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OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT

BACKGROUND
The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) is Australia’s higher education regulatory and quality assurance agency. This Report is published by TEQSA under the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011, in order to complete the quality audits initiated by the former Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). This Report is not to be taken as an assessment under the Higher Education Standards Framework as defined in the TEQSA legislation.

These audits adopt the audit process as previously advised by AUQA. They are concerned with the existence and effectiveness of the quality processes that the organisation has in place to achieve its stated objectives, to produce the desired outcomes and to meet the needs of the institution’s identified constituencies. ‘Effectiveness’ is judged by the results and standards achieved. The audit also addresses actions taken by the organisation to improve its effectiveness.

Quotations taken from the organisation’s Performance Portfolio are identified in the Report as (PF p).

The membership of the Audit Panel is provided in Appendix A, and Appendix B defines abbreviations and technical terms used in this Report.

THE AUDIT PROCESS
In 2010, an Audit Panel was appointed (Appendix A). AUQA preselected the theme ‘Internationalisation’ for the audit of University of Tasmania (UTAS), taking into account: the University’s strategic directions, offshore activities and the recommendations from the Cycle 1 audit.

The theme ‘learning outcomes’, one of the themes proposed by UTAS, was selected by AUQA in view of its significance for the University’s mission and strategic directions. The Audit Panel selected four affirmations and five recommendations from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report for follow-up in the 2011 audit, either as stand-alone items or in the course of auditing against the themes of the 2011 audit.

On 24 June 2011, UTAS presented its submission (Performance Portfolio) to AUQA, including 100 items of supporting materials. The Audit Panel met on 18 July 2011 to consider these materials.

The Audit Director undertook a Preparatory Visit to UTAS on 8 August 2011. During that visit, the answers to questions and additional information requested by the Panel were discussed, as well as the Audit Visit program.

A visit to two educational partners in the delivery of offshore programs in China was undertaken by the Chair of the Panel and the Audit Director from 20 to 22 September 2011. A written report of these activities was circulated to the full Audit Panel prior to the main Audit Visit. The main Audit Visit to the University’s Hobart, Launceston and Burnie campuses took place between 2 and 7 October 2011.

In all, the Audit Panel spoke with over 400 people in the course of the audit including the Chancellor and members of Council, the Vice-Chancellor, senior management, academic and professional staff, external stakeholders, undergraduate and postgraduate students and offshore partners. Open sessions were available for any member of the University community to meet the Audit Panel. Three staff took advantage of this opportunity.

The Audit Panel expresses its appreciation to Professor David Rich, Dr Angela Boyes, Ms Sally James and others at UTAS for their assistance throughout the audit process. The University is thanked for
supplying a considerable amount of additional information and for granting the Audit Panel secure access to its intranet for the period of the audit.

This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the Audit Visit, which ended on 7 October 2011, and does not take account of any changes that may have occurred subsequently, other than to note some significant impending changes that were advised to the Panel. The Report records the conclusions reached by the Audit Panel based on the documentation provided by UTAS as well as information gained through interviews, discussion and observation.

While every attempt has been made to reach a comprehensive understanding of the University's activities within the scope of the audit, the Report does not identify every aspect of quality assurance and its effectiveness or shortcomings.
1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 AUDIT FINDINGS

The scope for the 2011 audit of University of Tasmania (UTAS or the University) is the two themes, ‘Internationalisation’ and ‘Learning outcomes’, together with the follow-up of selected affirmations and recommendations from the 2005 Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) Audit Report. In addition, this Report includes comments on the University’s compliance with the MCEETYA National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes (National Protocols), other external reference points, and on academic standards.

The audit findings are contained in sections 2 to 4. A selection of data that supports the findings is provided in section 5.

1.1.1 Main Points

On the evidence considered, the University of Tasmania complies with the National Protocols.

In relation to internationalisation, the University is reconsidering its positioning across the gamut of its international activities and a comprehensive external review of this aspect of its operations was scheduled to occur soon after the Audit Visit. That review is expected to generate a different and more strategic focus on international activities. The University’s international activities in Kuwait were being terminated at the time of the audit and the Panel was advised of the forthcoming cessation of some other offshore programs.

UTAS is commended for the quality assurance arrangements it has established for programs delivered by offshore partners, and the close relationships it maintains with its overseas partners in designing and monitoring programs. The Panel had some concerns about the English language proficiency of students in one offshore program and the corrective action being taken by UTAS to establish higher standards of delivery and monitoring of English language programs offshore is affirmed (section 2.7). Much more work will be required to clarify and implement the University’s overall approach to internationalisation onshore and offshore, the future directions for which remain contingent in part on the findings of the forthcoming review. Irrespective of the findings of the review, UTAS will still need to advance its current efforts, for example in internationalisation of curricula, streamlining support for international students onshore and in achieving a more consistent approach to internationalisation across all campuses.

In respect of learning outcomes, the University has undertaken a University-wide initiative to strengthen the integration of learning outcomes through the development of revised unit outlines and new approaches to assessment. Significant progress has been achieved across all areas. The definition of outcomes at the course level is patchier, although in courses that are subject to external accreditation by a professional body where professionally-oriented learning outcomes have been specified, there are clearer sets of outcomes. UTAS’ leadership in national initiatives to define discipline-specific outcomes in particular disciplines is noted. The proposed extension and application of this work within the University to better define course-level outcomes through the new Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan is affirmed, as is the current project to redefine the University’s broader graduate attributes, particularly those that may reflect a ‘distinctive’ experience for students at UTAS. A previous rising trend in attrition rates for domestic and international students appears to have reversed over the past two
years, although this aspect of UTAS’ performance warrants continuing attention, particularly in the areas of ‘society and culture’ and ‘health’.

Overall the Audit Panel saw a great deal of progress in following up on the 2005 AUQA audit, in repositioning the University’s approach to internationalisation and in embedding learning outcomes. However, there is still much to be done to bring many projects to fruition. There have been many reviews of the University’s operations over recent years. The Panel formed the view that the main focus had been on the conduct of the reviews, with less emphasis given to implementation. If the University wants to move toward a stronger culture of change management there is a need to give greater emphasis to implementation of the findings of reviews and evaluation of the results than has been the case in the past. Future approaches to improvement could be driven much more strongly by an evidence base and by employing the ‘OADRI’ (Objectives, Approach, Deployment, Results and Improvement) approach that is advocated by the UTAS quality framework more systematically at all levels of the University.

1.1.2 Matters from Cycle 1 Audit

The University has undertaken a number of reviews of its operations with some in progress and more to come. Many changes have been or are being implemented as a result of these reviews, including those that address the affirmations and recommendations of the 2005 AUQA Audit Report.

A selection of findings from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report was reviewed in the current audit. Progress against two affirmations and three recommendations was reviewed specifically and a further two recommendations and two affirmations were considered in the context of the themes of the current audit.

UTAS is commended for the improvements in staff induction and orientation that have been achieved and for promulgation of information in relation to transnational education (TNE), particularly via the website and the ‘TNE Toolbox’. Work on embedding graduate attributes and related matters is continuing (section 4.3).

The University has also maintained and/or built on those aspects of its operations that were commended in the 2005 AUQA Audit Report in so far as they continue to be relevant to current operations.

1.1.3 Theme 1: Internationalisation

The University’s main international activities overseas involve delivery of offshore undergraduate programs via arrangements with partner institutions. The Australian Maritime College (AMC – now one of the ‘institutes’ of UTAS, although a separate educational institution prior to 2008) also delivers programs to students offshore by distance education, including on ships. There are over 2000 international students enrolled onshore (undergraduate and postgraduate) and the University has established a variety of international research collaborations and related activities. UTAS is closely involved in its international partnering arrangements and the quality assurance mechanisms for monitoring and managing offshore programs are commended. UTAS enjoys a continuing high level of satisfaction among international students, both onshore and offshore and international students are successful in their educational programs. The University is also seeking to strengthen its research performance and strengthened international activities are seen as paramount in achieving this goal.

The University has an Internationalisation Plan to guide its activities, although the current Plan may be modified by a forthcoming comprehensive review of international activities. It is also
likely to mean that the current plans for international activities at various levels of the University will need to be revised and new quality assurance and support measures will be required. The forthcoming review is expected to include a greater focus on implementation and performance monitoring than has followed previous comprehensive reviews of internationalisation.

Notwithstanding the coming review of internationalisation the University anticipates achieving higher enrolments of international students onshore, enhancing international mobility and developing more strategic international research collaborations and partnerships as important priorities for internationalisation. Maintaining the established international credibility of the ‘AMC brand’ remains an important and well-recognised priority for UTAS following the integration of the two institutions. The University acknowledges that there is more work to be done on the internationalisation of curricula and its continuing efforts in this respect are affirmed.

1.1.4 Theme 2: Learning Outcomes

UTAS has traditionally seen ‘learning outcomes’ through several perspectives. These perspectives encompass unit-specific outcomes at the narrowest interpretation, through to an aggregate contribution of the University’s overall educational efforts to the regional and statewide societal wellbeing of Tasmania at the broadest level. Other perspectives on learning outcomes such as discipline-specific learning outcomes, specifically identified graduate attributes and distinctive ‘Tasmanian’ outcomes are encompassed within this overall continuum of views, to varying degrees. These differing interpretations of learning outcomes at UTAS have resulted in some uncertainty about the application and implementation of the concept across programs and campuses. Achievement of greater consistency in approach will be an important part of future work.

UTAS has been involved in national Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) projects concerned with discipline-specific learning outcomes and UTAS proposes to develop and adapt this work into a continuing project within the University in the coming year, in line with its new Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan. If successful, this project stands to address at least two important current difficulties: consistency of approach across the University and better definition of outcomes at course level. The University’s intention in this respect is affirmed.

UTAS’ recent work on learning outcomes has been underpinned by a University-wide project on criterion referenced assessment (CRA), which has extended to most programs with the assistance of the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching and a series of ‘champions’ within schools. Most schools have made considerable progress. The University has also undertaken a University-wide project on internationalisation of the curriculum to incorporate and promote relevant graduate outcomes including a ‘global focus’. The initial work on internationalisation of curricula did not achieve the results that were hoped for and the project was ‘reinvigorated’ (PF p29) in 2010 with more emphasis on planning and monitoring at faculty level. The Panel notes that there are inherent conceptual difficulties with an approach to learning outcomes being driven solely ‘up’ from the unit level, rather than ‘down’ from overall outcomes at the course level as well (sections 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4). These issues are expected to be taken into account in UTAS’ continuing work on learning outcomes more generally.
1.1.5 National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes

The National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes require all universities to meet a range of criteria, in particular nationally prescribed criteria A1 to A10 and D1 to D5. UTAS provided a self-assessment against the National Protocols prior to the audit.

On the evidence considered by the Audit Panel, University of Tasmania complies with the National Protocols. The University is aware of the implications of the new Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and began to embed consideration of the implications for its courses (programs) in its course approval and review processes in May 2011.

1.1.6 Other External Reference Points

The University has also made use of a number of other external reference points to ensure the compliance and quality of its provision, including:

- AVCC (now Universities Australia) 2005, Universities and their Students: Principles for the Provision of Education by Australian Universities
- DEST 2007, National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (the National Code 2007)
- Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cwlth) and associated and subordinate legislation and regulations, including the National Code 2007.

The audit did not identify any matters of concern regarding the University’s compliance with these external reference points.

1.2 INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

1.2.1 Institutional Profile

The University of Tasmania is the fourth oldest university in Australia. It was founded by an act of the Tasmanian Parliament in 1890. The Hobart-based University merged with its northern-based (Launceston) neighbour, the Tasmanian State Institute of Technology, to form a ‘new’ University of Tasmania in 1991. The Australian Maritime College integrated with UTAS in 2008 and UTAS remains the sole university in Tasmania. It has six faculties (Arts, Business, Education, Health Science, Law, and Science, Engineering and Technology) each of which contains one or more schools. It also has three University Institutes – the Menzies Research Institute Tasmania (MRIT), the Australian Maritime College (AMC) and the new Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS) – which exist outside the faculty structure and report through their respective boards to the Vice-Chancellor and Council.

UTAS operates across three main campuses in Tasmania (Hobart, Launceston and Burnie) with smaller sites within or nearby such as in teaching hospitals. Nursing programs are offered in Sydney and programs are or have been offered offshore in Kuwait, Malaysia, China and Hong Kong. Students who complete a UTAS program in China also receive a qualification from the partner institution, subject to meeting certain additional requirements imposed by the Chinese Government. Student loads (December 2010) are tabulated by faculty/institute below (over page). Dispersion of loads across campuses is tabulated at data item 5.1.

The integration of the AMC and UTAS has brought a number of challenges, some of which are yet to be fully addressed, such as a final determination of the governance arrangements for the AMC, transition of all policy changes in UTAS ordinances, further developing internal research opportunities and continuing exploration of potential opportunities for articulation from AMC’s vocational education and training into higher education programs across UTAS. The Panel was reminded frequently by internal and external stakeholders of the AMC’s historic
prominent international reputation and its standing as an influential leader in maritime education, both nationally and internationally. A number of stakeholders expressed concern that the absorption of the AMC into UTAS may weaken the attractiveness and positioning of AMC and its programs in international markets. Students are keen to see that the AMC continues to be identified on testamurs and transcripts. In view of the intensity of these concerns UTAS should remain vigilant on these matters at executive level, in consultation with the Board of the AMC and other stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Load by Faculty and University Institute, December 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science, Engineering and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Institutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total University Institutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other a</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a ‘Other’ in this table is mostly enabling load that is not assigned to a faculty or University institute.

Source: UTAS Portfolio (PF p3).

A position of Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Development) has been created recently with a view to enhancing the University’s relationships with the community, particularly in the North and North West of the State initially. The University also signalled a renewed strategic focus on its research activities, including extending and possibly reshaping its international collaborations and affiliations, which might embrace geographically similar ‘island’ universities. Significant upgrades to the ICT infrastructure are also imminent including a new learning management system and a new student management system.

In the light of these existing and proposed changes the Audit Panel observes that UTAS is in a state of transition. In relation to following up on the Cycle 1 audit and to the themes of the current audit, a great deal of improvement work was in progress or foreshadowed to the Panel.
1.3 COMMENDATIONS, AFFIRMATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This Report contains commendations, affirmations and recommendations. A commendation refers to the achievement of a stated goal, or to some plan or activity that has led to, or appears likely to lead to, the achievement of a stated goal, which is particularly significant. A recommendation refers to an area in need of attention, whether in respect of approach, deployment or results, which is particularly significant. Where such matters have already been identified by the University, with evidence, they are termed affirmations. It is acknowledged that recommendations in this Report may have resource implications.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The University of Tasmania is commended for the attention it gives to the orientation, induction and involvement of its staff, including the particular needs of sessional staff and the UTAS staff and staff from partner institutions who are involved in offshore programs.

2. The University of Tasmania is commended for its inclusive approach in determining the operational needs and usability requirements of staff and students for its new learning management system.

3. The University of Tasmania is commended for its effective promulgation of relevant information to transnational education stakeholders, particularly for students and staff who are involved.

4. The University of Tasmania is commended for the actions it has taken to improve risk management, including the integration of a quality-improvement cycle to guide future developments.

5. The University of Tasmania is commended for the inclusive nature of the strategic planning process that it has implemented, including the on-going organisational capability that this process represents.

6. The University of Tasmania is commended for the comprehensive and effective quality assurance system it has established for governing, monitoring and improving transnational education partnership arrangements.

7. The University of Tasmania is commended for its approach to attracting and fostering high achievers in research and is urged to continue this endeavour in strengthening the internationalisation of its research.

8. The University of Tasmania is commended for its responsiveness to meeting the learning needs of regional communities and industry in the Cradle Coast region, particularly through its successful ‘Knowledge Partnerships’ approach.

9. The University of Tasmania is commended for its implementation of a Graduate Certificate in Research to augment research skills and promote generic skilling for postgraduate study and work.

10. The University of Tasmania is commended for the overall high level of student satisfaction with its teaching that has been achieved over recent years.

11. The University of Tasmania is commended for the scope, quality and effectiveness of its preparatory programs such as the UTAS College Programs, UniStart and the University
Preparation Program, and of its supporting programs, particularly the Peer Assisted Study Sessions. ......................................................................................................................................................................................................... 36

AFFIRMATIONS

1. The actions taken by the University of Tasmania to build on the integration of its quality systems are affirmed and the University is encouraged to continue this work through the advent of the new strategic plan, subsidiary plans and the current review of international operations, to develop a stronger culture of evidence-based implementation and improvement. ................................................................................................................................................................... 12

2. The actions the University of Tasmania has already taken to strengthen its data gathering, analytical and reporting capabilities are affirmed, and the University is encouraged to progress its planned improvements. .................................................................................................................................................................. 21

3. The University of Tasmania's efforts in internationalisation of the curriculum are affirmed, but the University is encouraged to build on that activity by advancing the work as a matter of priority and by better integrating it with other related projects. .......................................................................................................................... 24

4. While the University of Tasmania's initial efforts in promoting and supporting interactions between domestic and international students are acknowledged, the University's commitment to make more progress in this respect across all campuses and for all groups of students is affirmed. ..................................................................................................................................................................................................... 27

5. The University of Tasmania's plans to extend more systematically the definition of learning outcomes to course and discipline levels, through the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards (LTAS)@UTAS Project and through further collaborations with the professions and industry, are affirmed. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 32

6. UTAS' commitment to learning outcomes at the unit level being informed and led by the overarching outcomes for the whole courses or discipline areas of which the units are part is affirmed. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 33

7. The University of Tasmania's revised approach to reviewing the performance of organisational units is affirmed and the University is encouraged to continue with its efforts to implement the process and to link it to the forthcoming ‘business intelligence’ reporting system. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 36

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania takes action to ensure that its general entry requirements for proficiency in English are achieved on entry to all offshore programs, and that its standards for proficiency in English on entry to and completion of UTAS programs are monitored systematically and independently. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 15

2. It is recommended that the Council and the executive of the University of Tasmania reconsider the effectiveness of their respective roles in creating and maintaining the culture of the University, particularly in moving the University towards a climate of strategic evidence-based improvement. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 17

3. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania ensure that its formal internal reporting lines and its many less-formal cross-functional accountabilities and channels are effective and efficient management and reporting mechanisms as further changes to the structure of the University are implemented. ........................................................................................................................................................................................................ 18
4. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania re-examine the effectiveness of its strategies for building a culture of a coherent multi-campus university with a view to gaining stronger engagement with this concept among staff, students and external stakeholders, particularly in its regional campuses. .................................................................19

5. While the University of Tasmania’s extensive involvement in benchmarking activities is acknowledged, it is recommended that the University extend and transform its approach to benchmarking to develop this as a more systemic improvement-oriented and strongly evidence-based component of the University’s quality framework............................................................20

6. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania build on its current consultative planning processes by developing a comprehensive communication strategy to enhance the effectiveness of internal communication about forthcoming organisational changes. ..........21

7. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop an overarching strategic approach to student mobility to guide further developments in this aspect of internationalisation. ...........................................................................................................................................29

8. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania consider ways to strengthen the development of generic and ‘distinctive’ learning outcomes at postgraduate level.................................33

9. It is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop a better understanding of the causes of high attrition rates among both onshore domestic and international students, taking into account potential examples of good practice in the area of ‘management and commerce’ for international students, and considers the implications of its findings for any move to larger numbers of international onshore students........................................35

10. While the University of Tasmania’s overall commitment to supporting students at risk is acknowledged, it is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop a systemic capacity for detection of students at risk that is applied consistently across all programs and campuses.................................................................37
Recognising the importance of quality enhancement and improvement, the audit considers whether the recommendations and affirmations in the 2005 Cycle 1 AUQA Audit Report have been implemented. A sample of recommendations and affirmations is selected and checked. As well, evidence is sought of the increasing effectiveness of the institution’s quality assurance and improvement system.

In its Performance Portfolio, the University provided a summary of progress in implementing the fourteen affirmations and seven recommendations from its 2005 AUQA Audit Report. Matters relevant to several of these affirmations and recommendations are detailed further in sections 3 and 4 of this Report.

An assessment undertaken by AUQA in light of the progress report on Cycle 1 affirmations and recommendations indicated that several recommendations should be reviewed in the Cycle 2 audit. After considering the Performance Portfolio and the supporting documents, and progress against the previous affirmations and recommendations, the Panel selected affirmations 1, 2, 4 and 14 and recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 for specific follow up.

2.1 RECOMMENDATION 1: QUALITY SYSTEM

Recommendation 1 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: AUQA recommends that, to ensure the momentum gathered from the self-review activities leading up to the AUQA Audit is not lost, UTAS consider whether to now adopt a more fully-articulated ‘Quality System’, one that extends beyond the current description of the ‘PIRI’ quality improvement loop.

UTAS has taken a range of steps to better define its quality system and to integrate it with related organisational functions such as internal audit, strategic planning, risk management and quality assurance of offshore programs. Nonetheless there is more work to be done. UTAS has undertaken many reviews of its operations over recent years but these have not necessarily led to improvements through implementation of the findings of those reviews. This may indicate an incomplete adoption of the ‘OADRI’ improvement cycle that is advocated by the UTAS quality system. The Panel notes, however, that the new Reviews Policy explicitly sets out roles and responsibilities around monitoring reviews and following up on outcomes, which is intended to enhance adoption of the OADRI cycle more generally and for the forthcoming review of internationalisation in particular.

UTAS is aware of the prevalence of reviews, and that there is room for improvement in the way reviews are managed, which led to the recent adoption of a Policy on Reviews to guide future reviews. An important improvement has been an increased focus on necessity and risk in stimulating reviews, in unit and school reviews for example, rather than basing reviews solely on a schedule. Notwithstanding a number of critical improvements, such as the advent of the Planning, Performance and Review Committee (PPRC) and new planning processes (section 2.9), the Panel observed an organisational culture that has been dominated by ‘review’. The Panel believes more work is needed to move to a culture of ‘implementation’ (deployment) accompanied by systematic evaluation of the University’s approach, implementation and results in directing future initiatives toward strategic goals. This could be helped by stronger modelling of the University’s ‘OADRI’ approach by the executive and other leaders in the organisation.
The Panel also noted an overall lack of sufficient good data and information on which to base decisions, and a lack of access to user friendly and timely data for decision makers throughout the organisation. UTAS has acknowledged this issue and has initiated a variety of measures to enhance its data gathering and analytical and reporting capabilities, including the implementation of a new ‘business intelligence’ system. In the interim the effectiveness of the quality system (and performance monitoring) remains at risk until a robust evidence-based culture for management and improvement is fully implemented.

Affirmation 1

The actions taken by the University of Tasmania to build on the integration of its quality systems are affirmed and the University is encouraged to continue this work through the advent of the new strategic plan, subsidiary plans and the current review of international operations, to develop a stronger culture of evidence-based implementation and improvement.

2.2 RECOMMENDATIONS 2 & 4: INDUCTION AND ORIENTATION

Recommendation 2 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: AUQA recommends that UTAS pay further attention to the induction and training of tutors and sessional staff across the University.

Recommendation 4 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: AUQA recommends that UTAS review its current approach to the general induction and orientation of academic and general staff.

Because of the related nature of recommendations 2 and 4 they are dealt with together. Staff interviewed felt comfortable with the induction and orientation provided for their roles. Sessional staff reported a high level of satisfaction with their orientation and, particularly, with their opportunities to remain abreast of developments in their academic areas by involvement in staff meetings and through regular communications from the University.

A first-year teaching forum has been introduced and support for staff to undertake award study, such as the Graduate Certificate in University Learning and Teaching, has been extended to include casual staff. The Panel notes in particular that staff from the offshore programs at Shanghai Ocean University (SOU) and Zhejiang University of Technology (ZUT) are also provided with regular comprehensive orientation and professional development sessions in China. A number of key administrative and academic staff from SOU have participated in orientation and induction programs in Tasmania. These were highly regarded by the participants and have led to improved services for offshore students.

Commendation 1

The University of Tasmania is commended for the attention it gives to the orientation, induction and involvement of its staff, including the particular needs of sessional staff and the UTAS staff and staff from partner institutions who are involved in offshore programs.

2.3 RECOMMENDATION 3: WEB-ENHANCED TEACHING

Recommendation 3 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: AUQA recommends that, when implementing the actions outlined in Affirmation 3, UTAS pay further attention to addressing
the variation in the use of and quality of the web-enhanced teaching across academic organisational units.

The University conducted a review of its web-based services in 2007–2008 which stimulated a number of improvements. UTAS has a well-established learning management system (MyLO). All students who were interviewed (onshore and offshore) reported that the system meets their learning needs, it offers good internet speeds and it is readily accessible by wireless with negligible outage. AMC students on ships find it a useful learning tool. A minority of students report that some of the videoconference materials used in their programs or stored for later access are not of good quality, citing insufficient training of staff in video presentation and deterioration of stored video material.

Videoconferencing is an important tool for the University’s dispersed system of campuses. While the Panel noted that some online tutorial material on videoconferencing is available to staff, its use is not monitored and its effectiveness has not been assessed. In view of the proposed increasing use of videoconferencing the Panel feels further attention to staff development in this area is warranted. The Panel notes that a major upgrade of the learning management system is imminent, along with enhancements to the associated ICT infrastructure.

Selection of the replacement learning management system was informed by a survey of needs and usability testing for both staff and students. On that basis UTAS is confident that the new system will meet the needs of its clients. The Panel finds the University’s approach to this new development to be comprehensive in noting the needs of users and the importance attached to those needs. The participative approach adopted by UTAS in involving a broad cross section of users has further reinforced the perceived value of inclusive decision-making processes as a part of the continuing culture of the University.

**Commendation 2**

The University of Tasmania is commended for its inclusive approach in determining the operational needs and usability requirements of staff and students for its new learning management system.

2.4 **RECOMMENDATION 7: INFORMATION ABOUT TRANSNATIONAL EDUCATION**

Recommendation 7 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: *AUQA recommends that UTAS identify and implement ways to promulgate information about the University’s TNE operation amongst its staff, students, and other stakeholders more effectively.*

UTAS has addressed this issue with a multifaceted approach to improvement encompassing the launch of a new TNE website in 2010, strengthened statistical reporting to the Internationalisation Committee and dissemination of informative news articles. There is a comprehensive ‘one-stop’ tool for staff involved with TNE, the ‘TNE Toolbox’, which provides a repository of all relevant materials such as contracts, program details and quality assurance reports. The Panel notes that this excellent tool includes only high-level details of programs and suggests that it could include detailed program material as well. Irrespective of the outcomes of the forthcoming review of international activities this infrastructure positions the University well to accommodate and manage any changes in offshore activities that may occur.
Commendation 3
The University of Tasmania is commended for its effective promulgation of relevant information to transnational education stakeholders, particularly for students and staff who are involved.

2.5 AFFIRMATION 2: RISK MANAGEMENT

Affirmation 2 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: AUQA affirms the intention of UTAS to strengthen risk management across the University.

UTAS has taken several steps to strengthen its approach to risk management at all levels of the University, including establishing an Office of Risk Management and Audit Assurance and developing a governance framework for risk management with a dynamic risk register. An evaluation of these approaches has led to an action plan for further improvement. The quality assurance processes that are used for periodic monitoring of offshore programs are significant contributors to effective risk management in what is recognised as a high-risk area of the University’s work. The Panel notes that the likely changes to the directions of the University established by its new strategic plan may bring substantial changes in risk profile. Proactive management is indicated in this respect and the new risk management framework will be an important contributor. The Panel identified substantial risks attached to the scale of the management system upgrades that are being proposed, such as the learning management system and related ICT infrastructure, but notes UTAS’ confidence about being able to manage such risks.

Commendation 4
The University of Tasmania is commended for the actions it has taken to improve risk management, including the integration of a quality-improvement cycle to guide future developments.

2.6 AFFIRMATION 4: GRADUATE ATTRIBUTES

Affirmation 4 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: While noting the work being done to embed and evaluate graduate attributes in certain sections of the University, AUQA observes that progress is variable across the UTAS curriculum and affirms the need for further attention to implementation.

This matter remains an issue and is dealt with in section 4 (4.2-4.4) of this Report.

2.7 AFFIRMATION 14: PROFICIENCY IN ENGLISH

Affirmation 14 from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report is: In affirming the review activity applied to the TNE operation, AUQA supports UTAS in its progress on and further intentions to implement the recommendations arising from the TNE reviews, but also encourages careful analysis of the advantages and risks of further growth in this sector, including maintaining appropriate entry and exit standards of English language proficiency.

UTAS is conscious of the importance of proficiency in English in its international programs, which are delivered in English. For example, entry to a UTAS program in China is contingent on completion of a one-year preparatory program studying English, which is followed by a further program on ‘business’ English during the UTAS program. UTAS claims that the standard of English that is achieved by the preparatory program is equivalent to at least IELTS (International English Language Testing System) 5.5 although this is not formally tested. The
standards of the programs are instead monitored through periodic review by an IELTS-accredited staff member who assures the University in relation to IELTS equivalence. By way of assuring itself that its admissions standards are being maintained, the University should consider periodic independent testing of the standards of proficiency in English that are achieved by its students, both on entry to and on completion of UTAS programs, onshore and offshore. The Panel notes that participation in the English preparatory program associated with UTAS programs has been associated with enhanced performance in the ‘College English’ tests required by the Chinese government for the issue of a local qualification.

UTAS acknowledges that it has had some recent difficulties with maintaining standards in English at its offshore operations in China, particularly at ZUT, where it has been difficult to recruit and retain appropriately qualified staff in the English program. Local teaching staff in the UTAS program confirmed that material delivered in English is often reinforced in Chinese during tutorials. The UTAS TNE quality assurance system (section 3.4.3) detected and addressed this matter and UTAS believes that it will be able to resolve these issues successfully with the imminent appointment of a new more capable service provider for English language teaching at ZUT. The Audit Panel saw this as a matter of great concern if the deficiencies it observed remain uncorrected. The University must continue its vigilance on this matter and it is committed to doing so.

The Panel notes that UTAS’ agreements with SOU and ZUT specify a minimum entry standard for English equivalent to IELTS 5.5. An IELTS score of 5.5, which UTAS claims to be the standard for the preparatory program, is below the minimum IELTS requirements for entry to other UTAS programs (IELTS Academic 6.0 – no individual band below 5.5). The Panel also notes that the UTAS program itself incorporates additional English language components, although the efficacy of this component in achieving IELTS equivalence is not monitored. The Panel is concerned that UTAS has no systematic mechanism for determining that its onshore English language requirements are being met on entry to its offshore programs, or that the English-language components that run in parallel with UTAS units offshore (whether formal or informal) are effective in enhancing competence in English.

Recommendation 1

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania takes action to ensure that its general entry requirements for proficiency in English are achieved on entry to all offshore programs, and that its standards for proficiency in English on entry to and completion of UTAS programs are monitored systematically and independently.

2.8 CORPORATE AND ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE

The Panel notes that the University of Tasmania is undergoing a number of important changes that are central to the follow up and thematic components of this audit. These include aspects of governance (corporate and academic), leadership, executive management, risk management, management reporting, the quality system and organisational culture. Salient aspects of these relationships are discussed in the following sections.

2.8.1 Council

UTAS’ governing body is a 17-member Council, which is assisted in its work by seven formally-constituted subcommittees. (The Panel notes that there are currently some vacancies and some temporary appointments pending a proposed legislated change to the size of the Council.)
The Chair and members of the Council are well acquainted with the particular societal needs of Tasmania and the ways in which the University might contribute. The Council is also supported by a comprehensive policy framework, which has been further developed since the 2005 AUQA audit (Affirmation 1 of the 2005 Report). Members of the Council are comfortable that they are well informed about the University, whether through formal reporting channels or informally via functions involving the community and stakeholders (for example, in conjunction with Council meetings that are held across the campuses or associated with graduation ceremonies offshore) and through their personal networks and constituencies.

The Council has been active in improving the types and relevance of reports that it considers in its governance role and is generally satisfied with the improvements it has achieved, although the advent of UTAS’ proposed new ‘dashboard’ (business intelligence) reporting system will be welcomed as another measure in facilitating and improving the effectiveness of its work. A recent review of the Council’s operations has encouraged further streamlining of its meeting procedures, continued strengthening of its strategic focus and further enhancement of the quality of reporting. The Council has also initiated a process of consultation with the Academic Senate, with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of its relationship with the Academic Senate on academic matters.

The Council has been active in oversight of the University’s risk management framework and feels confident that the executive is managing risks competently on its behalf, including risks associated with offshore programs. Members of Council and the executive report a positive, constructive and mutually respectful working relationship between these levels of the organisation. Members also report a collective willingness of the Council to continue to transition to a governance role (versus a ‘management’ role), notwithstanding the intimate knowledge of the operations of the University that has been gained by many Councillors during their membership. The forthcoming dashboard reporting method was seen as an important adjunct to this goal, particularly when it is able to incorporate core functions such as teaching and learning and research, which are yet to be addressed in the new reporting system.

The Council sees itself as having an appropriate involvement in corporate planning, particularly in being consulted early on matters of strategic significance, while still allowing ample opportunities for ‘bottom up’ involvement of the UTAS community. At the time of the audit the Council had not yet set performance measures for the Vice-Chancellor (and the executive), citing the recency of the Vice-Chancellor’s appointment and the importance of the evolving strategic plan and the forthcoming review of internationalisation in shaping such measures, particularly in achieving strategic alignment of corporate goals and actions. This is seen as an important piece of strategic governance work to be undertaken by the Council early in 2012 as a fundamental requirement for successful implementation of the new strategic plan.

As the governing body, the Council has a responsibility to contribute significantly in cultivating the ‘culture’ of the University. Over recent years UTAS has undertaken many reviews of its operations, the recommendations of which often seem to have had little impact. The Council is urged to reconsider its governing role in shaping the University’s culture, including its culture of improvement. The Panel sees a need for joint action between the Council and the Executive in determining the best approaches to achieving an evidence-based improvement culture. This does not suggest intervention in management issues by the Council. Rather, it seeks improved harmonisation of governance and management roles in achieving cultural change as appropriate to the respective roles.
Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the Council and the executive of the University of Tasmania reconsider the effectiveness of their respective roles in creating and maintaining the culture of the University, particularly in moving the University towards a climate of strategic evidence-based improvement.

2.8.2 Academic Governance

The peak academic governing body of UTAS is the Academic Senate, which operates in a comprehensive policy framework that, *inter alia*, provides for autonomy in academic governance. The Academic Senate has had recent reviews of its operations resulting in a variety of changes including a reduction in the membership from 120 to 100, developing a more strategic focus in debates and adopting more streamlined meeting procedures. While a body of about 100 members can be seen as large and potentially cumbersome in its operations, Senate sees the opportunity to bring together many perspectives through an inclusive membership as an important benefit to the quality of academic debate and leadership in the University. The Panel considers that the effectiveness of this model should continue to be monitored, in the context of other improvements in decision making and reporting that may allow the Academic Senate to further refine its processes. Access to enhanced performance data will be a critical improvement, such as is expected to be available with the advent of the business intelligence system and dashboard reporting to Council, through a highly-inclusive and strengthened strategic planning process and through the enhanced monitoring activities of the new Planning, Performance and Review Committee (PPRC).

The Academic Senate is supported in its work by six standing committees including a University Learning and Teaching Committee (ULTC) and the Research College Board (RCB). Faculties also have learning and teaching and research committees that liaise with the ULTC and the RCB to provide a conduit between policy making and local implementation. The Academic Senate assures itself of the quality of programs through a course review and approval process and it monitors the quality assurance reports on offshore programs. The Chair of Academic Senate also attends and liaises with offshore campuses periodically, for example for graduations.

The Academic Senate is assisted in its monitoring and implementation work by joint management and education committees for its offshore programs and it analyses periodic quality assurance reviews of offshore programs with the assistance of the ULTC. Periodic reviews of schools and other organisational units are overseen by the PPRC.

The Academic Senate sees its relationship with Council as appropriate and effective, although it welcomes the collaborations initiated recently by the Council to enhance this aspect of its operations. The Chair of the Academic Senate reported a positive and respectful relationship between the Academic Senate and the executive. With the exception of considering further streamlining of the operations of the Academic Senate mentioned above, the Panel is satisfied with the quality and capability of academic governance at UTAS and its role in quality assurance of programs.

2.9 MANAGEMENT, LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The current Vice-Chancellor was appointed in March 2011. He has reshaped the Senior Executive through a number of new appointments and by changing some existing roles within the executive. Two layers of executive input support the Vice-Chancellor. The first is the Senior Executive (SE), which consists of the Provost, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education)
(DVC(S&E)), Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) (DVC(R)), the new Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Development), the Chief Operating Officer and the Executive Director Strategic Projects. This group is expanded by the inclusion of the Chair of the Academic Senate, heads of UTAS institutes, deans, the Chief Finance Officer and the Director, Human Resources to constitute a ‘Senior Management Team’ (SMT).

The SMT is supported by six committees embracing corporate management and reporting functions. The recently-established Planning, Performance and Review Committee (PPRC), which is intended to bring together and analyse a diversity of data for management reporting, is seen as a pivotal part of an improved management reporting system for the SE, the SMT and the Council.

Members of the SE and SMT reported that these groups are helpful to decision making and internal communication, while acknowledging that the new senior executive arrangements are still in a formative stage and that some further refinements may be required as the roles of the groups evolve and the new strategic plan is implemented.

Leadership, accountabilities and reporting lines at faculty, school and centre level are generally typical of Australian universities and the incumbents of the relevant positions are clear on their roles and responsibilities. However, the University changed its planning and performance monitoring processes at faculty level in several ways in 2010 and 2011 (PF p12), which point to a series of potential implementation issues to be followed through while implementing the new strategic plan:

A further development in 2011 has reinforced the link between faculty/divisional planning, budgeting, target setting, performance monitoring and improvement, supported by the new Planning, Performance and Review Committee (PPRC), chaired by the Provost. A significant change is a move from annual planning to a rolling three-year cycle, accompanied by a shift to explicitly faculty-based strategies, budgets and targets. The planning-performance-budget process will be progressively expanded to include workforce planning, facilities use and major capital expenditure. A related priority is the recognised need to improve performance management and career development arrangements for staff, and to link them more explicitly to institutional and faculty objectives.

UTAS has also adopted a number of less formal decision-making, reporting and change-management strategies that run in parallel with formal accountabilities. Examples include the appointment of ‘champions’ for University-wide projects such as the criterion referenced assessment (CRA) project and widespread involvement of staff in University policy-making committees. While the Panel acknowledges that the University’s choice of change management strategies is a decision for management, the chosen arrangements have the potential to generate a climate of potentially mixed signals in relation to accountability and authority (for example between associate deans and deans, or between heads of schools and deans). The Panel formed the view that UTAS should, as part of its risk management, remain vigilant in relation to the potential risks of confused communication and accountabilities as the implementation of change continues. The Panel notes a significant commitment of staff time to wider organisational work including committees. Whether such involvement could be streamlined through different lines of reporting should also be considered. This matter could be revisited during the implementation of the new strategic plan.

**Recommendation 3**

*It is recommended that the University of Tasmania ensure that its formal internal reporting lines and its many less-formal cross-functional accountabilities and channels are effective and efficient management and*
reporting mechanisms as further changes to the structure of the University are implemented.

2.10 PLANNING FRAMEWORK

UTAS has an established history of effective strategic planning, encompassing iterations of its ‘EDGE’ (Excellence, Distinctiveness, Growth and Engagement) framework, which was first introduced in 2005. After a review in 2007, the University of Tasmania Strategic Plan 2008-2011: EDGE2 was developed. It is supported by a series of subsidiary plans; academic plans (teaching and learning and research), the Internationalisation Plan and support plans. Annual plans for organisational units, such as faculty plans, are aligned with the higher-level UTAS plans.

At the time of the audit a new strategic plan was being developed and an inaugural Statement of Values had just been developed. Subsidiary plans had already been prepared to guide current operations, although the staff concerned acknowledge that these would need refinement as the new strategic plan and its implications unfold. The process for developing the new plan was universally praised for its inclusiveness by all involved at various levels of the University. How it is envisaged to link the new high-level plan with local planning and monitoring was also well understood and accepted. The planning process is building on the process used for developing the UTAS Statement of Values which stemmed from a staff survey (‘Your Voice’) in 2009. The process to develop the Statement of Values was highly regarded by all who were interviewed, both for the outcome and for the inclusive nature of the process.

This strong foundation of ‘buy in’ to the corporate planning process provides a sound basis for finalisation and implementation of the new strategic plan and UTAS is commended for this achievement, not only for the immediate outcome but also for the on-going organisational capability it represents.

Commendation 5

The University of Tasmania is commended for the inclusive nature of the strategic planning process that it has implemented, including the on-going organisational capability that this process represents.

Despite the inclusive processes that have been developed and implemented the Panel found there were still patches of a lack of awareness of the overall directions and policies of the University among interviewees, often with a strong ‘campus focus’ where staff are more likely to identify with a local view rather than with a corporate view expressed by the University as a whole. While this is understandable in the particular context, the Panel formed the view that more work will be required to further develop the concept of ‘one university with several campuses’ as espoused by the executive. Stakeholders in Burnie and Launceston also commented on this point, noting the importance of continuing efforts to build on the standing and inclusiveness of the operations at those sites that have been achieved in the multi-campus model so far.

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania re-examine the effectiveness of its strategies for building a culture of a coherent multi-campus university with a view to gaining stronger engagement with this concept among staff, students and external stakeholders, particularly in its regional campuses.
2.11 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ENHANCEMENT

2.11.1 Benchmarking

UTAS provided the Panel with a register outlining over 70 examples of benchmarking activity undertaken over recent years, encompassing both academic and corporate aspects of its operations. These benchmarking activities include Australian and international comparators and embrace a broad range of benchmarking topics such as higher degrees and research training, teaching quality, orientation, transition, assessment, curriculum development, promotions and many others. Specific and effective benchmarking partnerships have been established with the University of Wollongong and Deakin University, and a partnership with University of Newcastle is in its early stages.

Like many Australian universities, UTAS participates in providing data for comparative reports provided by the Australian Universities International Directors’ Forum, the Council of Australian University Librarians, the Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology, the Association for Academic Language and Learning, the Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development, and other groups. It also utilises external surveys such as course experience, graduate destinations and student engagement. Internal student evaluation of teaching and learning surveys are used for comparisons between faculties and programs and these are integrated in individual performance reviews as well as for benchmarking across units.

UTAS is not affiliated with other universities in one of the well-recognised national groupings. For the purposes of its Institutional Performance Portfolio (IPP), UTAS is grouped with a cross section of different ‘types’ of universities (The Australian National University, The University of Adelaide, The University of Newcastle, The University of Western Australia and the University of Wollongong). While this allows UTAS to place itself in a spectrum of Australian university performance, it does not provide as robust a basis for performance comparisons as might be gained from a group of more alike universities. A cluster of more ‘natural’ comparators has been identified for the next IPP.

While UTAS presented ample evidence of comparative studies that have been made, and many examples of good standing in relation to comparators, the Panel saw rather less evidence of such comparisons extending to ‘benchmarking for improvement’ (see comments about the OADRI cycle in relation to the UTAS Quality Framework) and setting performance targets based on benchmarking. Recent work with the University of Wollongong and Deakin University is moving more positively in this respect.

**Recommendation 5**

While the University of Tasmania’s extensive involvement in benchmarking activities is acknowledged, it is recommended that the University extend and transform its approach to benchmarking to develop this as a more systemic improvement-oriented and strongly evidence-based component of the University’s quality framework.

The Panel saw some examples of performance targets that seemed ‘aspirational’ (at least in the short term), such as for UTAS’ overall ranking in research performance against other Australian universities. However, it was put to the Panel by a number of staff that they would prefer to keep such targets in critical areas as ‘aspirational’ or ‘stretch’ targets, even though they may take some time to be realised.
As UTAS moves ahead with its evolving strategy for internationalisation, the benefits of extending its current benchmarking activities in this area could be considered.

2.11.2 Use of Data and Information

UTAS acknowledges that it needs to improve its use of data for decision making, performance monitoring, benchmarking and other evidence-based improvements. The advent of the PPRC, the forthcoming update of ICT systems and the advent of the new business-intelligence dashboard-reporting approach are all significant steps in this respect. The Audit Panel identified various barriers to the use of data to create a culture of management by information at local level. These barriers include complex report formats, lagging data, the need for local customisation and a lack of timeliness for some reports.

While the University is very experienced in obtaining comparative external data for benchmarking topics, there is considerable opportunity to refine its capabilities to collect and analyse its internal performance data in a meaningful way. The Panel finds that this particular aspect of UTAS’ organisational capability has not yet been selected as a benchmarking topic. This should be considered in guiding UTAS’ continuing development. Associated improvements could include consideration of the types of performance measures and indicators that will accompany the new planning framework and how the necessary data might be generated to better monitor internal performance in a more systematic way.

Affirmation 2

The actions the University of Tasmania has already taken to strengthen its data gathering, analytical and reporting capabilities are affirmed, and the University is encouraged to progress its planned improvements.

The Panel notes some uncertainty and confusion among staff about potential or proposed future structures and reporting lines, including proposed changes to data gathering and reporting such as the business intelligence system and the role of the PPRC. Although this is understandable, in view of the many changes that are taking place or have been foreshadowed, it also points to a significant component of change management that will be needed to enable staff to understand what will be required of them in achieving the changes, whatever they may prove to be.

While it is acknowledged that UTAS has been successful in establishing an inclusive planning process, which has generated a sense of involvement and participation across the University, the Panel formed the view that current uncertainties will need to be addressed deliberately as a foundation for continuing success of the planning process and implementation of the plan. To that end it is recommended that the strengths of the current planning process be built on with a strong communication strategy to support the implementation of the array of proposed changes to future strategic directions, enhanced data gathering, and analysis and development of the University’s ICT systems. Such a strategy should be meaningful to staff at all levels and it should promote the benefits of the proposed changes.

Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania build on its current consultative planning processes by developing a comprehensive communication strategy to enhance the effectiveness of internal communication about forthcoming organisational changes.
3 THEME: INTERNATIONALISATION

This theme was chosen in recognition of the significance of internationalisation for the University’s strategic directions.

This section addresses the following aspects of internationalisation:
- overview
- strategic directions and planning
- internationalisation of the curriculum
- offshore programs
- international students’ experience
- internationalisation of research
- student mobility (inbound and outbound)
- international reputation
- outlook.

3.1 OVERVIEW

The University’s main international activities overseas involve delivery of offshore undergraduate programs through arrangements with partner institutions. The AMC also delivers programs to students offshore by distance education, including to students on ships. There are also over 2000 international students enrolled onshore (undergraduate and postgraduate) and a variety of international research collaborations and related activities.

At the time of the audit UTAS was preparing a new strategic plan and had just commissioned a comprehensive review of its international strategy. The Audit Panel’s findings are presented in the context of the likelihood of significant changes to UTAS’ internationalisation agenda and consequent operations in the near future, including internationalisation of curricula.

3.2 STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS AND PLANNING

Following a review of UTAS’ international education strategy in 2008 the University amended its vision and adopted the following definition of internationalisation:

Internationalisation is the integration of international, intercultural and global dimensions into the overall student and staff experience and into the teaching and learning, research and service functions of the University. (Knight, 1999) (PF p21)

UTAS’ activities are currently guided by an Internationalisation Plan 2011–2013, which is intended to move the University more towards its current vision of ‘integration’ of its international activities. The Internationalisation Plan was developed by the Internationalisation Committee and adopted by the University, although the plan is undergoing further development and will be informed by the forthcoming review. Substantial revision of the existing Plan and the subsidiary activities flowing from it were foreshadowed to the Panel.

There is no separately identified stand-alone executive management position for internationalisation such as a PVC (International) for example. Instead internationalisation is included in the executive management portfolio of the DVC(S&E) and the DVC(R) provides assistance in some specific areas (such as internationalisation of research). A new arrangement that will see consolidation of international student support (particularly for undergraduate
students) into a combined domestic and international student support office was noted by the Panel, although many members of staff were unaware of this development, despite a formal change management process being undertaken over the last year. Many aspects of support for international research students will remain with faculties and such services, while offering the capacity to tailor services to local needs, will in future become vulnerable to inconsistencies in service delivery if not guided by a strong well-communicated policy framework.

Management of overseas programs is carried out by the faculty or school concerned, although approval and monitoring of offshore programs is supervised by the Academic Senate as for any other program. Offshore programs are also overseen by joint management and education committees with partner institutions. The majority of administrative work for offshore programs is undertaken electronically in Tasmania.

While the current Internationalisation Committee is seen by the University to meet the current needs of UTAS, it will be important to ensure that any recommendations it makes continue to be integrated with the University’s accountability channels, particularly if accountability and performance management at faculty level evolve into a more decentralised model (section 2.9).

The University’s goals for internationalisation according to its Internationalisation Plan 2011–2013 are:

**UTAS Internationalisation Goals, 2011–2013**

1. UTAS will be internationally recognised for its research, and be a sought after partner for international collaboration
2. UTAS will utilise an internationalised curriculum that is global in perspective and facilitates intercultural competence
3. UTAS will provide a quality student experience, and encourage students to take up mobility options that prepare them academically and socially for life and careers in the globalised society
4. UTAS will welcome students from around the world through onshore and TNE programs
5. UTAS will welcome staff from overseas institutions to UTAS, and encourage UTAS staff to engage with colleagues in other countries
6. UTAS will act as a catalyst to build appreciation of the benefits of internationalisation in the wider community

Source: PF p21.

**3.3 INTERNATIONALISATION OF THE CURRICULUM**

In 2010, in support of the goals of the current Internationalisation Plan, UTAS embarked on a University-wide project to internationalise curricula, following on from some earlier local successes at faculty level. The first phase of this project, to survey the extent of internationalisation of current curricula, has been completed. While the University points to some issues in interpretation of the data, much more needs to be done with only approximately 12% of units showing a high level of internationalisation and another 52% indicating only ‘some level’ of internationalisation.

The upcoming aspects of the project aim to develop staff capacity, offering access to and guidance about best practice, a conference to promote the concept of internationalisation and, possibly, the advent of local ‘champions’ along the lines used for other improvement projects. These steps will be backed by revised requirements for new course proposals and
new unit proformas, which will require specific documentation of the extent of internationalisation for approval of new courses and units. In view of the variable success of earlier iterations of this endeavour, UTAS is urged to obtain a better understanding of the reasons for the previous lack of success and likely success factors for the current reinvigorated program.

In light of the recent survey results it could be helpful to review the approach of the project to ensure it will be as effective as it can be, including its links to the graduate attributes project and the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards (LTAS)@UTAS Project (section 4). The low level of uptake of internationalisation of curricula achieved to date points to leadership and management issues and suggests that internationalisation of curricula might also be considered in relation to the revised performance monitoring approaches that are being introduced at faculty level (section 2.9). The low level of uptake may also benefit from a consolidated approach to the definition, communication and embedding of priorities for internationalisation.

**Affirmation 3**

The University of Tasmania’s efforts in internationalisation of the curriculum are affirmed, but the University is encouraged to build on that activity by advancing the work as a matter of priority and by better integrating it with other related projects.

### 3.4 OFFSHORE PROGRAMS

#### 3.4.1 Sampling

Leading up to its audit UTAS informed TEQSA that it would be withdrawing from a number of its existing overseas partnerships as it begins to reshape its international involvement. UTAS’ operations in China continue to be material to its international profile and the Panel decided to sample all UTAS programs at Shanghai Ocean University (SOU), the Bachelor of Information Systems and Bachelor of Business, and at Zhejiang University of Technology (ZUT), the Bachelor of Computing.

The approximate enrolments in these programs are tabulated below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>EFTSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Information Systems</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOU</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZUT</td>
<td>Bachelor of Computing</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UTAS Portfolio (PF p40)

#### 3.4.2 Arrangements

Both universities in China provide modern, dedicated teaching spaces and staffing for the UTAS program in specific ‘institutes’ within each university (SOU-AIEN Institute and ZUT International College). As is customary in China, students live on campus in shared accommodation in close proximity to the institutes and ancillary facilities such as library and dining facilities.
Students in both SOU and ZUT complete one year of intensive education in English before undertaking any UTAS units. The UTAS units are then completed over the subsequent three years, along with some local units, resulting in a four-year program overall (section 2.7). UTAS units are taught in English and local units are taught in Chinese. English continues as a subject into second year, but the content is focused more on course-related ‘business’ English rather than learning foundation English per se. Students are also required to complete a national ‘College English’ program which can be done at any time in SOU but must be completed by the end of second year at ZUT (which the Panel saw as an advantage in integrating all of the English components with the UTAS program).

The programs in China are approved by the appropriate regulatory authority and they are also bound by the terms of their respective Cooperative Education Agreement with UTAS. Each of these agreements outlines the overall legal framework and governance arrangements for the partnership. Programs are approved by Academic Senate and overseen by a Joint Management/Education Committee (JMC/JEC) which conducts an annual meeting to review the partnership, compliance with the UTAS agreement and the quality of academic delivery. In addition to the JEC, at SOU the relationship is governed by a joint UTAS-SOU Board that meets annually during the graduation visit.

The academic delivery schedule for each TNE program forms an attachment to the Cooperative Education Agreement and sets out minimum entry requirements, including details of any advanced standing arrangements and minimum English language requirements. UTAS rules and policies apply, including those governing academic misconduct and student complaints, although additional allowances are made in situations where time and distance disadvantage a student.

Students who complete the UTAS programs and also meet the requirements of the local institution are awarded a local qualification as well as a UTAS qualification. The Panel was informed that failure to complete the UTAS requirements will preclude the issue of a local qualification because of the large component of shared content.

Information for staff who are involved in UTAS TNE programs is readily accessible in a common repository, the TNE Toolbox. Administration of the UTAS components of the programs is mostly carried out in Tasmania, facilitated by liaison staff in China.

### 3.4.3 Quality Assurance

Comprehensive arrangements that are designed to maintain the quality of offshore programs are in place. These include a system of periodic review (approximately annually) of the academic and non-academic aspects of the program by a member of UTAS staff from a cognate discipline who is not involved in teaching the program. There is also extensive moderation of assignments (typically 60%) backed by clear statements of expectations for staff and students. The joint governance arrangements (JMC/JEC) are effective in initiating and following up on improvements. Plagiarism is reported to have declined markedly as a result of improved orientation and awareness of previous disciplinary actions taken against offenders.

Information for students about the UTAS programs is clear and comprehensive and includes significant orientation on Western approaches to higher education and understanding of plagiarism in particular. Professional development programs are provided in China by UTAS staff and key academic and professional staff have undertaken orientation and induction in Tasmania (Commendation 1 at section 2.2). These arrangements have been extended at ZUT by a formal system of weekly reporting from local staff to the Tasmanian course coordinator, a system that could be extended to other programs.
UTAS is commended for the quality assurance systems it has in place for offshore partnerships generally and for the implementation of the system in China in particular. The system has proved to be effective in detecting and rectifying actual or potential areas of concern (section 2.4, 2.7) and demonstrably contributes to the high standards of academic achievements offshore (data item 5.13). Satisfaction levels for international students completing the same units onshore and offshore are monitored using the same evaluation instrument. Data presented by UTAS show that the satisfaction results for onshore international students are generally similar for the two cohorts and in some cases higher for TNE students.

**Commendation 6**

The University of Tasmania is commended for the comprehensive and effective quality assurance system it has established for governing, monitoring and improving transnational education partnership arrangements.

Notwithstanding the robust and effective quality systems UTAS has in place for its TNE activities, the Panel suggests some areas for further improvement to this strong foundation including inclusion of detailed program arrangements in the TNE Toolbox to supplement the current higher-level information, enhancement of the processes for document control in the Toolbox, cataloguing of learning resources such as library collections for comparative purposes and greater use of student feedback by local staff in China to complement and further strengthen the roles of UTAS staff who already use feedback from the UTAS quality system to generate improvements. The Panel also notes that UTAS transcripts do not specify the teaching that is delivered in China by UTAS and suggests that this information be added to future transcripts. This could become of greater significance if the University moves more toward a mix of offshore and onshore delivery arrangements.

### 3.5 INTERNATIONAL STUDENT EXPERIENCE

#### 3.5.1 Students Offshore

Students who were interviewed at SOU and ZUT reported a high level of satisfaction overall with their programs. Aside from a small number of particular instances, the UTAS staff involved in the program and the communication and support provided by both academic and professional staff in Tasmania were regarded highly by students, as well as by local staff. Students believe that the information they obtained about their programs is accurate and that the expectations of them in the programs are clear, for example via unit outlines, assessment templates, inductions and the student handbook. There is universal satisfaction with online access to MyLO, the UTAS library resources and the quality of learning materials provided by UTAS lecturers. UTAS staff members were reported to be readily accessible during their visits to China and at other times by email. The enthusiasm and supportiveness of staff (local and in Tasmania) were praised by all students who were interviewed.

Gaining skills in English through a program delivered in English is seen as the paramount advantage of the programs, followed by enhanced competitiveness in the job market and the potential for easier global mobility that is expected to be conferred by an Australian degree. Notwithstanding the value of the international degree, the availability of a concurrently-awarded local degree is also seen as a benefit. The current programs in China enjoy a record of high employment among graduates (about 95%) and all are experiencing an increase in demand for places.
Complaints about the SOU and ZUT programs were few. However, some students believe that the ‘block teaching’ used by visiting UTAS staff offshore is sometimes overwhelming in relation to the large volume of the course covered at one time and/or taxing in relation to the students’ abilities to assimilate the material. The intensive delivery also limits opportunities to engage in reflective learning and some students feel somewhat inadequate in coping with intensive learning in English. While this criticism was far from universal, the Panel considers that UTAS could review the pedagogical effectiveness of this delivery model. Some adverse comment was received by the Panel about the capacity of a minority of local staff to deliver follow up material effectively in English. Occasional lapses in timeliness in giving feedback on assignments were also reported but this is not a general concern.

3.5.2 International Students Onshore

Feedback from international students in Tasmania was more mixed. While most students are comfortable with the learning resources provided, a number report difficulties with ‘fitting in’ with local students and two students suggested that staff in their schools lack cross-cultural awareness, to the point of occasionally disadvantaging international students. However, other international students report very positive experiences. The suggestion of a culture of limited engagement between international and domestic students overall is corroborated by the results of the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement 2008–2010 (PF p32). On the other hand the assistance provided for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students by the CALD Support Service was universally highly regarded. UTAS seems to be facing quite different issues in meeting the learning needs of international students who have primarily come to study at the University from overseas and who have a strong background in higher education, as compared with others of international background who have recently settled in Tasmania, sometimes with more limited educational backgrounds. The Panel is confident that the University is sensitive to this issue and is taking steps to achieve favourable outcomes for both groups, although more work is needed and will be needed as the number of students from an international background increases across the campuses.

UTAS acknowledges opportunities for improvement in its internationalisation of student experiences, although it points to recent successes on a small scale with its Community Friends and Networks program for ‘new to town’ students in spawning friendships and cross-cultural exchanges over the past 17 months. There are notable examples of enduring good practice, such as in the Faculty of Law, which received an Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) award for its mechanisms to offer student support, including those addressing the particular needs of international students. UTAS is seeking to have a broader distribution of international students across its campuses, but acknowledges that this is difficult, partly because of circumstances beyond its control, for example the Australian Government’s settlement program for the region which results in settlement of people of international background in the region who have quite variable educational experiences. The formation of the Internationalisation Committee and the current Internationalisation Plan are seen by UTAS as important early steps in guiding future progress and providing an appropriate corporate focus for improving the student experience.

Affirmation 4

While the University of Tasmania’s initial efforts in promoting and supporting interactions between domestic and international students are acknowledged, the University’s commitment to make more progress in this respect across all campuses and for all groups of students is affirmed.

Higher degree by research (HDR) students (international and domestic) generally report overall satisfaction with their program and experiences, particularly with their supervision.
Many indicated that they came to UTAS because of the international reputation of their supervisor. Induction was also considered to be useful, although the timing varied across faculties with some students not having their induction until six months after arrival. A number of criticisms of international graduate support processes were heard by the Panel, about administrative inefficiencies (loss of paperwork, timeliness in processing material) and occasional perceived lapses of professionalism (alleged breaches of privacy). UTAS is urged to examine whether these may be isolated instances or reflect systemic problems that need to be addressed.

Undergraduate students generally reported that the UTAS’ ‘meet and greet’ program for new arrivals was both welcome and effective, although some HDR students said they had been unaware of the process and did not use it. This may have reflected recent changes to the program but the University should explore whether this problem still exists and to what extent. In view of the large cohort of international students associated with the AMC and their sometimes different learning needs and circumstances, such as vocational education and training (VET) students, the needs of this cohort could be addressed specifically.

3.6 INTERNATIONALISATION OF RESEARCH

UTAS has a range of well-established research centres and institutes, many of which concentrate on issues relevant to Tasmania, but nonetheless attract international participation and collaboration because of acknowledged leadership and influence in their respective fields. The University has over 700 students undertaking higher degree by research.

The University is proud of its achievements and contributions that are not only particularly relevant to Tasmania’s economy and society (aquaculture, marine science, agriculture, forestry, Antarctic studies, biosciences, maritime studies) but have generated prominent international reputations in the respective fields. The University has approximately 120 research collaboration agreements with institutions in 30 countries, although these are varyingly ‘active’. The Panel notes that the effectiveness of these arrangements is being reviewed. As part of its strategy to enhance research participation and leadership the University has implemented two recruitment schemes, Quantum Leaps in 2006–2009 and New Stars in 2009–2011, both of which focussed on recruitment of world-class researchers. UTAS sees this approach as highly successful; resulting in recruitment of some 30 high-performing researchers, mostly building on areas of strength.

Commendation 7

The University of Tasmania is commended for its approach to attracting and fostering high achievers in research and is urged to continue this endeavour in strengthening the internationalisation of its research.

UTAS is seeking to strengthen its research agenda overall and has an aspirational target to be ranked in the top 10 of Australian universities, which will involve international strategies. These may involve a more strategic focus on existing and new collaborations, possible collaborations with geographically similar ‘island’ universities and further diversification or focus of research expertise. These strategies may also encompass continuing review of the success of centres and institutes and targeted initiatives such as recruitment incentives. The Panel heard of many prospects for international collaboration and leadership arising from potential synergies with industry in the North West of Tasmania in particular.

While the Panel recognises that UTAS’ aspirations in research are ambitious and will require considerable effort, the University has a strong foundation on which it can build, particularly through the architecture of its established centres and institutes. More work needs to be done
with emerging research arrangements (for example the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies) and with transitions and potential affiliations in cognate areas, such as reaching a decision on whether elements of the AMC’s research activities will be relocated into other centres or institutes.

3.7 STUDENT MOBILITY

UTAS has made progress in enhancing student mobility under the banner of its commitment to ‘equipping students for life and work in a globalised world’. The University has identified that financial constraints are the most important deterrent to outbound exchanges and a significant fund (initially $150K) has been established to provide travel subsidies. The Panel urges the University to progress this work as a fundamental prerequisite for a more strategic approach to student mobility.

Criteria and processes for allocating support from the mobility fund have yet to be formalised and awareness of it among students interviewed was inconsistent. The Panel formed the view that formalisation of the approach would be helpful, including adopting strategically aligned criteria for allocation. Further effort may be required at faculty level to encourage participation by students in those faculties that have had lower participation rates.

The Panel finds that UTAS needs to be clearer about its commitment to student exchanges. The University’s current endeavours seem to be piecemeal and a strategic focus is not obvious. The Panel acknowledges that further progress will be subject to the findings of the review of internationalisation and whether or not (i) UTAS moves its offshore involvement to a greater emphasis on international students undertaking part of their studies onshore, such as a ‘two plus two’ model like the one established recently with Shandong University of Science and Technology, and (ii) whether or not future models deliberately encourage outbound mobility (the current partnership models give negligible encouragement to international undergraduate mobility in either direction). While the Panel met research students who had benefited greatly from international exchanges as part of their higher degree studies, these benefits appeared to be largely opportunistic rather than part of a concerted strategic effort by UTAS.

The Panel urges UTAS to seek a more strategic approach to student mobility as part of its future mix in internationalisation. Like internationalisation of the curricula, this could play a significant part of the new system of performance monitoring of faculties, although an improved data collection mechanism is a necessary prerequisite.

**Recommendation 7**

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop an overarching strategic approach to student mobility to guide further developments in this aspect of internationalisation.

3.8 INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION

UTAS has established an international reputation with its offshore programs and its international research presence, especially through the work of its centres and institutes, although this reputation is still often based on the reputation of individual researchers. A view was put to the Panel on a number of occasions that the long-standing international reputation of the AMC (and the standing of its ‘brand’) may be vulnerable to dilution of the identity of the College as an unintended consequence of integration within UTAS. The Audit Panel did not form a view on the validity of this proposition in the context of this audit. However, the Panel does wish to draw these expressed concerns of internal and external stakeholders to the
attention of the University as a potentially serious risk to the international standing and reputation of the UTAS/AMC brand. The Panel also notes some lingering discontent with the management of the initial merger and subsequent integration among some AMC staff, which could potentially contribute to a reputational risk for UTAS.

Some students in UTAS programs in China exhibit varying degrees of confusion and uncertainty about the international and domestic standing of UTAS. For example, there appears to be poor awareness of the standing and credibility of UTAS when compared with some other Australian universities and also some doubts about the acceptance of UTAS degrees internationally. The Panel considers that UTAS should take this aspect of its reputational management in China into account in future conceptions of partnering programs.

3.9 OUTLOOK

Although UTAS is able to articulate its strategic directions through the current Internationalisation Plan 2011–2013, the Panel notes some uncertainty throughout the University community about future directions. Such uncertainties may have been created in part by differing awareness of possible future priorities being considered by the executive and uncertainty about the impact of the coming review of internationalisation, which appeared to be unexpected in several quarters. The Panel considers that it is a matter of urgency for UTAS to be able to articulate a clear strategic direction in this important aspect of its operations, one that can be embraced by the University and marketed to prospective students with clarity, including the ‘distinctive’ experience of UTAS that might be available to international students.

Within this context, the Audit Panel finds that UTAS has a robust record in establishing and monitoring successful offshore programs, which will stand it in good stead in so far as this capability is relevant to future directions. This capability is backed by a strong commitment to internationalisation by those involved (albeit surrounded by some current uncertainty) which can also be harnessed for future developments.

UTAS is urged to be as proactive as possible in establishing the new enabling and monitoring systems that will be needed for any significant changes to its approach to international activities and to pursue an engagement strategy to build on the current commitment of the staff based on historic successes. Delivery of new strategies arising from the coming review will also require a greater emphasis on implementation than occurred with some earlier reviews.

There is room for improvement in enabling staff to fully engage in the future internationalisation agenda of the University by considering more opportunities for training, rewards and recognition. UTAS’ human resources policies need to reflect and support the internationalisation strategy in a systemic way more so than at present, such as in recruitment, performance monitoring and promotion. The Panel notes that there are currently many identified international ‘collaborations’, although these seemed to be variably ‘active’ and determined more opportunistically and individually rather than by any overarching strategy. The intention to bring a more strategic approach to this aspect of UTAS’ operations is encouraged.
4 THEME: LEARNING OUTCOMES

The second theme for this audit was ‘Learning outcomes’. It was selected by AUQA after a consideration of issues relating to the theme, recommendations from the 2005 AUQA Audit Report, and the central significance of the theme to the University’s strategic priorities.

This section addresses the following aspects of learning outcomes:
- overview
- academic learning outcomes
- participation, retention and success
- approaches to improving learning outcomes
- outlook.

4.1 OVERVIEW

In addressing this theme the University notes in its Portfolio that the concept of ‘learning outcomes’ is evolving globally, nationally and institutionally (PF p53). UTAS has traditionally seen ‘learning outcomes’ through several perspectives. These perspectives encompass unit-specific outcomes at the narrowest interpretation, through to an aggregate contribution of the University’s overall educational efforts to the regional and state-wide societal wellbeing of Tasmania at the broadest level. Other perspectives on learning outcomes, such as discipline-specific learning outcomes, identified graduate attributes, and distinctive ‘Tasmanian’ outcomes are encompassed within this overall continuum of views, to varying degrees. Notwithstanding the collaborative processes that were adopted in defining learning outcomes, the Panel noted some uncertainty about the application and implementation of the concept across programs and campuses in interviews with teaching staff. The University expects to address this issue in its continuing work in this area.

UTAS notes that a new Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan is being developed in 2011 and that it reflects a ‘core philosophy of learning that is student-centred, participatory and built around a refreshed approach to learning outcomes and graduate attributes’ (PF p52). The University also informed the Panel that it hopes to achieve ‘distinctive’ learning outcomes and a ‘distinctive student experience’ at UTAS, while continuing to equip students with a global perspective for life in the modern world.

The University cites two pivotal historical developments in relation to learning outcomes: a University-wide project to implement criterion referenced assessment; and a significant involvement of UTAS in the former ALTC’s threshold learning outcomes (Learning and Teaching Academic Standards-LTAS) project through discipline scholars and other leadership. The strengthening of the Australian Qualifications Framework and the advent of the new Higher Education Standards Framework are also seen as critical contextual factors for future developments at UTAS; as are the roll out of a derivative of the ALTC project within the University (LTAS@UTAS Project) over the coming year, the review of graduate attributes that is in progress and any changes to learning outcomes that may arise from a new internationalisation strategy.
4.2 ACADEMIC LEARNING OUTCOMES

4.2.1 Focus on Academic Learning Outcomes

UTAS has conducted a University-wide criterion referenced assessment (CRA) project aimed at specifying and assessing learning outcomes, primarily at the unit level. This initiative has been assisted by the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching, a network of ‘champions’ and new enabling resources such as standardised unit outlines, templates, guidelines and case studies. The CRA project has been implemented across the majority of programs.

The Panel finds that this project has been largely successful, with generally willing uptake by staff, including the assessment rubrics that are intended to capture specified outcomes in unit-level assessment. Students have benefited from clearer specification of expected outcomes. However, specification of learning outcomes has been primarily in the cognitive domain and more work will be required in the affective domain, as has been acknowledged by the University. This is a complex area, which will be revisited during the forthcoming LTAS@UTAS Project and though the refreshment of the UTAS graduate attributes.

Definition of learning outcomes at levels above units, for example at course, discipline and major levels, was found to be quite patchy except for courses that are subject to external accreditation. This is acknowledged by UTAS and will be addressed over the next triennium beginning with the roll out of the LTAS@UTAS Project. This is an important initiative and UTAS is fortunate to be able to draw on a pool of former ALTC discipline scholars. Since May 2011 a system for assessing compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework is being applied progressively to all awards (PF p56). This too will need to be integrated with UTAS’ overall approach to learning outcomes.

In relation to externally-accredited programs, the Panel observes that UTAS, like other universities, is at risk of deferring unduly to professional bodies to set outcomes, for example, in diminishing emphasis on future orientation and prospective academic developments in favour of contemporary practice. The Panel encourages the University to continue to manage this risk by working toward mutually-agreed outcomes, as the Panel saw occurring successfully in several areas, such as in education, medicine, pharmacy and AMC programs.

These considerations also apply to the definition of graduate attributes for professional courses (including consideration of the affective domain as noted above) as well as to discipline-specific outcomes, although not necessarily to the same extent.

Affirmation 5

The University of Tasmania’s plans to extend more systematically the definition of learning outcomes to course and discipline levels, through the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards (LTAS)@UTAS Project and through further collaborations with the professions and industry, are affirmed.

UTAS’ previous approach to developing learning outcomes based primarily at the unit level presents certain challenges in that such outcomes have not necessarily been informed by the overarching outcomes of the course as a whole, which are yet to be defined in many cases. A focus on the whole course may require some reorientation in future specification of learning outcomes and the Panel encourages UTAS to focus on this issue as part of the roll out of the LTAS@UTAS Project.
Affirmation 6

UTAS’ commitment to learning outcomes at the unit level being informed and led by the overarching outcomes for the whole courses or discipline areas of which the units are part is affirmed.

UTAS demonstrated many examples of programs with identified learning outcomes that are intended to contribute specifically to the wellbeing of Tasmanian society in research programs (for example in aquaculture, agriculture) and in teaching and learning. The advent of a Graduate Certificate in Business at the Cradle Coast, which is specifically tailored to the educational needs of the local industry and to meet gaps in local provision, is an outstanding example of what has been achieved. This program has also enhanced participation in an area of Tasmania where this is typically low, and it links well with local VET programs. This initiative is expected to lead to further similar developments with other programs and at other sites, encouraged by the new Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Development) under the banner of ‘Knowledge Partnerships’.

Commendation 8

The University of Tasmania is commended for its responsiveness to meeting the learning needs of regional communities and industry in the Cradle Coast region, particularly through its successful ‘Knowledge Partnerships’ approach.

The Panel met with a selection of HDR students and researchers. Aside from discipline-specific outcomes and the generic outcomes that might be expected of higher degree studies and research, UTAS does not yet seem to be offering any special or ‘distinctive’ outcomes at this level. The Panel was surprised to find that for many interviewees this was the first time that they had met, leading the Panel to form a view that more effort might be given to achieving more interactions across the graduate community such as developing ‘communities of scholars’, which could be expected to foster both generic and ‘distinctive’ outcomes at postgraduate level, as well as an enhanced longer-term commitment to the University.

Recommendation 8

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania consider ways to strengthen the development of generic and ‘distinctive’ learning outcomes at postgraduate level.

However, postgraduate students did welcome the advent of the Graduate Certificate in Research, which focuses on generic skilling in research and postgraduate study, as a valuable generic component of higher degree study at UTAS. For some students this was an avenue for valued cross-disciplinary engagement as well. Students in the arts were more critical of the content of the graduate certificate in that some of the content was seen to be more orientated to scientific disciplines. UTAS is encouraged to consider ways of broadening the applicability of the program across all areas, while still not losing its value as an adjunct to generic learning. As this program is in its infancy, its applicability for the needs of students across the range of disciplines should be monitored.

Commendation 9

The University of Tasmania is commended for its implementation of a Graduate Certificate in Research to augment research skills and promote generic skilling for postgraduate study and work.
4.3 PARTICIPATION, RETENTION AND SUCCESS

Tasmania has a long history of low participation in higher education and indeed in tertiary education generally and UTAS has been keen to help address this as part of its contribution to wider community advancement in Tasmania. The following sections deal with participation and related matters, drawing on the Institutional Performance Portfolio (IPP) prepared by DEEWR and further detailed analyses of the data in the IPP.

4.3.1 Access and Participation

Domestic enrolments at UTAS have increased by about ten percent over recent years (data item 5.2). The average entry scores for UTAS students are lower than the average of its IPP comparators although, unlike some of its comparators, it has been able to maintain or even increase average entry scores slightly (data item 5.3).

4.3.2 Retention and Success

Progress rates for domestic students are lower than for UTAS' comparators, although they are being maintained against a slight downward trend for the comparator cohort overall (data item 5.4). The progress of international students onshore is generally better than for UTAS' comparator cohort (and for UTAS domestic students), albeit with the possibility of a recent downward trend that needs monitoring (see data item 5.5). Participation and progress rates for equity groups are generally better than for UTAS' comparators (see data item 5.6–5.9), although this observation may be somewhat distorted by the particular geographic distribution of the Tasmanian island population and UTAS being the only university in the state. Indigenous students enjoy a high rate of success in UTAS programs, when compared with both the sector and the comparator cohort (data item 5.7).

UTAS has much more of an issue with attrition. Attrition rates for domestic students are higher than for UTAS' comparators and rates have been rising (data item 5.10). This is an issue in all broad fields of study identified in the IPP, although worst in the ‘health’ category. There is some evidence that the rise in attrition may be reversing and more recent data presented by UTAS at the time of the audit supports this proposition to some extent, which UTAS attributes in part to its preparatory programs and improved strategies for dealing with students at risk.

Overall, attrition of international onshore students has also been rising markedly since 2005 (data item 5.11), which is more worrying for the University, although UTAS has not yet been able to identify any particular major or specific contributing factors. An exception is the area of ‘management and commerce’ where attrition rates for 2004 to 2007 was lower than for UTAS’ comparators but increased again slightly in 2008 (data item 5.12). There is an indication that attrition rates in the ‘health’ and ‘society and culture’ categories, while still higher than for the comparator cohort, are decreasing (data item 5.12).

International students generally achieve high grade point averages, both on shore and off shore, typically exceeding the performance of domestic students except for the high distinction/distinction level where domestic students perform slightly better than international students onshore (data item 5.13). The failure rates and withdrawal rates for international students are also far lower than for domestic students (data item 5.13).

The recent rising attrition rates for international onshore students (in contrast to a decline in average attrition rates across UTAS' current IPP comparators - data item 5.1.1) point to some risks for recruitment of more international students onshore in the future, as is being contemplated by the University. However, this issue appears (based on data to 2008) to be...
managed relatively well in the area of ‘management and commerce’ from whence transferable good practices may be able to be applied in other areas.

The panel sees it as a matter of urgency and priority that the University should gain a better understanding of the underlying causes of high attrition rates in Tasmania with a view to rectifying this area of relatively low performance in relation to the sector and its comparators.

**Recommendation 9**

It is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop a better understanding of the causes of high attrition rates among both onshore domestic and international students, taking into account potential examples of good practice in the area of ‘management and commerce’ for international students, and considers the implications of its findings for any move to larger numbers of international onshore students.

### 4.3.3 Graduate Attributes, Satisfaction and Destinations

Students reported a high level of satisfaction with teaching overall at all campuses, commenting generally favourably about the positive attitudes and accessibility of teaching staff. This finding is corroborated in the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) results for good teaching (data item 5.14), which show a rising trend in satisfaction, noting however that this trend is not consistent across all areas of study and UTAS needs to look at the areas such as ‘health’ (data item 5.15) that have not performed as well as other areas.

**Commendation 10**

The University of Tasmania is commended for the overall high level of student satisfaction with its teaching that has been achieved over recent years.

The CEQ also shows a high overall level of perceived satisfaction with attainment of generic skills, comparable with the sector average. In both the ‘society and culture’ and ‘management and commerce’ categories UTAS exceeds the average of the sector in this respect with a positive trend, but in ‘health’ the perceived acquisition of generic skills is lower than the average for the comparator cohort and the sector and appears not to be improving in relation to the comparator cohort. Although the Panel notes and encourages the early adoption and involvement by health disciplines in important academic initiatives such as the Academic Standards and CRA projects, this should be a point of focus for UTAS as it refreshes its approach to graduate attributes. These results are mirrored in perceived overall satisfaction (data item 5.16).

Graduate destinations show a fall in full-time employment and an accompanying, although lesser, rise in full-time study in recent years as has been typical of the sector during recent global economic difficulties (data item 5.17).

### 4.4 APPROACHES TO IMPROVING LEARNING OUTCOMES

#### 4.4.1 Reviews of Courses, Faculties and Schools

The Panel sees the new strengthened process for review of organisational units that is being implemented (section 2.9) as an important vehicle for performance monitoring and improvement, particularly in incorporating a risk-based approach. The advent of the PPRC and the forthcoming business intelligence reporting system are important adjuncts to the success
of this approach. UTAS is urged to proceed with the development of these systems as soon as practicable to assist in building a culture of evidence-based improvement.

**Affirmation 7**

The University of Tasmania’s revised approach to reviewing the performance of organisational units is affirmed and the University is encouraged to continue with its efforts to implement the process and to link it to the forthcoming ‘business intelligence’ reporting system.

### 4.4.2 Enabling Pathways

UTAS has implemented a comprehensive suite of preparatory programs to assist students in orientation and transition to university study (such as the UTAS College program, UniStart, and the University Preparation Program) to improve their language and learning skills and to assist with cultural assimilation, for example the CALD Support Service. The Peer Assisted Study Sessions (PASS) program has been particularly successful, involving some 54 first-year units with some 86 sessions being facilitated by 48 PASS leaders weekly in semester 1, 2011. An evaluation of the program found that participants achieve higher grades and are less likely to withdraw from study.

UTAS has strengthened its capacity in relation to transition and PASS through a successful benchmarking partnership with the University of Wollongong. Faculties have Student Advisors, backed by a central Transition Support Service, and provide credit-bearing foundation studies. Participation and achievement are also fostered through a variety of ‘high-achiever’ programs.

**Commendation 11**

The University of Tasmania is commended for the scope, quality and effectiveness of its preparatory programs such as the UTAS College Programs, UniStart and the University Preparation Program, and of its supporting programs, particularly the Peer Assisted Study Sessions.

The Panel finds that these programs are effective overall and students generally gave positive feedback on their experiences. However the Panel agrees with the University’s view that further improvements can be made and notes that UTAS will give priority to these matters as part of the new Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan, along with some restructuring of the DVC(S&E)’s division that is intended to streamline support while enhancing participation and learning outcomes.

While UTAS’ preparatory, transition and support programs are making a positive contribution to early student experiences and learning, it is less clear that systemic support systems exist for later year students, particularly specific support to retain students in a context of relatively high attrition rates (section 4.3.2).

In interviews with staff, the Panel found inconsistent approaches to detection of students at risk across the University. Staff gave examples of *ad hoc* detection by casual observations of behavioural indicators and occasional comments from colleagues or fellow students. Approaches to managing difficulties with English varied markedly in intensity and approach in offshore programs.

The Panel acknowledges that staff are committed to the well being of students and that collegial processes at the AMC and at the Cradle Coast campus appear to be effective in relation to academic risks, as is the needs analysis conducted in preparatory English programs.
offshore. However the Panel formed the view that this issue needs more work to build on existing practices to ensure there is a consistent and capable approach to detection of students at risk across all campuses and programs and at all levels of study. The Panel notes that the Business Intelligence project will enable better cohort identification, data drill down and responsiveness to monitor student performance and students at risk.

**Recommendation 10**

While the University of Tasmania’s overall commitment to supporting students at risk is acknowledged, it is recommended that the University of Tasmania develop a systemic capacity for detection of students at risk that is applied consistently across all programs and campuses.

### 4.5 OUTLOOK

Like its approach to internationalisation, the University of Tasmania’s approach to learning outcomes is undergoing change, including the prospective impact of a new internationalisation strategy on internationalisation of curricula and in accommodating a different mix of offshore program types. The concept of ‘learning outcomes’ has been addressed in a number of ways at UTAS, which has led to some confusion in the University community about its meaning at the operational level. Establishing a clearer and more consistent view of the concept across the University at all levels will benefit future work in this area.

A foundation for a focus on learning outcomes was established through the CRA project in particular, although this work has largely been confined to outcomes at the unit level. There has also been a greater focus on the cognitive domain and rather less on the affective domain. UTAS acknowledges the need to address these points and hopes to do so in the coming triennium.

The new LTAS@UTAS Project, which builds on UTAS’ former leadership in discipline-specific learning outcomes with the ALTC, offers a means to bring about an appropriate and renewed focus on outcomes at the course and discipline level where progress to date has been limited. This in turn will help to drive a reshaping of unit-level outcomes where needed and will be augmented by revisiting UTAS’ graduate attributes. While UTAS frequently refers to a ‘distinctive’ learning experience, or indeed a ‘distinctive Tasmanian’ experience, the Panel found little to suggest that this has been achieved in any meaningful way. To do so will be an important pillar of the attractiveness of future offshore programs where it is envisaged that more overseas students will come to Tasmania as part of their program rather than complete their entire program offshore.

The University enjoys a good reputation for the quality of its teaching and students frequently remarked on the positive and supportive attitudes of teaching staff across all campuses. This provides a strong foundation for future developments. Despite its record of good teaching and overall student satisfaction, UTAS experiences higher levels of attrition than might be hoped when compared with its IPP comparator cohort, notwithstanding the particular demography of Tasmania. This is worse in some disciplines than others and some cross fertilisation of successful approaches is indicated for the future. Greater attention to this risk is also indicated with the prospect of more overseas students coming to Tasmania, for example in ‘2+2’ programs with two years of study offshore preceding two years onshore as has been established recently with Shandong University of Science and Technology (SDUST).

UTAS is taking significant steps to enhance individual learning outcomes in ways that are responsive to the local context, for example the Graduate Certificate in Business that is tailored
to the educational and business needs of the North West Tasmanian community. The recent appointment of a Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Development), who will be able to bring further executive input and local attention to regional needs, is seen as a pivotal development in this respect. The Panel also heard of a myriad of potential developments with industry, for example in manufacturing, agriculture and aquaculture, some of which will ideally come to fruition to the benefit of the community generally and research students in particular. The University is also seeking to enhance participation in education in Tasmania overall through a variety of outreach programs for schools and the VET sector, which are hoped to yield benefits in the longer term.

The University of Tasmania has a well-established research culture but outcomes in this respect could be improved. Aspirational targets have been set for research performance nationally and internationally, although it is acknowledged that these may take some time to achieve. Higher degree by research students generally report a positive experience at UTAS, particularly with their supervision, and this provides a sound foundation for future developments. There was however little evidence of a community of scholars at this level, or (aside from the particular Tasmanian content of HDR topics) a ‘distinctive’ experience for research students; two areas with opportunities for improvement in learning outcomes.
Note: The cohort chosen for benchmarking purposes in the UTAS 2010 Institutional Performance Portfolio (IPP) consists of The Australian National University (ANU), The University of Adelaide (UA), The University of Newcastle (UN), The University of Western Australia (UWA) and the University of Wollongong (UW). In some figures in this section of the Report the University of Tasmania is identified by the abbreviation ‘UT’ rather than UTAS as used elsewhere in this Report.

ITEM 5.1: STUDENT LOAD AND HEADCOUNT BY LOCATION, DECEMBER 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>EFTSL</th>
<th>% total UTAS EFTSL</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
<th>% total UTAS Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hobart</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>13,680</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launceston</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>7514</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnie</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Australia</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hangzhou</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>16,237</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>26,781</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UTAS Portfolio (PF p5).
### ITEM 5.2: TRENDS IN STUDENT LOAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFTSL</td>
<td>13267.68</td>
<td>13456.90</td>
<td>14461.98</td>
<td>15172.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>10389.90</td>
<td>2877.78</td>
<td>10471.92</td>
<td>2984.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>2108.78</td>
<td>7689.12</td>
<td>1374.06</td>
<td>1532.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>411.49</td>
<td>376.13</td>
<td>447.54</td>
<td>322.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>321.22</td>
<td>341.39</td>
<td>361.53</td>
<td>353.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts</td>
<td>784.80</td>
<td>808.20</td>
<td>833.68</td>
<td>859.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1487.09</td>
<td>1447.23</td>
<td>1377.96</td>
<td>1409.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>475.41</td>
<td>482.21</td>
<td>878.79</td>
<td>995.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1914.70</td>
<td>2184.50</td>
<td>2558.15</td>
<td>2992.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1202.52</td>
<td>1103.20</td>
<td>975.23</td>
<td>1020.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2003.41</td>
<td>2128.57</td>
<td>2412.61</td>
<td>2430.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>1143.96</td>
<td>1159.15</td>
<td>1104.53</td>
<td>1235.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Field</td>
<td>279.83</td>
<td>336.06</td>
<td>354.44</td>
<td>370.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-award</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>3238.37</td>
<td>3085.38</td>
<td>3147.02</td>
<td>3162.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM 5.3: ENTRY SCORES ONSHORE (DOMESTIC STUDENTS)


ITEM 5.4: PROGRESSION RATES FOR DOMESTIC STUDENTS

ITEM 5.5: PROGRESSION RATES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS ONSHORE


ITEM 5.6: PARTICIPATION RATES OF EQUITY GROUPS 2004–2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Group Numbers</th>
<th>University of Tasmania</th>
<th>Percentage Share from Sector Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non English</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>5177</td>
<td>5123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>4048</td>
<td>4285</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity Group Numbers % from Total Domestic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITEM 5.7: PROGRESSION RATES FOR INDIGENOUS STUDENTS ONSHORE


ITEM 5.8: PROGRESSION RATES FOR LOW SES STUDENTS ONSHORE

ITEM 5.9: PROGRESSION RATES FOR REGIONAL STUDENTS ONSHORE


ITEM 5.10: ATTRITION RATES FOR DOMESTIC STUDENTS

ITEM 5.11: ATTRITION RATES FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS ONSHORE

ITEM 5.12: PROGRESS AND ATTRITION RATES FOR OVERSEAS STUDENTS ONSHORE BY FIELD OF STUDY


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIS – SOU Shanghai</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High Distinction or</td>
<td>Credit or Pass</td>
<td>Fail, No Result or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Withdraw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Onshore</td>
<td>Tasmania International</td>
<td>13.97%</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>21.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>41.55%</td>
<td>37.68%</td>
<td>20.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.61%</td>
<td>48.40%</td>
<td>20.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offshore SOU</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>47.94%</td>
<td>47.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Onshore</td>
<td>Tasmania International</td>
<td>24.34%</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>30.36%</td>
<td>38.93%</td>
<td>30.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28.24%</td>
<td>47.45%</td>
<td>24.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offshore SOU</td>
<td>International</td>
<td>45.19%</td>
<td>51.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  | BComp – ZUT Hangzhou |                     |                      |                      |
|                  |                    | High Distinction or | Credit or Pass       | Fail, No Result or   |
|                  |                    | Distinction         |                      | Withdraw             |
| 2010 Onshore     | Tasmania International | 21.89% | 50.54% | 27.57% |
|                  | Domestic           | 28.86% | 35.26% | 35.88% |
|                  | Total              | 27.15% | 39.01% | 33.84% |
|                  | Offshore SOU       | International      | 41.88% | 45.84% | 12.28% |
| 2009 Onshore     | Tasmania International | 26.70% | 56.40% | 16.89% |
|                  | Domestic           | 33.84% | 40.07% | 26.08% |
|                  | Total              | 32.07% | 44.14% | 23.80% |
|                  | Offshore SOU       | International      | 44.52% | 47.03% | 8.45% |

Source: UTAS Performance Portfolio (Supplementary Material SM02.37).
ITEM 5.14: BACHELOR GRADUATES CEQ SCORE SCALES – GOOD TEACHING


ITEM 5.15: BACHELOR GRADUATES’ GOOD TEACHING BY FIELD OF STUDY

ITEM 5.16: OVERALL SATISFACTION BY FIELD OF STUDY


ITEM 5.17: GRADUATE DESTINATIONS

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: THE AUDIT PANEL

Professor Joan Cooper, Pro-Vice Chancellor (Students) & Registrar, The University of New South Wales (Chair)

Dr Lindsay Heywood, Director Regulation and Quality Assurance, TEQSA

Professor Jim Jackson, Professor Emeritus Southern Cross University, Vice President Academic, Kaplan Asia Pacific

Dr Jane Knight, Education Consultant, Canada

Professor Faith Trent AM, Professor Emeritus Flinders University, Education Consultant

Observer (domestic Audit Visit only):

Ms Wei Wang, Chief of International Affairs, Higher Education Evaluation Center of the Ministry of Education, People's Republic of China
APPENDIX B: ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The following abbreviations and definitions are used in this Report. As necessary, they are explained in context.

ALTC ................................................... Australian Learning and Teaching Council
AMC .................................................... Australian Maritime College
AQF ..................................................... Australian Qualifications Framework
AUQA ................................................. Australian Universities Quality Agency
AVCC .................................................. Australian Vice-Chancellors Committee
CALD .................................................. culturally and linguistically diverse
CEQ ..................................................... Course Experience Questionnaire
CRA ..................................................... criterion referenced assessment
DEEWR ............................................... Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
DEST .................................................... Department of Education, Science and Technology
DVC ..................................................... Deputy Vice-Chancellor
DVC(R) ............................................... Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
DVC(S&E) .......................................... Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Education)
EFTSL .................................................. equivalent full-time student load
HDR ..................................................... higher degree by research
IELTS ................................................... International English Language Testing System
IMAS ................................................... Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies
ICT ....................................................... information/communication technology
IPP ....................................................... Institutional Performance Portfolio
JEC ...................................................... Joint Education Committee
JMC ..................................................... Joint Management Committee
LTAS ................................................... Learning and Teaching Academic Standards
MCEETYA .......................................... Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (now disbanded)
MRIT ................................................... Menzies Research Institute Tasmania
MyLO .................................................... online learning management system
National Protocols ....................... National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes
OADRI ................................................ Objectives, Approach, Deployment, Results, and Improvement
PASS ................................................... Peer Assisted Study Sessions
PF p ..................................................... Performance Portfolio page reference
PIRI ..................................................... Plan, Implement, Results, Improve
Portfolio ............................................ Performance Portfolio
PPRC ................................................... Planning, Performance and Review Committee
PVC ..................................................... Pro Vice-Chancellor
RCB ..................................................... Research College Board