conservatorium the UCP units gave her the opportunity to study music theory. She thinks that there has been a change in Degree units offered and consequently less opportunity to study theory so she values the theoretical basis that her UCP units provided:

Well there [are] three aspects to the degree – there’s the performance, history, and then theory. So last year...I got all the theory subjects out of the way because of the foundation subjects that I did [in the UCP]. So it [the benefit of the UCP] is relevant to the theory. But I think now you don’t have to do so much theory and there’s other degrees...like there is also a song writing degree now and other things they are introducing but I am glad I have the theory [because] it’s just good...for a teaching basis – know ... the theory behind things (Hobart FG, Line 251-256).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

It gave me a chance to improve more that year than I would otherwise have done, because I wasn’t doing a full load of academic subjects so I had more time to practice, and also the standard at the con[servatorium] was a lot higher than at my school, where I was one of the only classical musicians. So hopefully, that means I’m a better player now than I would otherwise have been.

Not really as it is not relevant to my course, however it did help me to understand MyLO and other online learning tools which have been useful in my success at university.
I think it has been encouragement, I have seen how I performed in a Uni course, providing me with motivation to keep achieving high standards.

Very important as it has given me the opportunity to ease into the work load of university as I didn’t have to complete as many courses in my first semester.

Not overly key to success, but like winter school, having that pass mark for a unit is invaluable.

Question 1e: In particular how important was the program in determining your choice of course or study?

Before beginning the University College Program most students had already formulated ideas about future studies. Many students used the UCP units to explore these interests, however Critical and Creative Thinking drew two students into a new area of study that they thought would assist with general academic development; and another student (who was interested in dance) did a Visual and Performing Arts unit even though she intended to enrol in a Bachelor of Education – Early Childhood.

Whilst this student intended to continue his studies at university he had not decided which Degree. As a high achieving student he had a range of options and had also achieved good results in the UMAT.

...no but as I say it was one of those subjects [Critical and Creative Thinking] where it could have fitted into...anything that I continued to do (Hobart FG, Line 278-280).

Some students chose Degree courses on the basis of what was being offered locally.

...the dance courses I’m interested in are only on the mainland and that was my only other real sort of area that I might have looked into and I did a Contemporary Practice A over the last summer school so I did a little bit of that then as well (Burnie FG, Line 120-122).

Yes – well that decision was kind of based on the circumstance because I couldn’t afford to move away from home, so I just went with the best course that was for me in Launceston and who knows later down the track I might go and study somewhere else in Australia or overseas or something (Launceston FG, Line 333-336).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

The program had no effect on my choice of course.

Not very important as I already had a firm idea of what I wanted to study at university.

It did not really help my choice in study overall. However it enabled me to recognise strengths that I can employ, if I enroll in a particular course.

I never really had any discrepancy as to which course I would do.

Question 1f: If you were commencing university again, would you undertake this program?

Regardless of the apparent issues and challenges encountered in the University College Program all of the students said they would do the program again and/or recommend it to prospective students. They have indicated areas where changes/improvements could be made but overall they expressed a belief that the
program had been of benefit to their ongoing education, and eased the transition to university.

Yes - I enjoyed it and...you still have work to do but it wasn’t cutting over too much [into] your other work that you had in other subjects either, so you were still able to manage everything. [Interviewer: Did it stretch you at all?] I’d say the journal did a little bit but it just got me used to having to write constantly (Burnie FG, Line 128-131).

In a previous discussion question one student currently studying at the Conservatorium had noted that the UCP units she studied had provided her with a good theoretical basis for her ongoing studies. She remains certain of their relevance to her current studies.

Yes – I did say before that there were...three different aspects [to study] but really to have the understanding of the theory [is important because] you need to interpret the music...and understand what other composers are doing (Hobart FG, Line 317-319).

Surprisingly the student who was discontent with the outcome of the Chinese unit she had undertaken said she would still encourage prospective students to do the UCP language program. However, because her focus was on language skills rather than cultural knowledge she would not personally do it again if the format was the same as the unit offered in 2008.

[Interviewer: You wouldn’t do Chinese again?] No – well... [Interviewer: You would do it if that wasn’t counted as first year?] Yes [because] I’ve always planned to go straight into first year anyway because...[after a gap year] I’d just forgotten it - so yes...I’m [going to] go back and do first year Chinese. I didn’t realise this was putting me into second year Chinese so I probably wouldn’t do it [again] (Hobart FG, Line 312-326).

[However reflecting later that the cultural aspect of the Chinese program was interesting she says] I’d definitely recommend they do it [because] it is – it does have its benefits (Line 631) [and] It certainly didn’t affect my choice whether to come to university or not - but the Chinese - it was really good to have that look at the culture and it is a good motivation (Line 661-662).

On the contrary the student who studied German found the unit credit useful and would do the program again because it provided direct entry to a second year level UTAS unit.

I realised then that first year [German at University] would have been I guess too easy so I was glad that I was jumped into second year afterwards. I think the language differs a little but certainly...the pre-tertiary language [unit] and the first year language [unit] are very similar so that’s why the program is offered in the way it is – it’s just an extension so you do the additional grammar and where the gaps are in the curriculum so that effectively stretches extends your pre-tertiary and prepares you for second year. ...And also with second year German in the first semester they just cover everything you’ve done in first year just a very fast pace so you practically cover all the grammar that you were supposed to cover anyway (Hobart FG, Line 331-338).

It was noted that Critical and Creative Thinking had been withdrawn from the University College Program and one student who had successfully completed that unit provided a very strong endorsement of the unit and would do it again.

Absolutely [I would do it again] – yep – I’m not sure if it is being offered again this year... [Interviewer: No it’s not] ...no? – it’s not! – but it was great [Another student: Sounds like you were lucky]. Yes. [Interviewer: That was a great opportunity for you]. Yes if it was offered again I’d recommend it to anybody. It was one of those things where you didn’t need to be a particularly high achiever to get something out of it. [Interviewer: And yet I think probably the assessment of the Philosophy Department was that it shook down to being a unit for high achieving students] OK – alright. [Interviewer: Because initially there were 70 students enrolled and 25 finished]. Yes but I - this was
the thing - we were all feeling that way after the first two or three weeks and then they just kept saying get through the first two or three weeks – this is people that had done the same unit before – get through the first two or three weeks once you get past the first two or three weeks it will be fine and all these people were dropping out in the second week – and so I think most of the ones that finished it were in fact the ones that just held out that little bit longer and got through all the course material and yeah – so I don’t know I find that interesting that ...(Hobart FG, Line 343-364).

The same student commented later that:

Yes look I know they [the other campus] were a lot more structured about it than we were so possibly that’s where some of the dropouts came from as well - was from Hobart students who thought it was going to be more structured than it actually was in the end. But I know students that completed it, who wouldn’t consider themselves to be high achievers at all, that got credits and distinctions. I think it really was just about keeping up with it and staying with it (Hobart FG, Line 691-695).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

Yes. I found the program helped me to improve my skills and feel as if I had achieved something. It made me realise that I have the capability to undertake studies at a tertiary level.

Yes

Definitely yes, there are a few things that need polishing, such as a good revision of the Journals concept, but apart from that this program was great.

Developing skills and abilities

Question 2a: Which of your skills and abilities were most developed by your University College Program?

Units offered by SVPA exposed students to a wide range of different learning media which engaged UCP students in an interactive and innovative program that developed new learning and skill development; many students seemed to enjoy the program.

I found at the colloquium - learning about the different theatre – like doing some stuff with the lighting and seeing how the costumes are effected by different lighting – all of that...side of things that you don’t usually...get to look too much into. You don’t look into all the technical stuff behind it when you are doing a theatre course at school – you’ve got to focus too much on the performance side of things – so it was interesting to have a look at that – useful sort of knowledge to put away for future reference (Burnie FG, Line 143-148).

I found it really interesting when we learnt about everything you had to do at university to put on a show and all the production schedules and all the lists you had to write - yes they were interesting (Burnie FG, Line 150-152).

It was useful [because] I want to keep doing shows on a casual...basis with the societies...so it’s useful knowing what’s behind those things [backstage] and if one day maybe I don’t want to be in a show but I want to help the production manager or something I have a little bit of knowledge about the stuff that I’ve got to do. [Other student: Yes help out backstage]. Get it all going (Burnie FG, Line 155-160).

It did give me like an insight to the different [areas of the Arts] – [because] … before I was like oh I’m only a photographer I can only do photography but when we went into the other studios I was like oh I am actually all right at sculpture as well – I’m not just a
photographer – so it gave me a different look on what else you can do (Launceston FG, Line 384-387).

The school production however posed different challenges for skill development.

For the production we only had two people actually doing the production course for [the UCP] and having to get everyone else motivated enough to learn their lines and put on a good show was difficult [because] you had to always keep the spirits really high and everyone was doing really well – not everyone was putting in the same effort because not as much depended on it for them (Burnie FG, Line 168-171).

I guess it was opposite for us because our teachers sort of got told about it and...the whole cast was involved in it. And in terms of comparison to the other unit I guess it was – you pushed yourself a bit more when you knew you were being watched and were being assessed by it. But there wasn’t as much stress I guess in that one because there wasn’t the written side of things – you were just able to get out there and perform for them (Burnie FG, Line 178-182).

I’ve been in like a few productions before that one, but mainly I think it helps you develop more confidence. ...I didn’t think it really helped me become a better singer or a better dancer or be better at music in general [Interviewer: It just gave you more practice?] Yes  (Launceston FG, Line 402-406).

For the German language student grammar was a preoccupation throughout his study:

I learnt grammar there - it wasn’t really covered that much in the pre-tertiary subjects – it helped in a way but at times I felt that with the program it was just a bit rushed – the person that was taking it – the tutor or whatever you call it – just – I felt like she just rushed it at times especially when you were covering grammar that you haven’t seen before, so at times it felt really overwhelming (Hobart FG, Line 406-409).

Critical Thinking develops critical thinking:

I think the unit title says it all doesn’t it Critical and Creative Thinking and that’s exactly what it taught us. It’s just been really handy for everything - all the other subjects that I did last year (Hobart FG, Line 411-412).

...looking at things critically – it was the critical thinking part and it was like it gave like a broad outlook about how it’s all set out and what to do and everything but then we were given good practical examples – and yes so – it really helped develop the whole idea of critical thinking which is whenever you get an assignment or anything like think critically – think critically – so it really was good in that sense - to develop it. (Launceston FG, Line 372-376).

Question 2b: What skills and abilities would you have liked to be further enhanced or developed by the University College Program?

The complex pressures on year 12 students and uncertainty about tertiary education can create unnecessary anxiety for students who intend to progress to University. The University College Program appears to have bridged a gap in knowledge about UTAS/University for many of the focus group participants; and provided useful experiential learning that may have alleviated some of the transitional stress for some of these students. Some students would have liked more on-campus activities and others were focused on workload—either too much (Critical and Creative Thinking), or not enough (some of the Arts and Language programs). Few students, for this question, actually identified personal skills or abilities that could have been developed further.

...during senior college everyone’s thinking uni’s really scary and doing that course it...was just like going to school only that little bit extra (Burnie FG, Line 200-201).
[There is] so much decision making that’s happening in grade 12 – you’ve got so much different stress in your head thinking about where you’re going to go – what you’re going to do – so just doing that and having that bit of reassurance that it’s really not going to be all that scary was ...(Burnie FG, Line 202-204).

All the teachers saying you have to work really hard to get into uni and focus on it a lot and then doing one of these courses you just go – that’s not as scary as they’re all making it out – I can actually do this (Burnie FG, Line 205-207).

...I found it was a bit of a confidence boost I guess - like you said it sort of showed me well I don’t need to be...nervous or anything or uptight about going to uni I can...handle it and [I] was able to cope with some of these things even if it was like not...full on. Just a bit of a taste of...everything was good (Burnie FG, Line 195-198).

I think it would have been great if we’d been given more opportunities like, a few different colloquiums throughout the year to experience the different – almost like classes – like maybe have a technical theatre class, and have an acting class...specifically devoted to those areas so that we could experience what it’s [going to] be like at uni in different classes and therefore that would influence our choices of units and so on - yes I would have enjoyed that (Launceston FG, Line 427-431).

I think if we got together with – [because] we only got together once with all the other students – and if we got together more and like bounced ideas off one another a bit more and got to know the other students that were doing it, and what they were doing it would be better – [because] for an artist it’s very hard to work just by yourself (Launceston FG, Line 423-426).

I would have liked to have had more contact with the university people who were doing it – I don’t even remember who they are. [Interviewer mentioned staff from the Conservatorium]. Yes – I mean I know they were in Hobart [and] I went to school in Devonport so it was a fair way but if they could have come up more it would have been better (Launceston FG, Line 435-441).

Well not really skills...I had to drop out of my second semester one because I had that and I also had my exam on top of that – so I found it really hard to be able to put enough effort and keep up with all the readings - so maybe if it was...so you did one in one year and then the second in the second year more so – so that it was more spread out but yes...[Interviewer: Or would it be better if it replaced one of the TCE subjects?]. Well I know a lot of people were really interested in doing it [Critical and Creative Thinking] and a lot did have to drop out because they had so much work from their normal subjects but they really wanted to keep going with it (Launceston FG, Line 415-422).

[French] This is probably going to sound really strange but probably if we were given more readings or a bit of more work to do [because] all we had was one assignment per semester and the one workshop so it really wasn’t a lot of effort put in on our behalf – one day per semester and one assignment. [Interviewer: So you only had one assignment?] I think it may have been two but I think it was just one but it may have been two. [Interviewer: It should have been two]. It should have been two? – it may have been but still in the long run in comparison to the work we were doing already it wasn’t much extra...[Interviewer: Did you all feel there was an opportunity to stretch you further with it – more could have been demanded of you?] Yes. (Launceston FG, Line 443-454).
The process of Learning

**Question 3a: What were the most important lessons you learnt from your participation in the University College Program?**

Reflecting back on their experience of the UCP students focused on the need to manage uncertainty, workloads, and time-keeping everything in balance. Knowing what was required of them, with regard to tasks and assessments, was a primary focus in their thinking for this question. The lesson seems to be that clarity in these areas would have aided their learning experience and outcomes.

That I need to have some good time management (Burnie FG, Line 226).

Balance everything - whether it was school or rehearsals or working stuff out - I really need to work on balancing everything. I’m still learning that. [Interviewer: That’s one of the most important?] If you get a balance right then things are OK and don’t put things off – when you find out about them do them then – as soon as you put them off with journal you get to the last sort of minute and you’re kind of panicking thinking ‘oh I haven’t done it and I need to do it and I need more than there is’ (Burnie FG, Line 227-233).

Find out what it’s going to do for you as in – I didn’t realise that Chinese – that course was going to put me into second year - so realise what it is that you are doing – and if it had had the extra content that we needed to get into second year then I would recommend it to people that were planning to go straight to second year but especially [because] I had that gap year I’d always planned to do first year - so yeah know what you are doing I suppose – know what it is going to do for you (Hobart FG, Line 447-451).

You can just be surprised by how much you can get done like I made the time for those subjects – I mean I did want to do other pre-tertiary ones but I could have if I’d have put more effort in but yeah doing four pre-tertiaries and two subjects or eight across the year or whatever it is you know it if you put your mind to it you can achieve a lot (Hobart FG, Line 452-455).

[Critical & Creative Thinking] Time management is king and something I’ve never been very good at so I had to learn quickly (Hobart FG, Line 464).

[French] It’s sort of hard because it was very similar to what I was already doing – what I already knew it was just putting what I was already doing on a separate piece of paper so I don’t know (Launceston FG, Line 464-465).

The dialogue below, involving students in the Conservatorium and SVPA programs, demonstrates some of the uncertainty regarding unit guidelines and assessment criteria that confused a number of students throughout the UCP.

Student (a): I have no idea – I wouldn’t say I learnt nothing from doing it – I’m sure I learnt something but there is nothing that really stuck in my mind – I was doing it [school performance] [because] it was fun.

[Interviewer: Do you think it would have helped you if you knew exactly what the objectives were in the unit of study you were doing for university?]

Student (a): Yes...I knew we were being assessed – I had no idea what criteria we were being assessed against – I just went up there and did the songs and dances or whatever as we’d been taught them but I had no idea...what they were assessing specific areas of ...

[Interviewer: And if you knew the criteria upon which you were being assessed would it have impacted on your performance?]
Student (a): I think it would have made me work harder in some areas [because] I know that there are some aspects of it that I was better at than others so it probably would have made me work harder at the ones that I wasn’t as good at.

[Interviewer: So a bit of a different approach than if you were just doing the school musical – no learning around it?]

Student (a): Yes

Student (b): I agree with [student (a)] because we weren’t given – even though we knew we were being assessed on theatre - we weren’t given any criteria either so if we had I probably would have worked harder at meeting that criteria whereas I just sort of guessed what we were meant to do.

Student (c): I don’t think we were given criteria either - so yes probably the same.

Student (d): It was, yes, a bit hard to know actually what they wanted from us because the uni didn’t tell us - it was just what my teachers were saying that I should improve on this and this (Launceston FG, Line 466-487).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

That studying at a tertiary level requires a lot of self directed learning.

To have goals and objectives placed into your life, to which you can strive to achieve.

The standards and requirements of university study.

**Question 3b: What learning from the program do you think was most important for your ongoing university study?**

Time management has previously been mentioned as an essential skill for managing the demands of ongoing study. Students also listed communication, peer support, and the efficient delivery of online components of study units as issues that facilitate better learning experiences. Problems accessing UTAS MyLO from school sites seem to have contributed to the perceived level of difficulty for the UCP unit **Critical and Creative Thinking**.

**[Performing Arts]** I guess perhaps I learnt...that if you were stuck don’t just keep trying to do it yourself and wasting [time]...if you’re not understanding and actually contact someone and talk to them for help - and that was really good [because] we had...our wiki page and different ways of communicating. If we were struggling [we could] always...share ideas and bounce off each other...it was good. I learnt not to try to do everything so much on my own – if I’m not understanding something go and get help don’t try and just soldier on. [Interviewer: Did you use the wiki page?]. Yes I did, I found it very useful [because] if you didn’t fully understand it, or had some questions about it, you could contact someone without feeling like you were wasting their time with a silly question and they’d always treat it as – you know – it was really good that you went and asked – and you got lots of support. [Interviewer: And have you continued to use that knowledge?]. Yes (Burnie FG, Line 247-259)

**[Critical and Creative Thinking]** One of the things was our study guide was online - and it wasn’t in text which was appalling because we couldn’t actually open the PDFs from school so when we were there doing our study we actually weren’t able to access them unless we already pre-downloaded them and everything. [Interviewer: So that is a real barrier isn’t it?]. Yes and we couldn’t actually access the Lectopia readings either – lectures – because the school computers wouldn’t allow the program. [Interviewer:
Could you get them anywhere else?]. Yes we could get them when we were at home but not when we were actually at school in the groups (Launceston FG, Line 497-505).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

Being able to advance my French skills further has given me more confidence in my language skills and has encouraged me to incorporate these skills into my future study. For example I am currently considering going on my fourth year medical placement in a French speaking country.

Breaking things up into sections, little goals, medium goals and large goals.

Gave me an idea of the standard of university.

Question 3c: What additional learning do you think you needed (or need now)?

There was not much commentary for this question however learning about time management was again mentioned here and the possibility of doing an innovative time management course/unit that wouldn’t be ‘boring’.

Commenting on additional learning that would have been helpful as they progressed onto University study, these Performing Arts students identified academic referencing styles as particularly confusing, and thought extra learning regarding referencing could have been incorporated into assessment tasks. The dialogue though raises again the issue of lack of clarity around assessment criteria and feedback for given tasks. It also emphasises the value students place on collaborative dialogue with peers and the on-campus experience.

Student (1): I’m having issues with referencing...because all throughout schooling referencing styles have been completely different but they’ve never been as strict as they have been...[at University]. I found that was a...shock to the system and I know not only me but other people struggle to find [information] that tells us exactly what [to do]...everything you look at is...that little bit different and then teachers mark it just that little bit different sometimes...

[Interviewer: It’s a maze – yes – have you tried the university library site on the referencing?].

Student (1): Yes I’ve had look at it and I think I’ve got a referencing book that’s in my text for this next semester because that was one of the things they spoke about in the other focus group....

....[Interviewer: So in terms of the generic preparation for university...[information about referencing]...would it have helped to have known that before?]

Student (1): Possibly a little bit of practice – I don’t know...if it was possible [but] some things in the journal I guess you could have maybe done references for...just for the work that you were relating to, just to give you a bit of practice and an idea of what you were going to be expected [to do for academic referencing at University]

Student (2): Yes just to have...a talk about how they mark doing all the different referencing [styles] they could have used would have been really helpful for when you went on [to University]....

....Student (1): Did we get our journals back with feed back or anything like that?

Student (2): I got mine back but I didn’t have any feedback

Student (1): Didn’t have any feedback?

Student (2): No
Student (1): Maybe like a bit of feedback on the journal maybe I don’t know – even maybe as a group, like with other students, just maybe a generalised sort of feedback or something

Student (2): Maybe at the end of it all hold another colloquium or something

Student (1): Yeah come together and get a bit of feedback about a few things maybe

Student (2): and how everyone felt about it (Burnie FG, Line 273-312).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

Nothing comes to mind.

None that I needed personally as I had all the information I needed.

The future development of the University College Program

**Question 4a: What preparation/ additional preparation would be helpful for students in order to get the best learning outcomes at university?**

Many students seemed to have settled comfortably into University life and felt they were progressing fairly well. Additional preparation seemed to relate to on-campus tuition and/or experiential learning.

When some students were asked how they were doing with their exams they responded:

Pretty well for my first semester, I think (Burnie FG, Line 318).

I didn’t have any exams doing a visual arts course but we had lots of practicals and lots of assessments to hand in – but on most of them I think I did pretty well (Burnie FG, Line 319-320).

It felt OK – I mean I felt a bit out of practice with writing under pressure I guess because all through grade 12 we were practicing again and again writing under pressure and stuff for our exam. And one thing I found it hard to get used to is not everything relies on your exams at the end of semester now - your assignments count for something and I found that [a] really interesting...change to make from grade 12 because [in] year 11 and 12 everything basically comes down to your end of year exam (Burnie FG, Line 321-326)

For language students additional preparation was related to tutorials and course content.

Well I suppose Chinese could have those extra things that we needed to know to get into second year—or so we’d be capable to do second year—but at the same time I think it is a good idea to have those fun cultural things that we did have because it does help motivate you to learn. You think this is a cool place I want to learn the language to go there. So yeah more of the things you need to help you get to second year would be good (Hobart FG, Line 519-523).

...If it has to be three or four Saturdays well the people that are serious about it would [think] is fine (Hobart FG, Line 538).

[French] Perhaps more face to face time with tutors rather than just once a semester – because tutorials go for what 50 minutes and we had one day per semester which was a whole day. It was not really the same sort of experience as we have in coming to university. [Interviewer: And you think that experiencing tutorials beforehand would have been adequate preparation?] I’d only assume – but yes a bit more of the university way of life (Launceston FG, 532=536)
For a SVPA student additional preparation was related to more practical ‘real’ experiential learning:

...just the real experiences of what it is [going to] be like not just the fun stuff that is going to encourage people to come but to actually teach us what we need to know for when we go [to university]. [Interviewer: Such as?] ... well a lot of the technical stuff that I do not many other students know about it...there’s a lot of paperwork involved. We did a little bit of that on the day but it wasn’t enough for them to understand it on that day I don’t think – so yes – it’s kind of hard [because] I’ve got two different theatre backgrounds whereas a lot of people only have one – so I guess in that respect I already had one up (Launceston FG, Line 554-564)

and a student who had completed *Foundation Practical Studies* commented that

I don’t think doing that unit really prepared me for university any better than I would otherwise have been [Interviewer: Really because no connection with the university experience]. No (Launceston FG, Line 538-541).

Other students seemed to think they were well prepared for University.

[Interviewer: Additional preparation for university? – were there any big shocks to you?]
No – no because it was all – it was grounded and it was just like continuing on from there next – the next year – yes smooth transition (Hobart FG, Line 566-567)

I really wouldn’t have a clue what kind of other additional preparation you would put into it (Hobart FG, Line 569).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

One-on-one consultation with a mentor of some kind to help students understand their options and where these options might take them. I remember feeling a little unsure about what I was getting into, what the program meant in terms of my future studies and what it involved.

It was useful for me to study the pre-tertiary subject that connected to the subject that I undertook as a part of this program.

**Question 4b: What could the University do differently in the program to increase student success?**

Consistent with previously expressed interest in more on-campus experiences those involved in the colloquium felt it would be beneficial having a second event to consolidate learning and get feedback from University staff and other students.

[Performing Arts] Like I was saying before I just think maybe a ‘big thing’ – maybe make it a requirement to make it a big one at the end like a colloquium again – people will get together because it was all very good but it just kind of ended really suddenly and it was ‘Oh we’re done ok’...it would give a sense of finishing up I think (Burnie FG, Line 351-354).

[Performing Arts] But I just think yes coming back together with everybody – seeing...speaking to some other people about it – finding out what ideas they had – how they went – all that sort of thing – having the feedback with the actual teachers as such too...just go over/clarify [things and] share some of the ideas (Burnie FG, Line 365-368)

Similarly Language students suggested more on-campus contact

[German] I guess...more workshops and like I guess maybe interacting with the students a bit more [because] I really...thought that it was just going to be like an
extension and just help you with your language but really it wasn't - it was just like just saying 'What kind of German do you know, show us, and we'll test you' (Hobart FG, Line 572-578). [This student also suggested that the inclusion of a German cultural perspective in the course content might make it more interesting].

Students were interested to receive more direct feedback on assessed work:

Yes on the journals in particular – a bit more feedback on them - and while we were writing them what would be the basics that would have to go in it [because] you started them and then at the colloquium you found out what had go in it and you are like 'Oh ok those pages might be wrong so...(Burnie FG line 358-360).

Of Critical and Creative Thinking the suggestion was:

Offer it again – I mean I think it was a really, a really good way to sort of dip my toe into university before I got there. I think [for] anybody who’s thinking about university it would be a good unit to think about trying. [Interviewer: But you didn’t like the 100% online?] Oh I didn’t say I didn’t like the 100% online [that was the]...the greatest challenge. I mean it was really good to be able to do it in my own time, and when I could find the time to do it myself, but it was challenging yes - so yes I think it was a really good start for me so...I’d encourage them to offer it again if the chance came up again. [Interviewer: It was interesting to get the feedback about the students who dropped out because at the university that was taken as evidence that it wasn’t a good thing to do]. Yeah, whereas I’m just not so sure that that’s the case. I think a lot of things happen in back of a 17 or 18 year olds head while they’re thinking about dropping out and the ones that completed it were just the ones that hung in there longer I think. [Interviewer: As opposed to being the high achievers?] Yes - well I mean – Yes (Hobart FG, Line 610-625).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

Follow up during the program through e-mail or phone call to see how the student is going and if they have any concerns

Explain the program clearer, even have previous students explain the program, and their own experience to students. This would ensure a clearer understanding, and would increase numbers.

Promote it more. I had never heard of the programs until it was mentioned by my teacher.

**Question 4c: What advice would you give other students contemplating undertaking a pathways program?**

The points below paraphrase the advice for other students:

during the colloquium don’t hang back so much at the start just get straight into it [because] you’ll get more out of it (Burnie FG, Line 388-389).

take advantage of the opportunity to meet other students at the colloquium; form study groups in your school with others doing UCP units—it’s all about communicating (Burnie FG, Line 390-396).

don’t forget to keep up with your journal (Burnie FG, Line 398).

it gives you confidence towards uni - don’t be afraid of looking stupid or asking stupid questions (Burnie FG, Line 400).

when you get your marks back at the end it gives you confidence and you realise that it [University study] isn’t quite as hard as you think it is (Burnie FG, Line 400-403).
University level study helps you be more independent and responsible— you've got to be in charge of what you are doing and getting it done (Burnie FG, Line 460-463).

participating in Performing Arts helps you become more confident (Burnie FG, Line 507-517).

participating in Performing Arts helps with so many different forms of communication (Burnie FG, Line 522-526).

if you do German you have to really know your stuff because it is a challenging (Hobart FG, Line 633-637).

getting University credits for UCP units is very useful because it gives you more flexibility (Hobart FG, Line 650-654).

'I had someone actually ask me [about the UCP] and I told them to do it because yes it was good to get a bit ahead (Launceston FG, Line 671-672)

for the journal take notes as you go along – don’t leave it till the last minute (Launceston FG, Line 676-680).

it was really beneficial for adding to studies during the year – a bit of extension (Launceston FG, Line 688)

it helps when you get to first year uni because you can use the credit and not have to take on a full time load immediately (Launceston FG, Line 694-702).

Comments from students who replied to questions via email include:

Do it but only if you are sure of what you want to do. You tend not to do a lot of hard subjects at school because it would be too much, so basically you specialize earlier. The program gives you a head start in your chosen area, which is great, but if you're not sure it's probably better to have the year at school and get a general education and then decide. It's only a year; it doesn't make a huge difference.

Go for it and don’t be afraid to ask questions.

Find out the facts first, what is involved, and then think about your personal future and how it will help you succeed in life. Remember that decisions are hard; finding out the facts first always helps.

That they should strongly consider it as it is a very helpful program.
Discussion & Conclusion
Discussion and Conclusion

Introduction

A range of meetings throughout the duration of the UCP pilot have indicated broad support for the initiative and that broad support has been re-iterated recently by the three Deans of involved Faculties. This support is echoed by Principals, Heads of School and staff from both the University and senior secondary sector in responses to the June survey. The students too are generally able to identify the benefits of the program and would recommend participation to their friend and future students.

For most, the implementation of a program that blurs the boundaries between senior secondary school and university and thus promotes Higher Education participation can only be seen as an advantage to students and the State. However, this program must be seen in the context of broad participation, preparation and social inclusion and an overarching UTAS Framework.

The experience of the pilot has been mixed and reflects the complexity of beginning a new program that not only crosses disciplinary boundaries but also sector boundaries throwing into focus differences that at the very least need to be accommodated if not resolved. The learning from the pilot phase of the University College Program can assist the University developing policy and strategy for a future that delivers a more educated and empowered Tasmania.

In the short term the successful continuation of the program will need to address issues identified by the evaluation process. These issues are categorised below.

The Student Experience

The evaluation research indicates that students value and enjoy their UCP experience and derive some benefit at least in smoothing their pathway to University. For some students the learning is significant, others tend not to have reflected on their learning experience at all. This situation is most likely when their university unit has been delivered entirely distant from the university and they have little connection to university lecturers. The more frequent the interaction with the university (face-to-face or online) the more students appear to have been connected to the learning. The Philosophy units "Critical and Creative Thinking" and "The Big Questions" offered to three colleges in 2009 appear to have had impact. Although there was a large withdrawal from the units potentially due the workload and certainly due the scheduling of exams for the second unit, those students who completed the unit performed very well and were able to identify significant learning.

Further development of online learning and resources are seen as an option to extend the learning but it is noted that connection to the UTAS online learning platform, MyLO is problematic in some schools and online access generally is still a problem for some more geographically remote students.

More generally, their connection to the university, that sense of belonging that has been identified as a critical success factor for first year students (Lizzio and Wilson, 2009 and others) is less likely to be developed without some sort of on campus experience. UTAS Schools are responding to this issue: the School of Visual and Performing Arts (SVPA) now not only conducts the very popular colloquium on
campus at the commencement of the program but also runs another exhibition and presentation event at the close. Guest artists as well as SVPA staff visit the colleges and communication through their UCP wiki and SMS alerts when a college visit is imminent keep the connection current. The UCP Languages team is considering options of more frequent shorter workshops for both this reason and for improved pedagogical outcomes. The consideration of on campus orientation for UCP students has been suggested. Other options including student mentoring may be considered in future.

A conclusion that can be drawn from the focus group outcomes and from senior secondary staff feedback is that the current pre-tertiary study does not prepare students for University and whilst the UCP provides a bridge there is an opportunity to include more generic university preparation in the UCP.

Although most UCP students already intend to come to university, there is some evidence of the UCP assisting in the raising of aspirations to attend university particularly in the North West of the State where the principal at Hellyer Campus of the Academy sees the program as having quite a marked impact and one that resonates with parents. Two students from the North West have indicated they would not have gone to University are now enrolled in the bachelor of Business at Cradle Coast Campus. One student in the Launceston focus group indicated that she had not thought of going to University but after participating the School of Visual and Performing Arts UCP she is now enrolled in the Bachelor of Contemporary Arts.

The senior secondary college is seen as the primary enrolment for UCP students and thus the primary duty of care rests with the college. The college principal or delegate signs off on the students UCP participation and considers factors like student capability, workload and other life commitments before approving the enrolment. The analysis of student outcomes would tend to suggest that this is an effective student selection process. However the issue of student maturity may still be a concern. It would be interesting to discuss the issue of selection and year of participation from the principals’ perspective at a future forum.

**Equity**

The issue of Equity has been raised within UTAS and by senior secondary sector. For colleges the issue often focuses on the availability of units statewide – a number of units during the pilot have only been offered to targeted schools – and geographical constraints when students have to travel to workshops or colloquia. Within UTAS the discussion focuses on equity with other first year students. For some there is concern regarding access to theoretically available UTAS student support services despite the provision of student support. For others the main focus is the option for withdrawal without academic penalty which has been provided for all students whose study is incomplete or who do not succeed. Provision of a sanction free pathway opportunity is seen as important by survey respondents generally. However the University needs to make a decision about the value of this opportunity in the context of this option not provided to other first year students.

The data provided by the TQA pertinent to the select group of UCP students who undertake full University units would suggest that this group is not socially inclusive, more likely to be from high socio-economic background and less likely to live in a remote area.
In the bigger picture, the pressing equity issue is the opportunity for students from low socio-economic backgrounds to go to the university. Many young people in this category do not remain at School in Tasmania past Year 10 and thus have no opportunity to undertake the UCP as a pathway. Although there is some evidence of a “trickle down” effect when the option for UCP becomes known in high schools, current participation rates would suggest that the UCP alone is not enough to increase participation and social inclusion at UTAS.

UCP Curriculum

Most units offered in the pilot program belonged to Schools in the Faculty of Arts. The program began in 2008 somewhat opportunistically with languages because of the duplication between the TCE pre-tertiary language curriculum and first year university language curriculum. By effectively offering extension to produce additional learning outcomes not facilitated by the TCE curriculum, the University was providing an opportunity for students to achieve results in both their TCE subject and two first year university units. It was hoped that this opportunity would encourage participation in language learning and indeed there is some evidence that the program has done this. Other areas of study have been identified where a similar overlap between the two curricula exists, Asian Studies and Accounting and Financial Management, for example.

In 2009 full UTAS units, like Critical and Creative Thinking and The Big Questions, Core Studies in Art and Design and Contemporary Indigenous Australia were offered to capable and high achieving students through the University College Program. The offering of full units though UCP has caused some confusion with the High Achievers Program (HAP). Since 2004 the HAP has enabled a small number high achieving senior secondary students to undertake full first year units contingent on their capacity to get to lectures and tutorials on campus. Results in these units contribute towards the student’s ATAR score. The same provision has been made for UTAS College students who undertake full units. The alignment of the two programs is being considered also in the 2010 Review of the High Achievers Program. The UTAS College model which enables more students to undertake the units using flexible modes of delivery in partnership with secondary teachers may well provide the way forward to expand more equitable participation for high achievers.

The suite of units is however limited and very much supply driven. Consideration of the demand side of the equation must now be given. What units of study will provide the most pathways within the University? What units will encourage the type of human capital development required for the State and identified, for example, by Skills Tasmania? What types of units will provide the best career and lifelong learning pathways and outcomes?

The size of the suite of units should also be considered. Already the limits to the number of units senior secondary students can undertake opens up the potential for a sense of disciplinary competition. It should also be noted that the establishment of the National Curriculum will impact on the UCP, particularly where units are mapped against current pre-tertiary units. It is unlikely that the capacity to undertake level 3 pre tertiary units in Year 11 without pre-requisites will be an ongoing option.

Numbers of Units

The number of units a student can undertake has been limited to two by the Faculty of Arts for example. Just over half of the students so far have undertaken one unit
(which may have been a 12.5% or 25% unit) with over a third undertaking two units. A pattern is emerging whereby students may take UCP units in Year 11 and subsequently undertake additional UCP units or HAP units in Year 12. This option becomes important where discipline continuation is essential for ongoing development, as in the case of languages.

S&AA would not propose an arbitrary limit to the number of units because of the many ways in which multiple enrolments may present. A small sample of the different scenarios that are possible follows:

- Students undertaking multiple co-delivery style units are undertaking the bulk of the curriculum as part of their standard TCE curriculum. The extension work involved to cover the 20-30% curriculum difference should be considered rather than the total weight of the unit. For example, a student undertaking two language subjects in year 11 TCE curriculum might seek to participate in the College Language Program for each language, resulting in a 50% first year UTAS enrolment.
- Participation in multiple Programs (College and Community) across multiple semesters resulting in a high cumulative UTAS load. For example, a student participating in the Summer Rock Program (Community Program semester 3) plus participating in Overture or Prelude as a gifted music student as well as enrolment in the University College Performing Arts Program because of involvement with a school/college production as well as involvement in a Community Program for e.g. CATS. (Appendix 15).
- Exceptional circumstances for a gifted HAP student who has exhausted all discipline options at TCE level due to early advancement throughout high school. (Appendix 15).

These issues concerning the possible number of units to be undertaken by an individual student throughout the pre-tertiary years and the related issues of student workload and school monitoring and pastoral are issues to be clarified though policy development.

**Relationship to the TCE**

The UCP is strongly connected to the TCE with units either extending or complementing the students’ pre-tertiary curriculum. Feedback from students suggests that, often but not always, the UCP experience enhances their TCE performance. Mapping of the curriculum by UTAS Schools involved in the delivery extension units has identified gaps between the TCE curriculum and the first year curriculum thus determining the UCP program offered but this work has not been standardised. Our understanding of the relationship between UCP and TCE has grown during the pilot. However, further work is required to explore student workload and overall learning experience which will require and understanding of at least:

- Greater depth, further learning provided by the university units;
- Mutually exclusive programs or units
- “Double dipping” where two results are achieved for the same piece of learning;
- Assessment and the relationship between UTAS results and the ATAR; and
- Learning equivalence and standards (potentially tested through an analysis of student work samples);
An agreed policy framework established with the TQA would provide the appropriate foundation for developing clarity of purpose and sound processes.

**Roles and Responsibilities**

Roles and responsibilities in the program have evolved to a certain extent. However many have been dictated by existing policies, processes and practices especially in regard to admission and unit approval, for example. Experience has shown that existing policy provision does not account for alignment with another education system (impacts on exams, timetables, notification of results, for example), nor does it provide for the cross-disciplinary nature of the program as a whole.

**Administration and enrolment**

The areas of administration and enrolment received the highest level of dissatisfaction in the surveys from UTAS staff and a similar level of dissatisfaction from senior secondary staff perhaps reflecting the difficulty of trying to fit the collaborative non-standard program into a standard mould.

UTAS College and Student and Academic Administration (S&AA) staff have focussed on improving processes and negotiating the administrative territory of the program. For both clarifying a coherent model for the program is a priority.

S&AA would like a standardised approach to course and unit development using existing mechanisms with standard documentation including information to students. Whilst the approvals are authorised by Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees, the process cannot be deemed standardised because of the inherent differences between the Faculties although some attempt has been made to develop standardised documentation.

A number of strategies to improve administrative processes are recommended by S&AA including using Student Marketing and Recruitment for communication and marketing; timing admission and enrolment activities to suit the secondary sector; reduce multiple census dates to a single UCP census date; utilising existing on-line application and enrolment processes, with appropriate connections to Ready for Uni processes; align ID card provision with bulk card production processes currently used with offshore and distance student groups (for example bulk production of cards using existing college photos) (Appendix 15). It is noted that photos have not always been provided by the senior secondary colleges due to privacy policy of those colleges.

Although results management and notification was improved with more timely communication to students and schools for the 2009 results, it is clear that processes in this area still need further review.

Multiple methods of communication are recommended to ensure that students, particularly for those students who do not access UTAS on-line services. A written communication from the UTAS College congratulating the participant and providing the result should be considered.

Student management at the University is the responsibility of the Faculty and Schools and S&AA. Relationships with the schools education sector have been the preserve of Marketing and Student Recruitment. UCP brings another dimension to student management. Where results have been reported to individual students we
now have a third party, the senior secondary school, to whom student results must be reported. In addition

Given the fact that student load in UCP can escalate as noted above under the numbers of units heading, clarification of the responsibility for the overarching monitoring of student load in UCP is required.

Whilst the facilitative, co-ordinating relationships management role of UTAS College has evolved during the pilot, it is now timely to clarify the administrative role of UTAS College.

Staff

In order to achieve successful student outcomes, staff members from both sectors need to be engaged beyond their traditional roles. The evidence suggests that the program works best when the relationship between University staff and senior secondary staff work together. The level of co-operation varies across the individual UTAS School offerings. When secondary staff are highly engaged they are not only supportive of the program but actively involved.

For example, the School of Visual and Performing Arts has established a review and advisory committee with representation from all colleges involved that meets several times a year, teachers make suggestions and contribute to the development of the program. The program was first offered in 2009 and in some colleges regarded with a degree of scepticism but the collaboration during 2009 has resulted in significant collaborative program development, high levels of support and involvement of staff to the point that many expressed concern that the program might not continue after the pilot. The evolution of the program is testament to the collaboration which has involved considerable investment of time on the part of the School of Visual and Performing Arts UCP Director visiting colleges and working with teaching staff. The SVPA has also appointed a project officer who also communicates regularly with all staff involved.

In the School of Asian Languages and Studies (SALS) long term lecturers have strong relationships with teachers in Schools, many of whom have studied in SALS in their student days. Lecturers have also been involved in setting TCE exams and have strong knowledge of the curriculum and standards associated with pre-tertiary study. A National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (NALSSP) grant has been won by the School which has enabled further and more formal development of this relationship. The development of the Chinese UCP from uncertain beginnings in 2008 as testified in the Hobart student focus group is developing on a very sound footing this year through the establishment of a Chinese teachers network which has collaboratively developed the approach for 2011.

Similarly the Tasmanian School of the Arts has run two meetings with southern teachers and collaboratively developed a strategy for the future which includes accreditation of a new unit.

The Conservatorium of Music has also invested in the program appointing a Senior Lecturer (pre-tertiary music programs) with considerable expertise and connections in the secondary arts sector who is also involved with student auditions and assessment. The close working relationship involves joint assessment and payment of college teachers as tutors for the for the complete UTAS unit undertaken by students involved in the College Musical, for example.
This investment is also reflected in senior secondary colleges. Sometimes it is a personal investment as in the case of some language teachers who actively encourage their students and set aside time to facilitate their study and ensure that they complete assignments and online assessment tasks between on campus workshops. Some colleges include UTAS College Programs in the timetable. At least one College has not only set aside time but has created a role for a College UCP Facilitator.

At the other end of the spectrum minimum investment and commitment means that students may have the opportunity to undertake UCP but they will not receive support from their College. At UTAS minimum investment is reflected in Schools that do not understand the importance of working in collaboration and see delivery of units through the lens of established practice and “normal” delivery for first year students thus requiring funding only for hours of delivery.

All UCP respondents to the surveys indicated a clear preference for collaboration in decision making. However further analysis of the data reveals an approach that puts the primary responsibility for student eligibility, pastoral care and facilitating communication with parents in the province of the senior secondary school. Similarly the University’s key responsibilities can be seen to be in the area of curriculum; units to be offered, unit evaluation and program evaluation and facilitating communication about the program (see Table 30). Notwithstanding this direction, other responses from senior secondary staff expressed dissatisfaction with their opportunities to be involved with the program and decision making and opportunities to collaborate with UTAS colleagues in their discipline. The opportunity to truly collaborate excited participants in the 2009 Symposia who made a number of suggestions and recommendations (Appendix 11).

The 2009 QA plan also identified the need for consultation with College staff to address:

- Their role in the UTAS College Program;
- Recognition through honorary appointment or alternative (including identifying/distinguishing paid work)
- Induction/Staff development required; and
- Access to facilities and resources

Although the Symposia began to address these issues as yet no formal recognition process has been agreed nor has induction or professional develop program established. Existing policy appears to limit our capacity to recognise the contribution of partner teachers from the senior sector. The partnership with, and recognition of, teachers will be an important component of any ongoing program.

The experience of the pilot would suggest that induction/professional development is also required for UTAS staff joining the program as well as ongoing fora to share best practice.

Development of a partnership business plan as described in the context section of this report may be a way to progress a number of these outstanding issues.
Quality Assurance

The initial QA Plan (Appendix 11) was based on existing policy and procedures which do not adequately provide for a collaborative program like UCP as already discussed. A number of identified actions in the plan remain incomplete either because current processes do not allow for their development (appointment of honorary associates, for example) or because of time and resource constraints.

The initial units offered in UCP were existing first year units, and the delivery deemed a minor change, thus approval processes remained with the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. As the program has grown there is a need to consider the program as a whole as well as ways to accredit new units as for the new units proposed by the Tasmanian School of the Arts. The pathway may be through the Preparations and Pathways Sub Committee of the University and Teaching Committee and/or through a potential Advisory Board. However these deliberations need to be made within the context of appropriate University policy framework.

Communication

The issue of communication has been raised in a number of fora. There has been a level of confusion around the UCP and UTAS College. When the Program commenced in 2008 the Languages Program was marketed as the College Language Program (CLP) but as the suite expanded momentum grew to have a single name for the program and meeting in the Arts Faculty in early 2009 decided that the term University College Program should be used for all units offered. There has been confusion also about the distinction between the High Achievers program and UCP which will be clarified through the HAP review process. This will improve at least published communication.

UTAS College itself is not well known; it is a brand for preparations and pathways programs but has no physical identity within the university. It was conceptualised as a virtual college and created to both develop and test the concept. One view, espoused by the Executive Director, Planning and Development, is that the University College Program is UTAS-College, that is, a brand that connects UTAS with the College(s).

Whilst information sheets, a website, brochures and a newsletter have been established the evaluation research would show that significant work needs to be done to improve communication. Students tend not to use their UTAS emails and do not necessarily access MyLO. Using SMS messaging is being trialled by S&AA and is used very effectively by SVPA but there are concerns about overuse of this methodology.

Colleges need timely information not only about student progress but also about proposed unit options and their requirements well in advance of the year’s commencement. Once the future of the program is determined and a clear policy framework provides clarity of context and purpose, the development of a comprehensive UCP handbook would be a useful communication.

A Business and Marketing intern will work with UTAS College staff during second semester 2010 to assist in the development of a marketing and communication strategy.
Resources

As mentioned above the UCP began with existing first year units and with the assumption that, given that students were studying a very similar curriculum in their TCE subject, little was required pedagogically to ensure good student outcomes. However the experience of the pilot has demonstrated that the foundations of the bridge to university need to be firmly anchored in partnership with the secondary sector. It must also be founded on learning and teaching methodologies that effectively address the gap between school and university; provide adequately for students in colleges across the State that may not be in close proximity to a university campus; and connect students to the university experience and culture whilst extending their learning. This cannot be seen as an add on or extra and needs to be properly resourced.

Ongoing Development of the Program

A policy framework should underpin the next phases of the UCP and thus provide a sound foundation for ongoing development.

Continuing monitoring of student destinations and outcomes will inform program development, further discussion of student pathways and consistent and connected approaches to Higher Education Contribution Scheme HECS waivers and scholarships.

Adopting a partnership business plan approach should involve key stakeholders in ongoing development. The concept of having an overarching UCP Advisory Board or Committee has been mooted and such a Board could have representation from key stakeholders from within the University and from key external stakeholders. This Board would complement the groups established by individual UTAS Schools.

Conclusion

The UCP pilot has had many positive outcomes including student participation and performance, developing relationships with the secondary sector and broad support from involved staff.

The evaluation research has shown that further development in regard to the UCP student experience, curriculum and overarching program development is required. It has also demonstrated that some administration, communication, equity and quality assurance issues need to be addressed.

In particular issues for further and priority consideration relate to:

- Social inclusion and participation given the current participant demographic;
- Working in partnership - acknowledging the developing role of senior secondary staff and establishing a strong professional development program for UTAS staff and college staff;
- More equitable statewide provision of the UCP the maintenance of HECS scholarships and the sanction free opportunity;
- Overarching consideration of the number and discipline areas of the units offered through the UCP
- The mapping of TCE and UTAS first year units and clarification of standards; and
- Strengthening University preparation and the student connection to UTAS

Understanding of the collaborative environment has grown within UTAS and much has been learnt through trial and error, but it is clear that any ongoing development needs be underpinned by UTAS Policy that puts the UCP in the context of the wider collaborative UTAS participation and social inclusion agendas.
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