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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Aim of the paper

The aim of this paper is to inform discussion about a policy for ensuring, developing and assessing English language proficiency and literacy for all UTAS students. It surveys the national context (Section 2) and existing issues and practices for English language proficiency at UTAS (Section 3), makes recommendations for key areas that a policy would need to consider (Section 4), and sets these in the wider context of current research literature and practice (Section 5). This executive summary provides an introduction to the need for a policy, and makes recommendations to the Senior Management Team in the light of the issues identified.

The need for an English language proficiency policy

The need for an institution-wide approach arises from the concerted national effort over the last decade to address concerns about the English language proficiency levels of both international and domestic students graduating from Australian universities. Key developments are the draft English Language Standards for Higher Education (DEEWR 2010\(^1\), Appendix 1), and the recent announcement by Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Commissioner Ian Hawke (2012) that TEQSA considers English language a significant issue for the sector. In this climate, many universities (for example University of Melbourne, Griffith University, University of Wollongong, Victoria University, University of Western Sydney, University of Technology Sydney, University of Canberra and University of South Australia) are reviewing or developing institution-wide approaches to English language proficiency. Two major Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) projects are currently underway, one surveying the development and effectiveness of institution-wide approaches at Australian universities (Dunworth et al 2011), and the second investigating how institutions can integrate English language learning within disciplines (Office for Learning and Teaching 2012).

\(^1\) In 2008, the then Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) established a project to develop a set of Good Practice Principles for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities, undertaken by a steering committee convened by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). Following extensive consultations with the Australian higher education sector, the Good Practice Principles steering committee was reconvened by DEEWR in 2010 to develop the principles into English proficiency Standards for all students in the Australian higher education sector. The draft Standards were submitted to DEEWR in July 2010, and are currently being considered by TEQSA.
A strategic, effective and context-specific approach to English language proficiency policy will enable UTAS to remain competitive in this climate and meet TEQSA requirements. It will also help to ensure that all students are able to participate effectively in their studies, achieve their full potential, and graduate with both generic graduate communication attributes and the specific communication skills of their discipline or professional area. Such an approach has the potential to become a point of distinction for the university.

The English Language Proficiency Policy Working Group

The UTAS English Language Proficiency Policy Working Group met for the first time on September 5 2012 to consider the need for, and potential scope of, this institution-wide approach to English language proficiency. The meeting considered the relevance of the DEEWR English Language Standards, and shared challenges and examples of current practice across the university. (A detailed consideration of the themes of this discussion in the context of the research literature and sector developments is presented in the discussion paper that follows.)

There was broad agreement that policy in relation to English language proficiency was needed, that it should apply to all students (not just international), and that it should encompass English language proficiency on entry, its development through a course, and the achievement of graduate attributes and professional registration or employer group requirements related to communication and English language skills. The Working Group agreed that any English language policy should capture the following key areas identified in the literature, and in the survey of issues and practice at UTAS:

I. An appropriate and shared definition of, and agreed terminology for, English language proficiency (see Section 5.1).

II. The setting of appropriate entry-level English language proficiency requirements for all students, including domestic and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD), in line with DEEWR Standard 1 (See Appendix 1) and recent sector developments. There is some concern about current entry requirements. For example, in the case of international students who demonstrate English language proficiency through providing a test
score, the minimum entry is an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of 6, or other test score deemed to be equivalent.\textsuperscript{2} However, the IELTS organisation recommends further English study for students with an overall band score of 6 enrolling in both ‘linguistically demanding’ and ‘linguistically less demanding’ academic courses, suggesting concerns about the capacity of students with a score of 6 to immediately participate effectively in degree-level study. Further, many universities (including ANU and Queensland, Melbourne, Sydney and Canberra) now require a minimum IELTS score of 6.5 for international students\textsuperscript{3}. There is also a need to take into account the complexity of entry pathways, in particular for CALD students and international students entering without an IELTS score - for example through Year 11 & 12 study in Tasmania, and through articulation and advanced standing arrangements. (The recent Student Learning Team’s response to the draft Admission Policy on this issue is attached as Appendix 2, and see Section 5.2 of this paper.)

III. Referral to appropriate preparation courses for applicants who do not yet meet English language proficiency requirements (see Section 5.2 and 5.3).

IV. Recognition that the English language proficiency required to meet graduate attributes is discipline and profession specific, develops incrementally throughout the period of study, and is acquired differently by different individuals (see Section 5.4). This suggests the mapping and embedding of development of discipline-specific and professional English language proficiency across degree study, with staged development of graduate communication attributes. There will be multiple approaches to this, which may include discipline-specific or generic credit-bearing English language units, explicit development and assessment of English language proficiency within discipline units, adjunct English language

---


\textsuperscript{3} Any change to IELTS or other requirements for international students would require adequate lead-in time in order to brief agents, update all marketing and publicity, and allow the English Language Centre to consider and address implications for preparation courses, including Direct Entry Academic Preparation (DEAP).
support for in-degree students, co-curricular approaches, and self-study resources. The OLT projects currently underway will identify examples of good practice, and inform the range of strategies, exemplars and resources that sit within any eventual policy. (This aligns with DEEWR Standards 4 and 5 - see Appendix 1, and Section 5.4 and 5.5 of this paper.)

V. Early opportunities within a course or higher degree research program for students and staff to identify English language proficiency requirements, and appropriate opportunities and access to strategies, resources and support (for example those provided by Student Learning) for all identified students, including students in distance and Sydney courses (see Section 5.4).

VI. Opportunities for professional development and support for disciplinary staff who wish to support the English language proficiency of their students, for example through the Graduate Certificate of University Learning and Teaching (TILT), and collaboration with TILT and English language academics (Student Centre) (see Section 5.4).

VII. Acknowledgment that any progression and implementation of policy will need to be adequately resourced, and consider implications for workloads, including for sessional staff (see DEEWR Standard 3, Appendix 1).

VIII. Collection, analysis and dissemination of data in relation to appropriateness of entry requirements and outcomes of preparation programs and interventions for in-degree students (see Section 5.6). An evidence-based approach is necessary to meet TEQSA requirements (Hawke 2012), and to align with DEEWR Standard 6 (Appendix 1).

IX. Opportunities to develop competence in everyday social Standard Australian English and intercultural communication, including through co-curricular approaches and networking and community connection (particularly for English as an additional language students) and opportunities to develop competence in intercultural communication, including English as an international language (particularly for monolingual English-speaking students). (See Section 5.5.)
**Recommendations**

The recommendations of the Working Group are that:

- The Senior Management Team endorse the Working Group to continue to progress the development of English language proficiency policy, strategy, guidelines and procedures in the context of this Discussion Paper, in line with the Standards (DEEWR 2010), and in relation to the outcomes of the two forthcoming OLT projects.

- The Senior Management Team consider the implications of issues raised in this paper for related UTAS strategic documents such as the Admissions policy, the Learning and Teaching plan, the Internationalisation Agenda, and the forthcoming Student Experience/Social Inclusion Plan. Any UTAS English language proficiency policy should be situated in this context and inform these related documents.

The working group looks forward to the Senior Management Team’s response to the above recommendations. Following this response, the next step in progression of policy would be to establish timelines, scope in more detail existing issues, strategies, practices and resources at UTAS, and consider the good practice models for policies, strategies and practices identified by the two OLT projects. The relationship of English language proficiency policy to the two Quality Assessments to be conducted by TEQSA in 2013, firstly on third party arrangements and secondly on English Language Proficiency⁴, should be taken into account. This would lead to the development of appropriate policy, with a range of associated strategies, procedures and guidelines suitable to the various disciplines, and to undergraduate, coursework postgraduate and higher degree research programs.

---

⁴ The terms of reference for the English language proficiency quality assessment are due to be announced in March.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The English Language Proficiency Policy Working Group
The UTAS English Language Proficiency Policy Working Group was convened by Dr Jane Skalicky (Student Learning and Academic Development [hereafter referred to as Student Learning]) in collaboration with Marian Star (English Language Centre) to consider the development of a strategic, effective and context-specific approach to English language proficiency for all UTAS students. The group includes representatives from all Faculties, including the Australian Maritime College (AMC) and the Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS), as well as from the Student Centre and the Centre for University Pathways and Partnerships (CUPP); and is communicating with broader internal stakeholders including the Graduate Research Office, International Marketing and Recruitment, the Internationalisation Community of Practice, and the Admissions Policy Committee. The working group is connected with national developments in the sector through attendance at recent forums including the Australian International Education Conference, and through contact with the leaders of an Office of Learning and Teaching project mapping nationwide policies and strategies for development of English language proficiency.

The first meeting of the working group (September 5, 2012) discussed the need for, and potential scope of, an institution-wide approach to English language proficiency at UTAS. The meeting considered the relevance of the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relation’s (DEEWR) English Language Standards for Higher Education (2010)\(^5\), and shared challenges and examples of current practice across the university. There was broad agreement that policy in relation to English language proficiency was needed, that it should apply to all students (not just international), and that it should encompass English language proficiency on entry, its development through a course, and the achievement of

\(^5\) See discussion at Footnote 1.
graduate attributes and professional registration or employer group requirements related to communication and English language skills.

Policy in this area has the potential to become a point of distinction for the university, to enable compliance with regulatory standards, and to ensure that students are able to participate effectively in their studies, achieve their full potential, and graduate with both generic graduate communication attributes and the specific communication skills of their discipline or professional area.

1.2. Aims and structure of this paper
The aim of this paper is to inform discussion about a policy for ensuring, developing and assessing English language proficiency and literacy for all UTAS students. It surveys the national context (Section 2) and existing issues and practices for English language proficiency at UTAS (Section 3), makes suggestions for key areas that a policy would need to consider (Section 4), and sets these in the wider context of current research literature and practice (Section 5). The paper focuses on key issues arising both in discussions to date at UTAS and in the literature on the topic: definitions and scope (Section 5.1), entry level English proficiency (Section 5.2), pathways courses (Section 5.3), supporting and developing English language proficiency of in-degree (including higher degree research) students (Section 5.4), ensuring the achievement of graduate communication attributes (Section 5.5), and data collection (Section 5.6).

2. THE NATIONAL CONTEXT FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Over the last decade there has been increasing concern nationally about the English language proficiency levels of students graduating from Australian universities, with much of the attention focussing on international students (see for example Arkoudis et al. 2009, Birrell 2006, Dunworth 2010 and International Education Association of Australia 2007). Similar concerns have been expressed about the English language proficiency of domestic students with English as an additional language (see for example Silburn, Earnest, De Mori & Butcher 2010),
and the academic literacy of domestic students (see for example Devlin 2011). These concerns have led to a concerted effort across the sector to develop strategies to address students’ English language proficiency both on entry and over the course of study. A key development is the English Language Standards for Higher Education (DEEWR 2010, Appendix 1) referred to earlier, which are currently under consideration by TEQSA. These Standards are intended to apply to all students, and clearly state that universities have a responsibility to ensure that students have an appropriate level of English language proficiency on entry, and to actively develop students’ proficiency over the course of their study. The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Commissioner Ian Hawke (2012) recently highlighted that TEQSA considers English language requirements a ‘major, decade-long, sector-wide issue’, with providers being asked to consider whether the English proficiency of their students has improved or declined over time, and how this can be demonstrated. English language will be the focus of one of TEQSA’s first thematic audits (Lane 2012).

In this climate, many universities (for example University of Melbourne, Griffith University, University of Wollongong, Victoria University, University of Western Sydney, University of Technology Sydney, University of Canberra and University of South Australia) are reviewing or developing institution-wide approaches to English language proficiency. The DEEWR Standards underlie many of these approaches, and thus English language proficiency is seen as applying to all students. Two major Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) projects are currently underway, one surveying the development and effectiveness of institution-wide approaches at Australian universities (Dunworth et al 2011), and the second investigating how institutions can integrate English language learning within disciplines (Office for Learning and Teaching 2012). The publication of the results of these two projects, the Association for Academic Language and Learning (AALL)’s forthcoming database of policies and practices, and the exemplars included within the DEEWR Standards document will inform any policy development at UTAS.
3. THE INTERNAL DRIVERS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY POLICY AT UTAS

Discussion at the initial meeting of the English language proficiency policy working group and follow-up written information provided by members highlights the need for an institutional approach to English language proficiency. There is widespread agreement that there are challenges to be met in relation to students’ English language proficiency on entry, development of English proficiency through the degree program, and on graduation. It would currently be difficult, therefore, for the university to demonstrate that practice and outcomes in this area are in line with the Standards. The following section discusses the challenges, and outlines some current approaches to addressing these. It is argued that in the absence of an overarching policy, while some of these approaches are excellent, collectively they are isolated, inconsistent, and difficult to sustain, and thus do not ensure that all students have equal opportunities to participate effectively in their studies and achieve graduate communication outcomes.

3.1. Entry level English language proficiency

Many respondents identified entry levels of English language proficiency for some students in their courses as insufficient for effective participation in studies and professional placements, and limited social English proficiency was mentioned for some international students, including higher degree research students. There were concerns about the complexity and appropriateness of current methods for determining entry-level standards, in particular articulation and advanced standing.

---

6 Initial verbal responses were obtained by working party members representing all faculties, centres and institutes at the first meeting of the working group. In addition, follow-up written responses via a formal template outlined: current practice in relation to English language proficiency; current challenges in relation to English language proficiency; entry pathways to courses; advanced standing and articulation arrangements; typical employers or professional registration bodies and their English language proficiency requirements; and any data collection activities in relation to English language proficiency as a factor in attrition. At the time of writing, written responses had been received from: the Faculty of Science, Engineering and Technology (one response for faculty, information provided by Greg Hannan); Faculty of Business (partial information provided by Simone Bingham and Susan Conway), Faculty of Health Science (one response for faculty compiled by Jo Kelder), individual responses from School of Pharmacy (information provided by Leanne Chalmers, Sandra Holmes and Kiri Fitzpatrick), School of Human Life Sciences (information provided by Merran Rogers and Tracy Douglas), School of Medicine (information provided by Rose Maree Lynham), School of Nursing and Midwifery (information provided by Cathy Dunham), Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies (IMAS), (information provided by Denbeigh Armstrong), Student Learning and Academic Development (information provided by Lucy Sun, Steve Newman and Louise Oxley), University Preparation Program and Diploma of University Studies (information provided by Lynn Jarvis), and English Language Centre (information provided by Marian Star).
arrangements whereby some students enter directly into later year units, having missed out on the scaffolded development of tertiary literacy and professional communication in earlier units. This suggests the need for some review in this area, and the collection and analysis of data to inform this.

3.2. English language proficiency development in preparation courses
Preparation courses offered in the Centre for University Pathways and Partnerships (CUPP), including the English Language Centre (ELC), were considered one of the keys to meeting the challenge of entry level proficiency, particularly in the context of the widening participation agenda. These courses include the University Preparation Program (UPP) and the Diploma of Tertiary Studies for domestic students, and Foundation Studies and the Direct Entry Academic Program (DEAP) for international students (see Appendices 3 and 4 for an overview). While the first three cater for students entering undergraduate courses, an increasing number of higher degree research students are taking DEAP.

The value of these courses lies in the fact that they prepare students for the typical communication tasks of tertiary study. However, caution was expressed in relation to the University Preparation Program (UPP) and the Diploma of Tertiary Studies as a pathway for students with very limited English language proficiency. It is considered that the timelines of these courses may not allow sufficient opportunity for language development for these students, and although an English Language Centre pathway has been developed for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students, not all the identified students are able to undertake the full time study required.

The Introductory Academic Program (IAP), designed for and delivered to AusAID scholarship holders newly arrived at the Hobart and Launceston campuses prior to the commencement of their studies, is run by Student Learning. Small class sizes in this course mean that activities can be tailored to students’ proposed study area.

The UniStart program (run by Student Learning) for students about to commence coursework programs provides an early introduction for domestic students,
including culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students, to the academic writing demands of tertiary study.

3.3. **English language proficiency development opportunities for degree students**

Responses from the working group indicated varying approaches to development of in-degree students’ English language proficiency. Some areas focussed on strategies (such as early, low stakes assessments tasks) for early identification of students in need of English language proficiency development, and in some cases development of Student Support Plans and/or Learning Access Plans (LAPs). These students were then referred to the relevant School or central support services - for example Year Coordinators, Faculty Advisors, and Student Learning (formerly CALT and EnglishAssist). In some cases there was formal referral to Student Centre support in faculty probation or intervention strategies. It was generally agreed that there was a reluctance on the part of some students to take up this support, and that providing support to identified individuals (particularly within Schools) was resource-intensive and often placed a heavy workload on individual staff members, particularly in the light of the lack of an overarching approach.

The support for development of English language proficiency offered by Student Learning takes the form of individual consultations, generic workshops and discipline-specific workshops (this last is discussed further in the next paragraph). While these services are rated highly by students who make use of them, the limitations of current resourcing and the perception by some students of these sessions as remedial, together with other pressures on their time, mean that not all those who would benefit are able to utilise these opportunities. Further, there were equity issues in relation to support for distance and Sydney students.

A second approach to support for in-degree students is English language proficiency development opportunities embedded within, or offered as an adjunct to, units in the degree structure. These approaches included embedding of teaching of discipline-specific written and oral communication skills and practices in courses, taught by discipline staff; and adjunct discipline-specific workshops on written and oral skills designed and taught by Learning Skills Advisors (Student Learning) in
collaboration with discipline staff. Such embedded and adjunct approaches are strongly supported in the literature (see Section 5.4). From the point of view of ensuring consistency, there are limitations in the current approach, in that activities tend to be the initiatives of individual Schools or staff members. Discipline staff may feel that teaching English language proficiency is not within their role, and although Student Learning is currently pursuing collaborative opportunities, including opportunities to ‘value-add’ to existing embedded activities, capacity is limited (see Appendix 5 for current examples of UTAS units and courses where Learning Skills Advisors from the Student Learning team have provided workshops in collaboration with faculty staff that have an English language proficiency, communication or academic writing focus in 2012).

Given that TEQSA has indicated that they consider Admissions only part of the picture in relation to English language standards, and that universities will be asked to demonstrate how they know that students’ English language proficiency is developed from entry to graduation (Hawke 2012), an integrated, holistic and evidence-based approach is necessary. The specifics of the approach will vary across programs and disciplines.

3.4. Higher degree research students
The requirements for research higher degrees, including written theses and viva voces, demand a high level of command of discipline-specific conventions of communication. At the same time, newly arrived international students are at particular risk of becoming isolated if they are not proficient in everyday social English. Thus much of the discussion in this paper is relevant to this group also.

Current graduate research support and practices for ongoing English language proficiency development, for both domestic and international candidates, come in a number forms. These include mandated requirements such as the Graduate Certificate in Research’s Communicating Research unit and the Confirmation of Candidature milestone. A Graduate Certificate elective unit to develop language skills for research genres, which will be available to all candidates, is also in development. In addition, the Graduate Research conference and peer learning and skilling program (planned from 2013) offer opportunities for candidates to
practice both cross-disciplinary academic as well as social Standard Australian language skills.

Clearly, successful English language proficiency policy at an undergraduate and coursework postgraduate level will also benefit higher degree research students who have studied at UTAS.

3.5. English language proficiency at graduation
The above factors (entry-level proficiency and limited structured opportunities to develop English language proficiency within degree structures) have led to a further area of concern - English language proficiency on graduation in relation to requirements of employers and professional registration bodies. This has been well documented in recent years (Arkoudis et al. 2009), and has led to increasingly formalised requirements, particularly for international students. The English language proficiency Standards under consideration by TEQSA (DEEWR 2010) regard students’ achievement of this proficiency as the responsibility of the institution, and universities may be asked to demonstrate how they know whether students have attained it.

3.6. Data on English language proficiency
The final area of concern was the collection, analysis and dissemination of data and evidence to identify challenges and evaluate interventions. There was general agreement that there is currently a lack of data on English language proficiency as a factor in attrition (or in academic performance more broadly), and it was agreed that this data needs to be collected, both to ensure informed responses and to satisfy the regulatory environment which increasingly asks for such evidence. There was also discussion of the need to consider methods for determining English language proficiency on graduation.

---

7 Various areas are in the process of planning how to collect this data. In the School of Medicine, and in a faculty initiative in Health Science, some work has been done on this. In the Student Centre, testing of English language proficiency is available on a voluntary basis for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) applicants, and some tracking of academic performance for students tested has been done.
4. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Discussion and responses within the Working Group to date support the need for an institution-wide approach to English language proficiency which draws on the strengths of current approaches and replaces the existing ad hoc nature of English language proficiency development to ensure a consistent student experience and address the challenges identified above. At the same time, any policy should be sensitive to the particular contexts of the various disciplines and degree structures (including research higher degrees), adequately resourced, informed by evidence and research, and continually evaluated. The Working Group agreed that any English language policy should capture the following key areas identified in the literature and in the survey of issues and practice at UTAS:

I. An appropriate and shared definition of, and agreed terminology for, English language proficiency (see Section 5.1).

II. The setting of appropriate entry-level English language proficiency requirements for all students, including domestic and culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD), in line with DEEWR Standard 1 (See Appendix 1) and recent sector developments. There is some concern about current entry requirements. For example, in the case of international students who demonstrate English language proficiency through providing a test score, the minimum entry is an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of 6, or other test score deemed to be equivalent. However, the IELTS organisation recommends further English study for students with an overall band score of 6 enrolling in both ‘linguistically demanding’ and ‘linguistically less demanding’ academic courses, suggesting concerns about the capacity of students with a score of 6 to immediately participate effectively in degree-level study. Further, many universities (including ANU and Queensland, Melbourne, Sydney and Canberra) now require a minimum IELTS score of 6.5 for international

---

students. There is also a need to take into account the complexity of entry pathways, in particular for CALD students and international students entering without an IELTS score - for example through Year 11 & 12 study in Tasmania, and through articulation and advanced standing arrangements. (The recent Student Learning Team’s response to the draft Admission Policy on this issue is attached as Appendix 2, and see Section 5.2 of this paper.)

III. Referral to appropriate preparation courses for applicants who do not yet meet English language proficiency requirements (see Section 5.2 and 5.3).

IV. Recognition that the English language proficiency required to meet graduate attributes is discipline and profession specific, develops incrementally throughout the period of study, and is acquired differently by different individuals (see Section 5.4). This suggests the mapping and embedding of development of discipline-specific and professional English language proficiency across degree study, with staged development of graduate communication attributes. There will be multiple approaches to this, which may include discipline-specific or generic credit-bearing English language units, explicit development and assessment of English language proficiency within discipline units, adjunct English language support for in-degree students, co-curricular approaches, and self-study resources. The OLT projects currently underway will identify examples of good practice, and inform the range of strategies, exemplars and resources that sit within any eventual policy. (This aligns with DEEWR Standards 4 and 5 - see Appendix 1, and Section 5.4 and 5.5 of this paper.)

V. Early opportunities within a course or higher degree research program for students and staff to identify English language proficiency requirements, and appropriate opportunities and access to strategies, resources and support (for example those provided by Student Learning) for all identified

---

9 Any change to IELTS or other requirements for international students would require adequate lead-in time in order to brief agents, update all marketing and publicity, and allow the English Language Centre to consider and address implications for preparation courses, including Direct Entry Academic Preparation (DEAP).
students, including students in distance and Sydney courses (see Section 5.4).

VI. Opportunities for professional development and support for disciplinary staff who wish to support the English language proficiency of their students, for example through the Graduate Certificate of University Learning and Teaching (TILT), and collaboration with TILT and English language academics (Student Centre) (see Section 5.4).

VII. Acknowledgment that any progression and implementation of policy will need to be adequately resourced, and consider implications for workloads, including for sessional staff (see DEEWR Standard 3, Appendix 1).

VIII. Collection, analysis and dissemination of data in relation to appropriateness of entry requirements and outcomes of preparation programs and interventions for in-degree students (see Section 5.6). An evidence-based approach is necessary to meet TEQSA requirements (Hawke 2012), and to align with DEEWR Standard 6 (Appendix 1).

IX. Opportunities to develop competence in everyday social Standard Australian English and intercultural communication, including through co-curricular approaches and networking and community connection (particularly for English as an additional language students) and opportunities to develop competence in intercultural communication, including English as an international language (particularly for monolingual English-speaking students). (See Section 5.5.)

Recommendations
The recommendations of the Working Group are that:

- The Senior Management Team endorse the Working Group to continue to progress the development of English language proficiency policy, strategy, guidelines and procedures in the context of this Discussion Paper, in line with the Standards (DEEWR 2010), and in relation to the outcomes of the two forthcoming OLT projects.
The Senior Management Team consider the implications of issues raised in this paper for related UTAS strategic documents such as the Admissions policy, the Learning and Teaching plan, the Internationalisation Agenda, and the forthcoming Student Experience/Social Inclusion Plan. Any UTAS English language proficiency policy should be situated in this context and inform these related documents.

The working group looks forward to the Senior Management Team’s response to the above recommendations. Following this response, the next step in progression of policy would be to establish timelines, scope in more detail existing issues, strategies, practices and resources at UTAS, and consider the good practice models for policies, strategies and practices identified by the two OLT projects. The relationship of English language proficiency policy to the two Quality Assessments to be conducted by TEQSA in 2013, firstly on third party arrangements and secondly on English Language Proficiency, should be taken into account. This would lead to the development of appropriate policy, with a range of associated strategies, procedures and guidelines suitable to the various disciplines, and to undergraduate, coursework postgraduate and higher degree research programs.

5. DISCUSSION

This section provides a more detailed discussion of the following key areas: defining English language proficiency, setting appropriate entry requirements, preparation courses, developing English language proficiency in the degree context, achievement of graduate communication attributes and data collection.

5.1. Definitions of English language proficiency

A first step in developing policy and strategy for English language proficiency is to reach a shared understanding of what this term encompasses, and indeed to agree on appropriate terminology. There are overlaps between English language proficiency and students’ academic thinking and knowledge of how to be a

---

10 The terms of reference for the English language proficiency quality assessment are due to be announced in March.
successful tertiary learner, and English language proficiency needs and effective approaches may differ for native speakers of English and students with English as an additional language. There is agreement in the literature that a definition needs to recognise the specificity of English language use in academic and professional contexts, and normalise the range of entry-level proficiencies¹¹ (Harper, Prentice & Wilson 2011). From a Student Learning perspective, the term ‘English language proficiency’ includes ‘communication’, ‘professional communication’ and ‘academic literacy’; however, this meaning of the term may not be shared across the institution.

The DEEWR (2010) definition of English language proficiency is a useful starting point:

‘English language proficiency’ has been defined as the ability of students to use the English language to make and communicate meaning in spoken and written contexts while completing their university studies. Such uses may range from a simple task such as discussing work with fellow students, to complex tasks such as writing an academic paper or delivering a speech to a professional audience. This view of proficiency as the ability to organise language to carry out a variety of communication tasks distinguishes the use of ‘English language proficiency’ from a narrow focus on language as a formal system concerned only with correct use of grammar and sentence structure.

In this definition, proficiency is considered in the context of the English language and communication tasks associated with particular disciplines, and the social dimension of language is also recognised. The relationship between everyday literacy, academic literacy and professional literacy is visualised by Harper, Prentice and Wilson (2011) as three overlapping circles - there is a shared core of grammar and vocabulary, but this is deployed differently in different contexts for different ends.

¹¹ Even with changes to Admissions Policy, these are likely to persist. See Section 5.4.
Harper, Prentice & Wilsons’ (2011, p.45) model of tertiary literacies in three domains of learning in the university teacher training context (adapted from Macken-Horarik et al., 2006)

Such a model has implications for ensuring English language proficiency on entry, for determining responsibility for students’ proficiency development, and for designing, implementing and evaluating effective approaches. In particular, it suggests that there is a necessity within each institution, and within particular disciplines or courses, to define what is meant by an appropriate level of English language proficiency on entry and at graduation, and to map the development of this proficiency within the course.
5.2. Setting appropriate entry requirements for English language proficiency

Entry-level English language proficiency was repeatedly raised at the initial meeting and in the written responses. Concern was expressed that numbers of current students (particularly first year students) from both international and domestic cohorts (including CALD students) do not have the level of English language proficiency and/or literacy that lecturers expect, and which would enable them to participate effectively in their studies. The literature confirms that this is the case in many institutions, and suggests a number of contributing factors including: pressure to increase enrolments; the difficulty of setting appropriate entry-level standards; loopholes in current Admissions policy; and, in some cases, unrealistic expectations on the part of both lecturers and students.

While this is sometimes discussed in terms of increasing diversity, it is important to note that students’ tertiary preparedness and entry-level English language proficiency cannot be predicted on the basis of their social, cultural or language background. Rather, it relates to multiple, inter-related factors including prior educational experiences. A study at the University of Western Sydney (presented by Janice Catterall at the AALL forum English language proficiency: what is your institution doing? in Sydney in May 2012) found all levels of English language proficiency were represented within all the cohorts tested in a group of Nursing students (including international, CALD, mature-age, and domestic).

At UTAS, all international applicants must demonstrate English language proficiency in order to receive an offer. However, there are some difficulties with the ways in which this proficiency is assessed. Arkoudis, Baik & Richardson (2012, p.18) explore current practices in Australian universities for determining readiness in terms of English language proficiency to participate in tertiary study on entry for English as an additional language students, and show the multiple pathways through which international students enter (including direct entry from English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS), articulation from partner institutions and completion of prior studies in an English speaking country). They argue that institutions do not always display understanding of the complexity

12 For example the articulation and advanced standing arrangements referred to earlier.
of determining equivalency in scores on different tests, and of what this actually means in terms of students’ readiness to participate in their courses.\(^{13}\)

Even for those who do supply a test score, this score may not ensure proficiency in the types of communication they encounter in their courses, or indeed in the ‘threshold English’ their lecturers may expect to see. Currently an International English Language Testing System (IELTS) score of 6 (or other evidence of English language proficiency deemed to be equivalent) is the minimum score for entry to some (not all) UTAS coursework degrees, and an overall IELTS score of 6.5, with no band lower than 6.0, is the minimum score for entry to some (not all) higher degree research degrees. It is worth noting that the IELTS organisation recommends further English study for students with an overall band score of 6 enrolling in both ‘linguistically demanding’ and ‘linguistically less demanding’ academic courses; and also further English study for students with an overall band score of 6.5 enrolling in ‘linguistically demanding academic courses’ (IELTS 2011). Thus there is a case for raising IELTS requirements at UTAS (see Appendix 2).

Unlike international applicants, the requirements for domestic applicants to demonstrate English language proficiency vary according to the course they plan to study. In the UTAS context, staff from the Student Centre have been concerned that some domestic students (including those from English speaking backgrounds) are admitted to UTAS with levels of proficiency below those required to succeed in their studies. While the Student Centre has a strategy for identifying, testing, and recommending pathways for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) students where appropriate, this approach puts the onus on the student to make a decision, and therefore does not comply with the Standards (DEEWR 2010).

Admissions requirements are also used to set English or other conditions on an offer, and may offer students CUPP preparation courses. At least one course requires a written statement on application, which is used to identify students who

\(^{13}\) The usefulness of the Common European Framework of Reference (cited in Arkoudis, Baik & Richardson 2012 and Dunworth 2008) as a framework for definitions of appropriate proficiency, and as a means of overseeing and comparing English language proficiency determined by different entry pathways and methods has been considered, for example for comparing scores on the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) and Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) tests.
do not have the requisite proficiency and attach conditions to the offer. This also happens for international students who may be offered DEAP or Foundation Studies pathways, and for domestic students taking UPP, Diploma of Tertiary Studies or Associate Degree pathways.

The expectations related to Standard 1 (DEEWR 2010) state that:

the higher education provider adheres to a formal policy that specifies English language entry criteria, including criteria for direct entry pathways, which are appropriate for the level of studies and the discipline and which are consistent with research evidence, including the recommendations of relevant testing organisations.

Ensuring that these entry level criteria are appropriate therefore overlaps with Admissions Policy. The Standards document further states that:

the provider systematically monitors the performance of students by entry pathway or by cohort and makes appropriate changes to entry criteria to ensure that it admits only those students who are able to participate effectively on entry.

There is therefore a need to gather research evidence and data on performance of students based on English language proficiency on entry - in order to ensure effectiveness and appropriateness of entry-level standards.

While the literature reveals tensions within the way Australian universities currently set entry levels, it also advises against higher entry levels as a complete solution and sees ensuring English language proficiency on entry as a necessary, but not sufficient, approach. It is argued that development of entry-level proficiency is the responsibility of the university, and should be situated within discipline teaching, rather than located solely as a problem or deficit of particular individuals or cohorts (see for example Arkoudis, Baik & Richardson 2012; DEEWR 2010; Dunworth 2010; Devlin 2011; Harper, Prentice & Wilson 2011; and Murray 2010). These arguments are explored further in Section 5.4.
5.3. Pathways (CUPP)

International students

UTAS preparation programs for international students include the Direct Entry Academic Program (DEAP), Foundation Studies, and the Introductory Academic Program (IAP) for AusAID Scholarship students. The first two are located within CUPP, while the latter is within the Student Centre. The broad aim of such programs is to bring students with diverse backgrounds, knowledge and skills up to a level of readiness to enter a chosen course of study. Both DEAP and the IAP cater for both coursework and higher degree research students.

Literature investigating effectiveness of English language intensive courses for overseas students (ELICOS) pathway programs for tertiary education is sparse, mostly localised and based on small sample sizes. A discussion paper commissioned by Australian Education International (AEI) in 2007 for a National Symposium: *English Language Competence of International Students* (AEI 2007) provides insight into issues which remain relevant. Reliable statistical data on success rates of students entering degree courses via different pathways is crucial - this would provide information for the resourcing and development of curriculum content to better meet student needs and faculty requirements and for effective support of students from point of entry to graduation. Given the context-dependent nature of language and academic tasks (discussed in Section 5.4), development of more tailored DEAPs to focus on specific discourses required for individual faculties has been suggested. This would require a co-ordinated approach involving consultation and collaboration across faculties, learning support teams and pathway courses. The development of an English language proficiency policy for UTAS is part of this approach.

Feedback from students indicates that they find DEAPs effective preparation for degree courses. They particularly refer to the combination of language development and understanding of academic culture as being helpful. The English Language Centre has recently developed a specific Maritime DEAP in collaboration with the AMC and further curriculum development to support pathways into specific faculties could be effective.
Domestic students
UTAS undergraduate pathways for domestic students are located within CUPP, and include the University Preparation Program (UPP), Diploma of Tertiary Studies and Associate Degrees. These units aim to improve students’ ability to read and write in an academic environment (which includes reading and writing critically). A structured approach is adopted as befits students of this level, with the aim that students will continue to develop their own personal styles as they continue on with their studies. Additional literacy related work is incorporated into some units.

There is a tension in pathways courses between teaching academic skills in a generic way, and teaching the skills embedded in discipline content. While there is a pedagogical preference for the second (see discussion in Section 5.4), there are resourcing implications that make this difficult. Additionally, English language proficiency development is a long term proposition, not amenable to a quick-fix within the limited time of these courses. There are concerns that some students currently being referred to, or enrolling in, these pathways courses have English language proficiency not yet sufficient for effective participation in their course.

There is some discussion in the literature of appropriate pathways to tertiary study for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) domestic students, particularly those from refugee backgrounds with disrupted prior education. Silburn, Earnest, De Mori & Butchers’ (2010) research demonstrated the effectiveness of an approach tailored specifically for the needs of these students.

5.4. Fostering development of ELP and literacy for in-degree students
The literature suggests three areas to consider in relation to the development of English language proficiency for in-degree students: development of discipline-specific English language proficiency, early identification of students with additional needs, and the provision of appropriate additional language development opportunities for this latter group.
Development of discipline-specific English language proficiency
As TEQSA has indicated (Hawke 2012), and the previous discussion of both entry requirements (Section 5.2) and the nature of English language proficiency (Section 5.1) suggests, adjustments to entry requirements will not on their own result in an improvement in graduating students’ English language proficiency. This is because of the social and contextual nature of language development and the specificity of academic and professional communication. As Mauranen (2006) has pointed out, there are no native speakers of academic English. In other words, it can be assumed that all students will need to develop proficiency in the specific communication tasks typical of their discipline, and this proficiency is unlikely to develop without explicit teaching in the discipline and professional context (see for example Arkoudis, Baik & Richardson 2012; Australian Association for Academic Language and Learning 2011; Australian Education International 2007; Devlin 2011; Dunworth 2010; and Harper, Prentice & Wilson 2011). Lea & Streets’ (1998; 2006) influential work on academic literacies and the development of student writing in higher education argues that successful written and oral communication is closely linked to developing awareness of the ways of seeing the world and constructing knowledge which constitute the discipline, and that therefore neither can be effectively developed without the other.

Likewise, appropriate English language proficiency for effective communication in academic and professional contexts cannot be developed without exposure to and participation in the language, thinking and communication styles of the discipline. (see for example Harper, Prentice & Wilson 2011). This is confirmed by research on the highly discipline-specific nature of the grammar and vocabulary of academic work (see for example the British Academic Written English corpus, cited in AALL 2011). The Standards (DEEWR 2010) are ‘based on a view that development of appropriate English language proficiency is more likely to occur when it is linked to need (e.g. discipline-specific academic activities, assessment tasks, practica)’. Motivation and timeliness are crucial factors in successful language learning. Providing meaningful opportunities for English development clearly linked to assessment and course outcomes is therefore likely to be effective.
There are two broad models for developing discipline-specific communication: embedded and adjunct learning and teaching (Arkoudis, Baik & Richardson 2012). In embedded approaches, learning and teaching is built into curricula and explicitly assessed within the regular course timetable for all students, usually by discipline staff. In adjunct approaches, additional sessions (outside the regular timetable) are available (usually to all students, although sometimes a form of assessment may be used to identify particular individuals). These sessions may be designed and delivered wholly by discipline staff, wholly by language and learning skills advisors, or through a collaborative approach. Another model of adjunct proficiency development is compulsory or elective credit-bearing units, such as breadth units.

UTAS currently has a number of courses or units which have created, or are in the process of creating, embedded or adjunct discipline-specific communication skills development. The ability to situate this work clearly within a policy framework would allow these approaches to be shared, and an overarching approach to evaluation and data collection to be considered. There may also be opportunities to build on these existing practices to incorporate the study of communication features such as grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation that are conventional in any given disciplinary context.

**Early identification of students**

Given the complexities of determining entry-level English language proficiency, and the likelihood that many students admitted under current provisions (for example international students with an IELTS score of 6) may not be sufficiently proficient to fully participate in their studies (Section 5.2), many universities have currently adopted, or are considering adopting, an institution-wide approach to post-entry English language assessment (sometimes referred to as PELAs). A variety of assessments are being used, including fully online screening tests, generic or discipline-specific academic writing tests, or the use of early assessment tasks
within course structures\textsuperscript{14}. Dunworth (2010) outlines the key points to consider in decisions about implementing post-entry assessment, including the reasons for introducing a test, the fitness for purpose of the chosen instrument, and planning and resourcing to ensure that appropriate development opportunities are available for the individuals identified by the assessment. Post-entry language assessment is a contested subject, and some have suggested that more useful information to inform teaching is gathered, and student resistance is less likely to be encountered, when such assessment is normalised in an early assessment task within the unit\textsuperscript{15}. At UTAS there have been some trials of both generic and discipline-specific post-entry English language and/or literacy assessments which could be drawn on to inform policy.

**Appropriate additional support for development**

Even if English language proficiency development is fully embedded for all students, it is likely, given the conditions listed above, that some students will require additional support to develop English language proficiency, including advice on effective strategies for ongoing learning. Specialist support for ongoing development of English language proficiency is offered in nearly all Australian universities\textsuperscript{16}. Issues in relation to effective provision of this support include adequate resourcing to meet demand - particularly for individual consultations which are highly valued by students, discipline staff, and specialist advising staff (Chanock 2007) - and challenges in relation to equitable provision of support for distance and remote campus students. In some cases students may be reluctant to take up support that is perceived as remedial, or may have difficulty accessing the support within the constraints of their timetables. Even when support is provided centrally by academic language and learning advisors, opportunities for collaboration and input from discipline staff (for example the provision of models


\textsuperscript{15} Anne Harris presented evidence to support this view of early assessment tasks at the AALL forum *English Language Proficiency: What is your institution doing?* in Sydney in May 2012 when reporting on Edith Cowan University’s trial of compulsory post-entry English language assessment for all students.

of good student writing in particular contexts) facilitate the effectiveness of this work, and raise students' perception of its usefulness.

5.5. ELP on graduation - achievement of graduate attributes, readiness for workplace or further study

Successful achievement of graduate communication attributes requires students to be proficient in the three domains illustrated in Section 5.1: academic, professional and everyday communication. The literature on attainment of graduate communication attributes and employer and professional registration requirements for English language proficiency suggests that this is likely to be seen as the university’s responsibility, and that evidence of student attainment and effectiveness of approaches may be required (DEEWR, Hawke 2012). Mapping development of communication proficiency through a course or program (see Section 5.4 ) would be one approach to this. It may also become relevant, within the current standards climate, for course-level learning outcomes to specifically articulate English language and/or communication learning outcomes for students. Opportunities for development of social English (best achieved through interaction) will greatly benefit most international and some CALD students. Many international students specifically choose to study overseas in expectation of these opportunities.

It will be necessary to take into account realistic expectations for students with English as an additional language, particularly for those whose experience of living in an English-speaking country begins only shortly before, or at the time, they commence their degree. While these students may be, or become, highly proficient users of English, their use of the language is likely to be different from that of native-speakers or long term residents of English-speaking countries. Decisions about what constitutes proficiency may need to take into account the study of English as an international language, which suggests that in order to prepare students to live and work in an increasingly globalised world where English is used as a lingua franca, curricula and proficiency frameworks should accept varieties of English language proficiency beyond the traditional native speaker model (Dunworth & Briguglio 2011; Canagarajah 2006).
Citing the inclusion of communication skills and intercultural sensitivity in the graduate attributes of most universities, and an increasingly globalised world where intercultural communication is a becoming an everyday reality in many professions, Dunworth & Briguglio (2011) suggest that these are becoming a core part of university curricula. Creative approaches to fostering the intercultural communication skills of both international and domestic students would have benefits for both groups, and thus an English language proficiency policy has strong links to the Internationalisation agenda and various co-curricular activities. These approaches might go some way to addressing the complex challenge of student employability, particularly for international students, where factors including networks, local work experience, proficiency in Standard Australian English, and local cultural knowledge have been identified as influential (Arkoudis et al. 2009).

5.6 Data collection and evaluation
As has been stated in the previous sections, it is likely that universities will be asked to provide evidence that their entry-level requirements for English language proficiency are robust, that efforts to develop proficiency within degree structures are effective, and that students’ attainment of graduate communication attributes can be demonstrated (Hawke 2012). A policy should therefore take this into account.
References


Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) 2010, Draft English language standards for higher education, Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Canberra, viewed 22 August 2012,


List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) 2010, Draft English language standards for higher education

Appendix 2: Student Learning Team response to UTAS draft Admissions Policy, September 2012

Appendix 3: Table summarising UTAS University Preparation Program (UPP) and Diploma of University Studies (DUS) units with an English language proficiency focus.

Appendix 4: Table summarising UTAS English Language Centre (ELC) courses.

Appendix 5: Table summarising Student Learning discipline-specific workshops in 2012
Appendix 1: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) 2010, Draft English language standards for higher education

**English language standards for Higher Education**

In 2008/2009, the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) funded a project to develop a set of **Good Practice Principles for English language proficiency for international students in Australian universities** (GPP). This project’s focus was **international** students studying in Australian **universities**.

The project was undertaken by a steering committee convened by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). The project was a quality enhancement activity for the Australian university sector and reflected extensive work being undertaken in many Australian universities. It built on the outcomes of a 2007 National Symposium commissioned by the Department of Education, Science and Training.

Following extensive consultations with the Australian higher education sector, the DEEWR reconvened the Good Practice Principles steering committee in 2010 (p. 12) and asked it to develop the principles into **English standards** that would apply to all students in the Australian **Higher Education sector**. The draft standards were submitted to the DEEWR in July 2010.

This document is the outcome of the work of the reconvened steering committee.

The inclusion of the **English language standards for Higher Education** (ELSHE) in a global standards framework is essential in the current context of developing a national framework for academic standards that would assist the higher education sector in setting up quality systems, in particular, to respond to recent government regulations and initiatives, such as the Knight recommendations and the Bradley Social Inclusion agenda.

Alex Barthel  
Member, ELSHE Steering Committee  
Public Officer, Association for Academic Language & Learning  
May 2012
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English Language Standards for Higher Education

Introduction

The project

This document provides standards for successful academic study in English in Australian higher education. The standards apply to all higher education providers operating in Australia.

This project was undertaken by a Steering Committee convened by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). Appendix A lists members of the Steering Committee.

How should these standards be used?

In the first instance, the standards provide a set of external reference points for higher education providers. The standards are general statements for individual higher education providers to address in the context of their own operations and environment. The standards do not require and are not intended to produce a standardisation of approaches among providers. They are broad enough to allow for institutions to respond in ways appropriate to their particular situation.

These standards for providers are intended to complement the academic disciplinary outcome standards being developed through the ALTC Learning and Teaching Academic Standards project.

The Australian Government is introducing legislation to ensure that all higher education providers meet requirements in a new Higher Education Standards Framework, with providers to be subject to evaluations as determined by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). The English language standards in future may be used by TEQSA in assessing higher education providers’ performance against the Framework.

Definition of English language proficiency

For this project, ‘English language proficiency’ has been defined as the ability of students to use the English language to make and communicate meaning appropriately in spoken and written contexts while completing their higher education studies and after they graduate. Such uses may range from a simple task such as discussing work with fellow students, to complex tasks such as writing an academic paper or delivering a speech to a professional audience.

While some students will enter higher education with a very high level of general English language proficiency, all students will need to acquire specific academic literacy skills during their studies, and the acquisition of these skills is part of improving English language proficiency. English language standards on entry are not adequate to ensure students’ English language proficiency on graduation. However, some students will require greater assistance than others in developing specific aspects of their English language proficiency. It is for this reason that higher education providers should identify the developmental needs of individual students at an early stage of their studies.

Structure of the standards

There are six standards, which are listed on the next page. Succeeding pages provide:

• The standard
• An account of the expectations, i.e. actions that providers are expected to have implemented to meet the standard
• Examples of good practice, which are not intended to be prescriptive
• A brief explanation of the reasons for the standard.
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the English Language Standards for Higher Education

1. The provider ensures that its students are sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in their higher education studies on entry.

2. The provider ensures that prospective and current students are informed about their responsibilities for further developing their English language proficiency during their higher education studies.

3. The provider ensures that resourcing for English language development meets students’ needs throughout their studies.

4. The provider actively develops students’ English language proficiency during their studies.

5. The provider ensures that students are appropriately proficient in English when they graduate.

6. The provider uses evidence from a variety of sources to monitor and improve its support for the development of students’ English language proficiency.
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Standard 1
The provider ensures that its students are sufficiently proficient in the English language to participate effectively in their higher education studies on entry.

Expectations

• The provider recognises that appropriate English language standards on entry are not of themselves adequate to ensure students' English language proficiency on graduation, and considers entry standards, the needs of the course of study and the support that is provided as a coherent whole.

• The higher education provider adheres to a formal policy that specifies English language entry criteria, including criteria for direct entry pathways, which are appropriate for the level of studies and the discipline and which are consistent with research evidence, including the recommendations of relevant testing organisations.

• The provider verifies the accuracy and authenticity of the evidence provided by prospective students to satisfy its English language entry criteria.

• The provider systematically monitors the performance of students by entry pathway or by cohort and makes appropriate changes to entry criteria to ensure that it admits only those students who are able to participate effectively on entry.

• The higher education provider gives feedback to direct entry pathway providers on the comparative academic performance of students who have entered through pathway provisions and on the provider’s satisfaction with the English language proficiency of entering students from the pathway provider.

• If the provider uses a test of English language proficiency to determine student entry, the provider is able to demonstrate the security, reliability and validity of the test that is applied.

Examples of Good Practice

• The provider has detailed and explicit statements of the measures of English language proficiency that it accepts for admission of students to a course of study, not limited to a list of particular standardised test scores.

• There are defined academic responsibilities for setting and reviewing entry standards.

• The provider’s staff and students understand what is signified by English language test results, including the strengths and limitations of these tests.

• The provider has secure and documented processes to allow it to check and approve that entering students meet English language entry requirements, including the use of precedent databases. These processes are controlled by the provider, involve more than a single individual and are subject to internal audit. Exemptions are given rarely and follow documented procedures.

• The provider has clarified its expectations with direct entry pathway providers and there are formal agreements between the provider and direct entry pathway providers.

• In determining entry criteria, the provider seeks advice from people with expertise in the development and assessment of English language proficiency.

English Language Standards for Higher Education (ELSHE)
Appendix 1: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) 2010, Draft English language standards for higher education

**Explanation**

This standard is an overarching general statement reflective of the fact that higher education providers set entry standards for admission to their courses of study. Entry standards are designed to allow most students to graduate, if the students engage diligently with their studies and are provided with appropriate opportunities for development during their studies. English language entry standards form part of admission criteria.

The standard assumes that students will complete their studies with greater English language proficiency than when they enter a course of study but recognises that a reasonable level of proficiency is needed for students to participate effectively in their studies from the commencement of the course.

Most providers allow English language entry standards to be met by students through a variety of means, so many students do not need to take a recognised test of English language proficiency to meet English language entry requirements. Given the practical impossibility of equating these other means with English language test scores, higher education providers need to find other means to assure themselves that students entering through pathways (including articulation from other studies, completion of English language courses and foundation programs) are equipped to participate effectively in their studies. In practice, this means at a minimum that providers need to monitor how well students from different entry pathways are able to deal with the language requirements of their discipline at various levels of study and further develop their proficiency. (Simple measures of aggregate academic performance by cohort may not provide sufficient information.) Higher education providers need to satisfy themselves that their pathway providers' programs are likely to be appropriate and to convey their expectations clearly to providers of pathway programs. Higher education providers need to manage their relationships with pathway providers effectively, including giving feedback on their performance and drawing attention to problems.

While there may be limitations on the extent to which higher education providers feel able to change their English language admission requirements for some groups, e.g. school leavers and students articulating from vocational education and training (VET) providers, providers should make known to relevant authorities any concerns about the entry-level English language proficiency of students admitted through these pathways.
Standard 2
The provider ensures that prospective and current students are informed about their responsibilities for further developing their English language proficiency during their higher education studies.

Expectations

- The provider formally acknowledges significant responsibility for the ongoing development of its students' English language proficiency and provides explicit advice to students of the nature and level of support that will be given to help them meet expectations of graduate English language proficiency.
- The provider ensures that students know they must play an active role in developing their English language proficiency during their studies.
- The provider’s education agents understand the provider’s expectations for further development of students’ English language proficiency.
- The provider’s onshore and offshore educational partners understand the provider’s expectations for further development of students’ English language proficiency.

Examples of Good Practice

- The provider has a policy that includes its goals for the development of English language proficiency for all students.
- The provider has a charter of student rights and responsibilities which makes explicit reference to development of students’ English language proficiency.
- As part of its orientation and transition programs, the provider ensures that students understand the English language proficiency required for their studies, the importance of further developing this proficiency, and how early identification of language development needs can assist them.
- The provider explains to new students how they will have opportunities during their studies to improve their intercultural competence and understanding of a range of English communication styles and why these opportunities are important.

Explanation

This standard reflects mutuality in the development of English language proficiency. While higher education providers have responsibilities to set entry standards and provide means for students to develop their English language proficiency during their studies, students must also take responsibility for their own language development during their studies, as part of taking responsibility for their learning. It is important that students are aware of this expectation before they commit to a course of study, so providers need to advise prospective students of their responsibilities. Students also need to be aware of the importance of taking opportunities to develop their intercultural competence and capacities.
Appendix 1: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) 2010, Draft English language standards for higher education

final version  5 JULY 2010

Standard 3
The provider ensures that resourcing for English language development meets students’ needs throughout their studies.

Expectations
• The higher education provider identifies students’ individual English language development needs early in their studies and addresses these needs.

• The provider ensures there are adequate resources for appropriately-qualified academic language and learning staff to meet the language and learning needs of students.

• The provider ensures there is adequate expertise available to assist academic staff to integrate English language proficiency into curricula and teaching.

• The provider ensures that academic staff know how to and are able to access professional assistance for the development of curricula, assessment tasks and teaching to develop English language proficiency in specific academic disciplinary contexts.

• The provider ensures that academic staff have opportunities to revise curricula and teaching to integrate English language proficiency with discipline-specific learning.

Examples of Good Practice
• The provider offers students opportunities to self-assess their language skills throughout their studies and to undertake developmental activities in response to the needs they identify.

• The provider has considered and addresses how best to meet the English language development needs of students studying online or remotely.

• The provider is able to demonstrate that its allocation of resources for English language development is commensurate with need.

• The provider has a clear statement of the responsibilities of various staff positions for developing students’ English language proficiency.

• The provider offers professional development activities to develop the expertise of academic staff in understanding, promoting and integrating English language proficiency in differing disciplinary contexts.

Explanation
The standard recognises that, having identified the development of English language proficiency its students require, the provider needs to provide sufficient resources for development of proficiency. A provider should be able to demonstrate how resources for English language development are allocated and how it knows whether or not these resources are adequate to meet students’ needs. Resourcing must ensure that adequate numbers of appropriately-qualified language and learning staff are engaged. (The Association for Academic Language and Learning (AALL) is developing in consultation with the Australian higher education sector, a statement on appropriate qualifications for academic language and learning professionals.) Further, resourcing needs to be provided to support academic staff to improve and revise curricula and their teaching to integrate English language proficiency with discipline-specific learning.

English Language Standards for Higher Education (ELSHE)
Standard 4
The provider actively develops students’ English language proficiency during their studies.

Expectations
- The provider ensures that development by students of their English language proficiency is integrated into curriculum design, assessment practices and course delivery.
- Course learning outcomes include English language proficiency outcomes that are taught and assessed during the course and take account of the proficiency that is required of graduates in the discipline for employment or further study.
- The provider gives attention to all aspects of English language proficiency in assessment methods, e.g. attention to listening, speaking, reading and writing.
- The curriculum takes into account time for students to develop their English language proficiency within overall expected student workloads.
- The provider has considered how best to use work placements or practice to assist students to develop their English language proficiency in professional or employment settings.
- Course approvals and reviews consider the extent to which English language proficiency outcomes are designed into curricula, assessment and teaching.
- The provider ensures effective interaction of students from differing cultural and language backgrounds in regular academic activities.
- The provider ensures that students are encouraged and supported to enhance their English language development through effective intercultural social interaction in a range of formal and informal settings.

Examples of Good Practice
- As part of its orientation and induction programs for staff, the provider ensures that all its academics, including contract staff, understand the importance of further developing students’ English language proficiency throughout the course.
- The provider offers fully contextualised, discipline-specific English language proficiency development within the course of study, for example through dedicated credit-bearing units or through specific learning activities.
- The provider has specific activities to assist online or distance education students to improve their spoken as well as their written English.
- The provider undertakes course mapping activities to identify and improve the ways in which appropriate English language proficiency will be achieved throughout the course of study.

Explanation
This standard acknowledges that different disciplines have different English language requirements and discourses and that most students do not enter higher education with ‘ready-made’ proficiency in the academic language of their discipline(s). It is based on a view that development of appropriate English language proficiency is more likely to occur when it is linked to need (e.g. discipline-specific academic activities, assessment tasks, practice).

The standard draws on expert advice, emerging practice and the available evidence on how to develop students’ English language proficiency during their studies, taking account of the varying needs of students, especially students with English as an additional language. These sources indicate that while there is no single ‘best way to develop students’ English language proficiency, contextualisation within disciplines and integration

English Language Standards for Higher Education (ELSHE)
of language development across the curriculum seem likely to be effective approaches. 'Integration' in this context means taking a holistic view across a discipline to address needs through a variety of means, including: embedding language development through curriculum design and assessment; workshops or credit-bearing units within a course; 'adjunct' workshops or sessions within a course; developing workplace communication through preparation for work placements and practice; and targeted individual or group support provided by academic language and learning experts. Similar ideas can be applied to support research students. Particular strategies may be needed to support online or distance education students.

The standard also addresses the need for providers to develop effective strategies to ensure that all students have experience of a wide range of contexts where English is used and thus are able to extend the breadth and depth of their skills in using English appropriate to particular sociocultural or academic contexts.
Standard 5
The provider ensures that students are appropriately proficient in English when they graduate.

Expectations

• The higher education provider states clearly to students and other stakeholders its expectations of its graduates, including its expectations regarding English language proficiency encompassing a range of communication skills.
• English language proficiency is an explicit component of academic standards for the course of study and is aligned to disciplinary standards.
• The provider obtains regular information from students on the extent to which they consider their English language proficiency is improving.
• The provider has ongoing dialogue with industry and with professional accreditation and registration bodies about their expectations regarding English language proficiency and the English language proficiency of the provider’s graduates.

Examples of good practice

• The provider has comprehensive plans to develop and monitor students’ English language proficiency throughout their studies up to the time of graduation.
• The provider uses stated criteria to assess students’ English language proficiency within assessment of course units.
• The course allows students to demonstrate the range of abilities and skills they have acquired throughout the course including appropriate English language proficiency, for example through capstone experiences.
• The provider has implemented ways for students to demonstrate their English language proficiency to prospective employers, professional referees, academics and others.

Explanation
This standard recognises that when students graduate with an Australian higher education qualification, they should possess the English language proficiency skills to communicate effectively in subsequent employment and professional activities or further study, and to engage in society more generally. This standard is consistent with most Australian universities’ statements of graduate attributes, which mention high level communication skills as a desired attribute, and one that research shows is crucial for employment in Australia on graduation.

The standard focuses on student learning outcomes and how providers know that students have an appropriate level of English language proficiency when they graduate. The standard does not suggest that providers offer students an external test of English language proficiency. Currently-available tests of English language proficiency for entry to higher education studies are not designed to assess proficiency on exit. Consistent with the principles of quality assurance, the standard asks providers to develop means to assure themselves that graduating students have appropriate English language proficiency. If providers have addressed all the other standards, they will have considerable evidence to demonstrate how this standard is being met.
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**Standard 6**
The provider uses evidence from a variety of sources to monitor and improve its support for the development of students’ English language proficiency.

**Expectations**

- The provider regularly compares its policies and practices for English language development against those of comparable institutions nationally and internationally and considers these in developing policies and practices that reflect the specific needs of its students and the requirements of specific discipline areas.
- The provider systematically monitors the extent to which its academics consider students’ English language proficiency on entry is appropriate and is developed through their studies.
- The provider systematically monitors the extent to which its graduates believe their English language proficiency was developed throughout their higher education studies.
- The provider makes adjustments as appropriate to its entry standards, resourcing, curricula, assessment practices or teaching to better meet students’ needs for development of their English language proficiency.

**Examples of good practice**

- The provider uses research findings, including its own, to inform its strategies for the development of students’ English language proficiency.
- The provider systematically monitors the extent to which employers are satisfied with the English language proficiency and communication skills of its graduates.
- The provider obtains comparative feedback from students on the forms of English language development support that they believe meet their needs most effectively.

**Explanation**

This standard uses the principle of continuous quality improvement, which entails the monitoring of outcomes and identification of ways to improve one or more elements of current practice. These elements include policies, procedures, projects and activities, curricula, resourcing and the ways in which ‘results’ are defined and assessed. Identification of improvements can occur through internal reflection, benchmarking and comparisons, research findings, or considering the views of students and other stakeholders.
Response by Student Learning and Academic Development team (Student Centre) to draft Admissions Policy, September 2012 [Head: Dr Jane Skalicky]

We appreciate the opportunity to give feedback on the draft Admissions Policy, extended to us as members of the English Language Proficiency Policy Working Group. As this group is not scheduled to reconvene until after the closing date for submissions on the draft Admissions Policy, and given the diverse membership of the group, we have suggested that members respond individually.

This response by the Student Learning and Academic Development team considers the draft Admissions Policy in relation to three contexts: the current UTAS strategic plan; the role of our team in supporting the academic, English language, literacy and numeracy development of students enrolled in degree programs; and the DEEWR English Language Proficiency standards for all students in higher education that are likely to inform TEQSA. We make two recommendations, and suggest a number of questions for Admissions Policy to consider.

Recommendations

1. The first DEEWR standard for English language proficiency requires that ‘the provider ensures that its students are sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in their higher education studies on entry’. To comply with this, we recommend a change in the wording of the third objective:
   Define the broad entry requirements for admissions to courses at UTAS, including English language entry requirements that ensure all students are sufficiently proficient in English to participate effectively in their higher education studies on entry.

2. The draft policy does not address the issue of English language standards for domestic students with English as an additional language (EAL). Policy Provision 3.7 states that ‘international applicants must meet the relevant English entry requirements defined in the Schedule and any course specific English entry requirements.’ Under current Admissions policy, some domestic EAL students are admitted with levels of English language proficiency clearly not sufficient to participate effectively in higher education on entry. While the Student Centre has a strategy for identifying testing, and recommending pathways where appropriate, this approach puts the onus on the student to make a decision, and therefore does not comply with DEEWR Standard 1. Thus we recommend that Provision 3.7 should state: Applicants with English as an additional language must meet the relevant English entry requirements defined in the Schedule and any course specific English entry requirements.'
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Questions

1. We appreciate that there is an agenda for an increase in diversity, and that pathways are available within the university for both international and domestic students. What is the role of Admissions policy in determining sufficient levels of literacy and numeracy in domestic applicants admitted to degree courses, and for recommending appropriate pathway options when these levels are not yet sufficient?

2. The current academic standards project means the likely introduction of capstone units with numeracy, literacy and English language proficiency components. What role does Admissions policy play in ensuring that students are able to meet these standards by the end of their study?

3. The expectations related to the DEEWR ELP Standard 1 (quoted above) state that ‘the higher education provider adheres to a formal policy that specifies English language entry criteria, including criteria for direct entry pathways, which are appropriate for the level of studies and the discipline and which are consistent with research evidence, including the recommendations of relevant testing organisations.’
   - Does the Schedule for English language requirements take into consideration research evidence on setting English language criteria for entry, including through direct entry pathways?
   - Does it take into consideration the guidance provided by the IELTS organisation of ‘English study needed’ for students with an overall band score of 6 enrolling in both ‘linguistically demanding’ and ‘linguistically less demanding’ academic courses; and of ‘English study needed’ for students with an overall band score of 6.5 enrolling in ‘linguistically demanding academic courses’ (IELTS 2011, Guide for educational institutions, governments, professional bodies and commercial organisations, IELTS, viewed 29 September 2012, <http://www.ielts.org/institutions.aspx>, p.13)?

4. The expectations related to the DEEWR ELP Standard 1 (quoted above) further state that ‘the provider systematically monitors the performance of students by entry pathway or by cohort and makes appropriate changes to entry criteria to ensure that it admits only those students who are able to participate effectively on entry’. Is UTAS currently collecting data on academic performance in relation to entry pathway and cohort, and is this data used to inform Admissions policy?

5. Are advance standing and articulation covered by Admissions policy, and if not, is there a consistent approach to these arrangements?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the unit/course and area of UTAS teaching it (e.g. ELC)</th>
<th>Short description (what it covers/learning outcomes)</th>
<th>Target/eligible students</th>
<th>Any entry requirements</th>
<th>Length (e.g. % weighting, number of weeks or hours involved),</th>
<th>Relevant exit requirements (e.g. how students are graded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Preparation Program</strong>&lt;br&gt;UPP020&lt;br&gt;Introduction to Academic Writing</td>
<td>The purpose of this unit is to introduce students to academic writing by taking them through a step-by-step process for writing an academic essay. Students learn how to plan an essay, read sources critically, analyse essay questions, structure essays, and write in a way that is suitable for the academic environment. Students are beginning to approach first year standard.</td>
<td>Pre-degree students who do not meet entry requirements for the Diploma of University Studies or other courses. Typically this includes the following: students who have not completed year 11 or 12; mature-aged students; humanitarian visa holders; and students with previously broken levels of educational attainment due to health or learning issues.</td>
<td>No entry requirement.</td>
<td>12.5% One semester unit</td>
<td>A pass in 8 UPP units (which may or may not include UPP020 but typically does) qualifies for general entry to UTAS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University Preparation Program</strong>&lt;br&gt;UPP070&lt;br&gt;Preliminary Academic Activity</td>
<td>This unit aims to prepare students to succeed at university by further developing the academic skills. The skills of reading, writing, listening, speaking, note-taking, and critical thinking</td>
<td>UPP students who have successfully completed UPP020.</td>
<td>UPP020</td>
<td>12.5% One semester unit</td>
<td>A pass in 8 UPP units (which may or may not include UPP070) qualifies for general entry to UTAS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 3: Table summarising UTAS University Preparation Program (UPP) and Diploma of University Studies (DUS) units with an English language proficiency focus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XAB021/XAB022 Academic Writing</td>
<td>Academic Writing develops students’ ability to write successfully in a university environment. These skills include analysing assignment tasks, structuring an essay, developing critical thinking skills, and synthesising multiple academic sources and referencing these in-text. Students produce work approaching first year standard.</td>
<td>Pre-degree students who meet entry requirements for the Diploma of University Studies. Typically this includes the following: students who have partially completed year 11 or 12; students who have successfully completed some UPP units; mature-aged students with relevant work history; VET students with certificate 3 qualifications in non-related disciplines.</td>
<td>As for Diploma of University Studies</td>
<td>12.5% One semester unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the unit/course and area of UTAS teaching it (eg ELC)</th>
<th>Short description (what it covers/learning outcomes)</th>
<th>Target/eligible students</th>
<th>Any entry requirements</th>
<th>Length (eg. % weighting, number of weeks or hours involved)</th>
<th>Relevant exit requirements (eg how students are graded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Studies Program (English Language Centre)</td>
<td>There are 3 study streams which students join depending on their chosen undergraduate degree – Science &amp; Engineering; Business &amp; Finance; Culture and Communication. Students study two compulsory subjects – English for Tertiary Study and Information Management plus 3 electives from their study stream. Students with undergraduate pre-requisites must study appropriate subjects to meet conditions for entry.</td>
<td>International Students with a UTAS undergraduate degree offer</td>
<td>5.5 IELTS or equivalent plus minimum academic level of completion of Year 11 or equivalent</td>
<td>28 weeks (two semesters of 14 weeks)</td>
<td>Students receive a GPA which is a combined aggregate of scores from all subjects. GPAs vary for each faculty and students are aware of the GPA required throughout the entire course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Direct Entry Academic Programs – DEAP (English Language Centre) | This course focuses on the development of English proficiency, study skills and academic culture. | International students with a UTAS degree offer | DEAP 20 – IELTS 5.0 (Writing 5)  
DEAP 15 – IELTS 5.5 (no band less than 5.0)  
DEAP 10 – IELTS 5.5 – (no band less than 5.5) | Currently three DEAP programs – 20, 15 and 10 weeks (400, 300 and 200 hours) Full-time study only. | Students are graded on a number of assessments including tutorial presentations and research essays. Students receive an overall mark as well as individual marks for skills. Each student’s exit |
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| Pathway English Courses (English Language Centre) | Seven levels of English language skills development starting at Pre-Intermediate and ranging to Advanced. Students study Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing, study skills and Academic English skills. | International Students – many have a UTAS degree offer and use this course to develop skills and then transfer to DEAP or Foundation Studies. Some CALD students, where assessed as eligible, also enrol in this course. | Students are tested on arrival and placed in the most appropriate level | 5 week modules 5-50 weeks | At the end of each module students are assessed and progress to the next level is based on reaching an overall score of 60% with no individual score less than 50% |
**Appendix 5: Table summarising Student Learning discipline-specific workshops in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS</th>
<th>Name of the unit</th>
<th>Short description of workshop aims &amp; content</th>
<th>Target students</th>
<th>Any entry requirements</th>
<th>Length (eg. % weighting, number of weeks or hours involved)</th>
<th>Relevant exit requirements (eg how students are graded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>HMA206/318</td>
<td>Essay writing</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit - focus on international students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 fifty-minute workshop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding Asia through Food (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HAF101</td>
<td>Essay planning</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 fifty-minute workshops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender, Power &amp; Change (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FFA192</td>
<td>Essay writing</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 fifty-minute workshops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theory Basics (Inveresk campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS</td>
<td>BFA705</td>
<td>This is a key unit in the Masters of Professional Accounting degree. Workshops run in this unit a total of 3 times to date (ie in Sem 2 2011, Sem 1 2012 and Sem 2 2012) to facilitate the development of key skills required in the major essay assignment. The workshops now cover: 1) Analysing the essay question, developing a research plan, selecting and organising the information 2) Vocabulary development; defining and using accounting terms 3) Writing the essay: organisation and language requirements; paragraph writing (reasoning)</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit (approx 90% international).</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 fifty-minute workshops</td>
<td>N/A?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial and Corporate Accounting (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEA111</td>
<td>Workshops have been run in this unit for at least four years. The focus is on appropriate analysis, planning, revision and writing skills for the key assessment types: • In-tutorial tests • Mid-semester test • Essay • Exam</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4 fifty-minute workshops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles of Economics (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BMA101</td>
<td>Analysing question, reading and note-taking</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 ninety-minute workshops (on each campus)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction to Management (Sandy Bay and Newnham campuses)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCE</td>
<td>CNA116</td>
<td>Essay writing</td>
<td>All students enrolled in</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 fifty-minute session</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5: Table summarising Student Learning discipline-specific workshops in 2012**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of course or program</th>
<th>Short description of workshop aims &amp; content</th>
<th>Target students</th>
<th>Any entry requirements</th>
<th>Length (eg. % weighting, number of weeks or hours involved)</th>
<th>Relevant exit requirements (eg how students are graded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Nursing (Newnham campus)</td>
<td></td>
<td>unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNA111 Introduction to Nursing Practice (Darlinghurst and Rozelle campuses)</td>
<td>Report writing</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 fifty-minute workshop on each campus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA102 Pharmacy in Health Care</td>
<td>Essay writing</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 ninety-minute workshop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSA444 Research Thesis A M Pharm Sci</td>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2 fifty-minute workshops</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDA372 Bridging Studio Design (Inveresk campus)</td>
<td>Essay writing</td>
<td>International students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 fifty-minute session</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDA114 History and Theory in Design (Inveresk campus)</td>
<td>Essay writing and study skills</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3 fifty-minute workshop</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KHA111 Psychology A (Sandy Bay, Newnham and Cradle Coast campus)</td>
<td>Essay writing: analysing the topic</td>
<td>All students enrolled in unit</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1 fifty-minute lecture at each campus</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER COURSES/PROGRAMS WITH DISCIPLINE-SPECIFIC STUDENT LEARNING WORKSHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of course or program</th>
<th>Short description of workshop aims &amp; content</th>
<th>Target students</th>
<th>Any entry requirements</th>
<th>Length (eg. % weighting, number of weeks or hours involved)</th>
<th>Relevant exit requirements (eg how students are graded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSO Program, School of Medicine</td>
<td>Coordinated by the School of Medicine. A parallel, adjunct program for students identified as needing additional opportunities to develop skills and knowledge for clinical communication. Student Learning staff contribute to patient communication sessions, focussing on linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of communication. Identified 3rd &amp; 4th year students, including international students articulating directly into 3rd year from overseas university.</td>
<td>Identified 3rd &amp; 4th year students, including international students articulating directly into 3rd year from overseas university.</td>
<td>4 two-hour Student Learning communication-focussed sessions per semester.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor of Pharmacy (Sandy Bay campus)</th>
<th>Clinical communication: counselling and professional communication</th>
<th>All students enrolled in Bachelor of Pharmacy</th>
<th>3 50-minute workshops</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rozelle and Darlinghurst campus students</td>
<td>Academic writing skills and exam preparation</td>
<td>All students studying on Sydney campuses</td>
<td>2 fifty-minute sessions on each campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BUSINESS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Management PhD program (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td>Thesis writing</td>
<td>International PhD candidates in Marketing, (requested by supervisor)</td>
<td>4 ninety-minute sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework postgraduate Business programs (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>International students transferring from partner program at Shanghai Oceans University</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law School Bridging Program (Sandy Bay campus)</td>
<td>The Bridging Program is an extended orientation program for students commencing Law studies. The Student Learning sessions cover tutorial participation and discussion skills.</td>
<td>Open to all commencing Law students; particular focus on international students articulating into 3rd year from overseas partner university.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Distance Programs</td>
<td>Exam preparation</td>
<td>Distance students enrolled in Education programs</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>