15 February 2012

Andrew Taylor
Branch Manager
Policy and Analysis Branch
Higher Education Group
Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations
PO Box 9880
CANBERRA CITY ACT 2601

By Email:  AQHE@deewr.gov.au

Dear Andrew

Re: The University of Western Australia (UWA) Response to Discussion Paper Development of Performance Measurement Instruments in Higher Education

The University of Western Australia (UWA) welcomes the opportunity to make these submissions in response to the recent discussion papers 'Development of Performance Measurement Instruments in Higher Education', 'Assessment of Generic Skills' and 'Review of the Australian Graduate Survey'.

There is little doubt that the Australian higher education sector will benefit from the development of well-conceived, reliable, valid and cost effective performance measurement instruments which contribute to the assurance of its quality. This University's responsiveness to such imperatives is clearly evidenced both through our national and international engagements, and in our longstanding commitments to internal performance measurement and our ethos of continuous improvement.

In broad overview, there are some proposals within the trio of discussion papers which we would wholeheartedly support (for example, a shift to central administration of the Australian Graduate Survey). However, there are other features which UWA views with some concern. I note, for example, that matters previously raised with the Department in our earlier submissions concerning the reliability, cost and utility of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) appear to have gone unremarked.

Similarly, caution must be exercised to ensure that any proposed data provision avoids duplication, is effective and relevant, and that the outcomes of its analysis are widely understood and will be of enduring value to the sector. It will also be important to ensure that any measures proposed in this context do not stray into areas of oversight for which TEQSA has recently been established.
In respect of other elements of the papers, I trust that our responses prove useful to the Department as it addresses the substantial issues raised, devises appropriate performance measures for our sector and revises existing instruments to ensure their continuing relevance.

Should clarification of any points in this submission be required, our institutional contact is:

Winthrop Professor Jane Long  
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)  
The University of Western Australia (M466)  
35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009.  
Email: jane.long@uwa.edu.au  
Telephone: (08) 6488 2077

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Professor Paul Johnson  
Vice-Chancellor

Att
The University of Western Australia (UWA) welcomes the opportunity to make this submission in response to the recent discussion paper, ‘Development of Performance Measurement Instruments in Higher Education’. As a response to one of three papers released concurrently by DEEWR, it may be read alongside our other responses to those discussion papers, ‘Assessment of Generic Skills’ and ‘Review of the Australian Graduate Survey’.

The University notes that in respect of performance measurement, it supports the following principles:

- the maintenance of robust minimum standards, without unnecessary intrusion upon institutional autonomy;
- the avoidance of duplication in data made available to the government by the University, in various contexts;
- the adoption of clear definition, and performance measurement instruments that are fit for that defined purpose, characterised by valid methodologies and whose results are subject to expert analysis and peer review;
- a focus upon outcomes, rather than upon processes.

Alongside these principles, we note those elaborated within your current papers (fitness for purpose; consistency; capacity to be audited; transparency; and timeliness). Others we believe should be added to that list include:

- validity and reliability
- relevance
- cost effectiveness

There are some proposals within the papers which UWA would wholeheartedly support (for example, a shift to central administration of the Australian Graduate Survey). However, there are other features within the papers which UWA views with some concern.

We note, for example, that matters canvassed in our earlier submissions concerning the validity, reliability, cost and utility of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) have gone unremarked. Similarly, UWA notes that the purpose of some envisaged data provision and the multiple purposes to which it is envisaged to be put, is not clear. We are concerned that such data collection will exceed the intended purpose of performance measurement for quality assurance, and will instead stray into areas for which TEQSA has recently been established.

We have also provided responses to specific questions posed within the original paper. We trust that these may prove useful to the Department in addressing the substantial issues raised, and in devising appropriate performance measures for our sector.
Development of Performance Measurement Instruments in Higher Education

This Discussion Paper provides an overview of the Government’s proposals to develop and introduce a number of performance measures. The accompanying discussion papers further extend the discussion on the ‘Assessment of Generic Skills’ and “Review of the Australian Graduate Survey’. While UWA will respond to each of these separately, our core response is based in our response to this paper in particular.

In overview, UWA would register some areas of general concern about this paper, as follows:

1. it is not explicitly receptive to the institutional responses made to earlier discussion papers released in December 2010 and October 2011, which pinpointed the lack of clarity of purpose surrounding some proposals;
2. in particular, there is overlap into areas of oversight for which TEQSA has been established, particularly in the area of learning outcomes and standards;
3. the performance funding that was to accompany the introduction of these measures has been withdrawn which brings into question the cost of proposed activities relative to their benefit. Cost effectiveness is not addressed in the paper and is an important consideration.
4. the ways in which these performance measures are to be implemented is not addressed nor details provided as to how data is intended to be made available and reported. Clear codes of practice, statements of purpose and application need to be developed prior to the generation and publication of any data.

The paper is unclear about the ultimate purpose of the performance measures and the use of the data. The paper indicates that the purpose of the performance measures is for both quality assurance and quality enhancement. UWA supports and recognises the Government’s legitimate interest in quality assurance and monitoring. It does not support proposals which intrude on institutional responsibility for enhancement of quality.

The Government’s concern with the quality of the provision of higher education is indisputably appropriate. It already gathers significant data for review to this end, relating to student enrolment, retention and completion, and monitoring of satisfaction and employment outcomes through the AGS. The proposed additional tools and measures mooted in the current discussion paper, to fill gaps the Government discerns, are the University Experience Survey, the revised Australian Graduate Survey and the Graduate Skills Assessment (Collegiate Learning Assessment). These are coherent, although not uncontroversial ways to ‘assure’ the quality of higher education.

There is digression from this legitimate focus on assurance, however, where additional data is gathered for ‘enhancement’ purposes. We contend that the role of enhancing the quality of higher education resides primarily with the institution.

Further, UWA is concerned that these performance measures appear to be directed at the university sector only. We would argue that the higher education sector as a whole (public and private) must be required to provide and participate in the measurement of performance using the same instruments and processes, to best assure quality.


Are there other principles that should guide the development of performance measurement instruments?

In addition to the principles listed, the following are suggested:

- **Relevance** – the measurement should be of relevance and meaningful to inform the institution and the students, rather than providing figures for reporting purposes alone. Data should also be generated in a manner to inform the institution at the most useful level, not merely to generate comparison tables. Course level data, rather than fields of study may be the most appropriate level. Often, there is more intra-institutional variability than inter-institution variability: data needs to be
gathered appropriately, to inform relevant degree programs, not at artificially constructed fields of study.

- **Universality of application** – performance measures and instruments should apply to all approved higher education providers, not just to Self-Accrediting Institution (SAI) university providers.

- **Comparability** – the ability for an institution to compare performance of student cohorts through time and across institutions for quality benchmarking purposes

**Is it appropriate to use a student life-cycle framework to guide the development of performance measurement instrument?**

**Are there aspects that should be included in the student life-cycle framework?**

While a student life-cycle framework is useful, its framing within the paper is problematic. It assumes a linear progression of students from school, to university study and then employment. While this is the experience of a large number of students at this university, it does not reflect the student experience in many other universities where students enter and leave and re-enter in a much more complex life-cycle than portrayed. In addition, a large number of students do not enter through obtaining an ATAR score but through alternate pathways, including direct entry into the second year of a program. With the development of multiple pathways for entry into university, a first year survey such as the UES will not capture the experience of an increasing number of these students.

While the discussion paper relates to national performance measures and a national perspective of the student life-cycle, elements of Figures 1, 2 and 3 have strayed into current institutional-level quality assurance and enhancement practices and measures, and are therefore not appropriate for inclusion in the final papers as their use is much more fragmented and varied than is suggested in Figure 2.

All figures need to reflect a national approach, with individual institutions’ specific responsibility for quality practices and measures left to consideration by them, and by TEQSA as the regulator. As such, reference to institutional responsibilities and practices should be removed from the figures, as these are not within the intended purview of these government initiated performance instruments.

We have therefore presented some revised figures for consideration below, re-framed on the following bases:

- The original Figure 1 has been retained, but with the areas that should be removed highlighted in blue: these blue areas relate to institutional quality practices which will be subject to the scrutiny of TEQSA;
- We argue that ‘student learning outcomes’ should not be separated into three distinct categories, ‘student learning outcomes’, ‘preparedness for employment and future study’ and ‘achievement of skills’. In fact, the latter two categories are both sub-sections of student learning outcomes;
- By contrast, the Government’s intention to carry out ‘Assessment of generic skills’ requires that the category of “achievement of skills” be separated out, despite the evidence that learning of these skills takes place within a discipline and within a program of study.

Our proposed revised Figure 1 below, therefore, includes only the aspects that are the stated intended focus of Government and include national performance indicators only. All other aspects that relate to institutional practices and responsibility have been removed.

We argue that Figures 2 and 3 should be collapsed, to include only the data that is gathered comprehensively from universities at the national level and which directly relate to the revised Figure 1. (i.e., while Figure 1 presents the student life-cycle with its elements that enable the quality of Australian higher education to be monitored nationally, Figure 2 presents the tools which will be used to collect the data (existing and proposed). Many of the instruments in the original Figure 2 are used intermittently and differently by institutions as quality tools, and are not national or universal, and hence should not be included here.

If the suggested revisions are made, Figure 3 is no longer required.

We would further argue that pre-entry data be included in the data reported. This data includes the ATAR scores of entering students, median entry ATAR scores for the relevant discipline, and the number and
type of non-ATAR based entries, which are currently readily available and provide valid pre-entry data which relate to the first two elements identified in Figure 1 (‘readiness for university study’ and ‘pathways to study’). This data would make a valuable addition to the information sought by students and their parents on the My University website.
Existing Figure 1: Student life cycle – key aspects to be measured by national performance measures (with all institutional quality practices highlighted in BLUE to be removed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-entry</th>
<th>University (undergraduate) study</th>
<th>Post- study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/admissions and enrolment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for university study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway to study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Middle years</th>
<th>Final year</th>
<th>Completion and graduation (1 year out)</th>
<th>Greater than 1 year out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for university study</td>
<td>Readiness for university study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate satisfaction with study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year experience/engagement and satisfaction with study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall study experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> Level of support provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate employment and further study outcomes</td>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> only to review courses Continued employment and education outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> University experience and engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> Course satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> Quality of teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> Student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness for employment is encompassed in student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remove -Institutional</strong> Preparedness for employment and further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Achievement of skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 1B: Student life cycle – key aspects to be measured by national performance measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-entry</th>
<th>University (undergraduate) study</th>
<th>Post-study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/admissions and enrolment</td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Middle years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for university study</td>
<td>Readiness for university study</td>
<td>1st year experience/engagement and satisfaction with study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathway to study</td>
<td>Retention and progress data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 2: Student life cycle – measurement instruments commonly in use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-entry</th>
<th>University (undergraduate) study</th>
<th>Post-study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application/admissions and enrolment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Middle years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove- Institutional AUSSE</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove- Institutional FYEQ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention and progress data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove- Institutional ISB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remove- Institutional Institution course evaluations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Alternative Figure 3: National performance indicators for reporting on *My University* website

#### Pre-entry
- Application/admissions and enrolment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-entry</th>
<th>University (undergraduate) study</th>
<th>Post-study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Completion and graduation (1 year out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle years</td>
<td>Greater than 1 year out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### University (undergraduate) study
- **Pre-entry**
  - UES
  - REMOVE CLA
- **First year**
  - UES
  - REMOVE CLA
- **Middle years**
  - CLA
- **Final year**
  - REMOVE UES

#### Post-study
- **Completion and graduation (1 year out)**
- **Greater than 1 year out**
  - Revised AGS - CEQ
  - Revised AGS - GDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre Entry</th>
<th>University (undergraduate) Study</th>
<th>Post study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application/admissions, enrolment</td>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Middle years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATAR and alternative entry data</strong></td>
<td>UES</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Existing surveys

UWA notes that the surveys discussed in this section are almost exclusively institutionally based tools, used to inform and enhance institutional practice. UWA has readily participated in the First Year Experience Survey and the AUSSE to inform its practice and to benchmark its performance and it surveys its alumni and employers to inform curriculum development. UWA will continue using such tools in the future. However, many of the instruments included in Figure 2 are used only intermittently and partially by institutions in the sector and so do not represent a national or comprehensive data set. For this reason we would argue that they be removed from Figure 2. Since the discussion document relates to a national approach, the focus should be on national performance indicators, including only those surveys and data sources that are national and apply to the whole sector.

Pre-entry
While as a general principle, the University has reservations about using input measures for the purpose of performance monitoring, our view is that the data on the numbers of applications, basis of admission and the ATAR of applicants obtained from National Data Collections (referred to on page 9 of the Discussion Paper) should be used to provide information of relevance to potential applicants, including alternative entry applicants. This information could be readily included in the My University website, and could be used by applicants in preparing their applications for admission.

University Study
As noted, the surveys and data sources mentioned here (and in Figure 2) are applicable to quality data gathering and enhancement practices within institutions rather than at national level, and therefore not relevant to the current purpose.

Post Study
The AGS is a national survey of long standing and the companion discussion paper details our responses to proposed changes to it. The Beyond Graduation Survey is neither national nor widely used. Its purpose has institutional enhancement and course improvement as its focus, and is not relevant to this context. Many universities survey their alumni and employers when undertaking curriculum and department reviews as part of their institutional quality enhancement practice. However, we caution against attempting to attribute continuing employment outcomes to an institution following graduation longer than one year as many factors can impact on employment. National Census data collection is a more appropriate means to gather data on employment and other economic benefits of university study.

3.2 Links with new instruments
While we acknowledge that performance measures developed at national level have the potential to provide some more useful assessments of performance, they cannot replace measures confined to a particular institution or subset of institutions. National instruments by necessity focus on issues of common interest across the higher education sector, and, as such, there is an ongoing need for the concurrent development and use of local and institutionally selected benchmarking instruments to address institution-specific issues.

4. New instruments

UWA acknowledges the general support in the sector for a University Experience Survey in year one of university study, and also supports the review of the Australian Graduate Survey.

There has been, and remains, no widespread support for the introduction of the Assessment of Generic Skills in the higher education sector. UWA’s position has not wavered since its earlier submissions, in respect of the shortcomings and inappropriateness of any planned application of a CLA like instrument in the context of national assessment.

Each of these items is addressed briefly here, and developed in more detail in UWA’s responses to the specific companion Discussion papers.
4.1 UES

The University of Western Australia supports the introduction of the UES as a survey of the experience for first year students. Given that the UES combines aspects of the AUSSE and the first year experience survey, UWA is confident that this new survey will provide the Government, the sector and the University with useful data. UWA is pleased to support its development and implementation. We note the concern expressed by institutions which have a significant number of students entry into the second year of university and so will not be included in a survey of first year students.

However, we see no benefit in this survey being administered on a second occasion in the final year of the program of study, beyond the context for which it has been conceived, developed and trialled. While the report on the development of the UES (released on 10 February) suggests it has been developed for use in the first year and final year of undergraduate study, this was not the initial brief outlined in the DEEWR briefing papers, nor in its initial development.

Final year /completing students currently complete the AGS, following graduation, which provides data on student satisfaction about their course etc. If a final year survey is considered warranted, then UWA would support consideration of the CEQ being administered in the final year of study, in the same manner as the National Survey of Students in the UK. This approach would provide data that could be benchmarked more legitimately, since the survey would be administered nationally at the same point of the students’ study. The opportunity to benchmark internationally would provide a valuable set of information for institutions and courses to internationally benchmark their courses and for informing international students on the quality of courses in Australia comparative to the UK and NZ.

Were the UES deemed a more appropriate measure of students’ experience of a course in the final year of study, then the CEQ component of the AGS should be removed, to minimise duplication. However, this would result in a loss in the opportunity to benchmark with an internationally comparative instrument.

4.2 Assessment of Generic Skills

The stated purpose for this measurement strays considerably from the focus upon national performance measurement, into institutional responsibility for determining the quality and standard of their students’ learning outcomes and into the role of TEQSA.

The rationale and purpose of this indicator discussed within the paper is the source of particular concern. The argument put for the use of the CLA or a similar test of generic skills is not supported by the CLA originators, the sector, or within the higher educational research literature. Moreover, we note with concern that the AHELO project sponsored by the Government, which currently utilises the CLA, is yet to conclude its trial or report its findings.

We therefore urge the Government to consider the removal of the CLA proposal as one that is not supportable, unsuited to the intended purpose, and both cost and labour intensive, or at a minimum, delay until the results and reports of the AHELO project have been received and the ramifications from it are considered. However, while this is our clear and preferred position, and recognising the imperatives of Government and the context in which the paper is proposed, UWA is prepared to cautiously support the administration of an Assessment of Generic Skills in the final year of study. Given the significant issues that will need to be addressed in developing this tool, we urge the Government to revise the proposed timeline to allow for sufficient time for development, consultation and piloting before introducing an assessment instrument.

Our concerns regarding the Assessment of Generic Skills are detailed briefly below, and in more detail in our response to that specific Discussion paper.
The assertion in the paper that the Assessment of Generic Skills is a “direct measure of learning outcomes” (p13) remains highly contested, given that “generic skills” are actually not generic: they are learned in a context that is specific, based within disciplines and their particular discourses, and therefore also most clearly evidenced in these specific contexts. An assessment of generic skills outside the discipline of study therefore remains an indirect and proxy measure of learning outcomes. UWA fully supports the development of clear learning outcomes and evidence of standards attained, and is participating in a number of projects to achieve this end including the Go8 standards verification project and the ALTC project Achievement Matters: External Peer Review of Accounting Learning Standards. We argue that peer review, moderation and external verification is the most valid way to determine learning outcomes and standards and that TEQSA is best placed to oversee these.

Claims that ‘value-added’ can be simply measured using tests such as the CLA have been routinely discounted over many decades, by internationally reputable evaluation experts. As such, the intention to administer the CLA “to first and/or final year undergraduate students” (p14) is not supported by UWA. More importantly, the administration of an Assessment of Generic Skills in the first year of study is effectively an input indicator that is more appropriately captured by their students’ ATAR scores. The first year administration of a CLA-like test as an input indicator has been shown to have limited validity and therefore its cost effectiveness and fitness-for-purpose is questionable. It also is contrary to the Government’s stated focus on outcome measures rather than input measures. We note that Australian universities are able to subscribe to the services of the CLA on an individual basis, should they wish to utilise this test as an enhancement tool within their own institution – the purpose for which the test was developed.

If the Government’s intention is to be assured that students graduating from university have attained a minimum standard of critical thinking, analytic reasoning, problem-solving and written communication skills (independent of the learning that has taken place in the discipline they have studied for their undergraduate degree) then the administration of a common test, acceptable to the sector and prior to graduation, would be cautiously supported by the University, though peer review and verification of standards is our preferred option. If such a test were administered, UWA would argue that the numerical results for all institutions should be published, in the interests of transparency.

4.3 Review of the AGS

A review is supported, in a form that takes account of the UES and other performance measures so that the AGS can be adjusted to become part of a suite of integrated performance measures.

The review of administration arrangements should be linked and mirror those of the UES and any other measures, to minimise the administrative and resource load on institutions and to avoid duplication and confusion.

(Further detail is contained in UWA’s companion response to the Review of the Australian Graduate Survey discussion paper.)

5 Issues

5.1 Administration of new instruments

UWA supports a common administration process for new and existing instruments.

5.2 Student Selection

UWA would propose the following basis for selection of students:

University Experience Survey – Survey
Collegiate Learning Assessment – Survey
AGS/Course Experience Questionnaire – Census
5.3 Central sampling of students

UWA supports the central, entirely online administration of surveys to ensure a consistent process is used across institutions. Identifiable data enables linking to data held local.

5.4 Uses of data

Student data must be made available to the University in a manner which enables analysis at levels appropriate to institutional purposes, i.e. to Course/program level, year level, degree-specific level, as required.

UWA supports the reporting of actual numbers, with neither extrapolation nor weighting or other forms of statistical modelling to ‘account’ for contentious input factors.

The paper suggests that a key driver for collecting the data is to populate the My University website. However, in order to respond sensibly to questions concerning appropriate use of data, we require more detailed information concerning the proposed level of its aggregation; the uses to which the data will be put; and the explanations that would be furnished for its users. It is not clear what data is proposed to be available on the My University website. For example, will all questions from the UES be available for students or just one or two questions, or will scales be reported?

We support the development of guidelines of use and reporting practices that is endorsed by the members of Universities Australia, before the release of data.

5.5 Intersection of existing and new instruments

All instruments (new and existing) must be considered as part of an integrated framework. Existing instruments may need to be altered or removed to avoid duplication and to ensure data gathered is relevant to its purpose. The selection and use of the instruments also needs to proceed with the recognition that they provide the Government with samples and snapshots of quality at particular points in time. They cannot and should not be interpreted as comprehensive.

As is the case with many universities, UWA has comprehensive systems for data gathering, the outcomes of which it uses for both quality assurance and enhancement purposes. UWA looks forward to contributing to the generation of robust national performance measurement instruments for quality assurance purposes. We do not support the generation and proliferation of additional instruments or the collection of data that relates to institutional quality enhancement, which is appropriately the preserve of institutions themselves, and which is subject to oversight by TEQSA.

Should further clarification of any aspect of this paper be required, The University of Western Australia’s institutional contact is:

Winthrop Professor Jane Long
Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)
M 466,
The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway
Crawley WA 6009

Email jane.long@uwa.edu.au

Telephone: (08) 6488 2077