

CHARLES STURT

U N I V E R S I T Y



Progress Report

On Affirmations and Recommendations from
the 2009 Cycle 2 AUQA Audit

1 December 2010

CONTENTS

Vice-Chancellor’s Statement.....	2
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	3
Listing of Commendations, Affirmations and Recommendations	5
CHAPTER 2: AFFIRMATIONS	8
Affirmation 1	8
Affirmation 2	12
Affirmation 3	15
Affirmation 4	18
Affirmation 5	24
CHAPTER 3: RECOMMENDATIONS	28
Recommendation 1	28
Recommendation 2	32
Recommendation 3	36
Recommendation 4	39
Recommendation 5	43
Recommendation 6	46
Recommendation 7	50
Recommendation 8	53
Recommendation 9	55
Recommendation 10	60
Recommendation 11	64
Recommendation 12	67
Recommendation 13	71
Recommendation 14	73
Recommendation 15	75
APPENDICES.....	81
Appendix 1: AUQA 2009 Internationalisation Self-Review Action Sheet	81
Acronyms	93

Vice-Chancellor's Statement

On behalf of Charles Sturt University (CSU), I am pleased to submit the University's Progress Report in response to the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) 2009 Cycle 2 Audit.

The Audit Report identified aspects of the University's ongoing work that represent 'good practice', with 15 Commendations reflecting some of the institution's notable achievements as a University with a clear sense of purpose and a commitment to serving its professions, regions and communities.

The AUQA Audit was conducted around two themes: 'Professional Education and Practice-Based Learning' and 'Internationalisation', both highly relevant as CSU conducts its learning, teaching and research in regional, national and international settings and with particular emphasis on service to the professions and workplace learning.

This Progress Report outlines the steps that CSU has taken, and those planned, to address the five Affirmations and fifteen Recommendations in the Audit Report, as well as other matters raised by the Audit Panel. CSU's *University Strategy 2011 - 2015* will focus on 'Course Profile', 'Student Experience' and 'Research', and in so doing address relevant concerns of the Audit Panel at the highest level. More importantly, the Strategy will also contribute to the University's longer-term aspirations and help it to accomplish its goals in professional education and internationalisation more comprehensively.

I take this opportunity to thank all staff for their significant efforts in implementing Charles Sturt University as 'One University', despite its widely dispersed campus network. Their work has ensured that the University is recognised for its substantial contribution to higher education, both in Australia and beyond, while operating from and acting with special regard to the regional communities of Australia.



Professor Ian Goulter
Vice-Chancellor and President

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

In October 2009 AUQA conducted its Cycle 2 Audit of CSU. As detailed in the AUQA Audit Manual (Version 6.0, March 2009) *the approach to Cycle 2 audits involves an increased emphasis on academic standards and outcomes, coupled with assessment of the extent to which institutions are meeting external requirements*¹.

The Audit focused on two themes, 'Professional Education and Practice-Based Learning' and 'Internationalisation', as well as following-up on Recommendations and Affirmations made in the University's 2004 Cycle 1 AUQA Audit.

In preparation for the Audit in July 2009, the University submitted to AUQA a self-assessment, the Performance Portfolio which included Supplementary Material.

In advance of the main Audit Visit held between 12 and 15 October 2009 on the University's Wagga Wagga Campus, a delegation of the Audit Panel, the Audit Panel Chairperson and Audit Director, undertook various pre-visits to:

- Three of CSU's overseas partner institutions: HELP University College, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia; SPACE, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China; and Changchun Taxation College, Changchun, China (15 September to 21 September 2009); and
- CSU's Study Centre, Study Group Australia, Sydney; Tertiary Education International, Sydney; the NSW Police College at Goulburn; and CSU's Wagga Wagga Campus to meet with distance education (DE) students attending residential schools and view online systems and subjects (28 September to 30 September 2009).

In all, the Audit Panel spoke with approximately 240 people in the course of all visits, including the Chancellor, the Vice-Chancellor (VC), senior management, academic and general staff, undergraduate and postgraduate students, both internal and DE; and some external stakeholders.

On 27 January 2010 AUQA released its findings, *Report of an Audit of Charles Sturt University*, namely the Audit Report². The Audit Report included Commendations, Affirmations and Recommendations in relation to the University, a listing of these follows within this Chapter.

Following the release of the Audit Report, AUQA invited CSU to participate in the AUQA Good Practice Database³ and the University submitted entries for Commendations 2 and 11.

As part of the audit process, AUQA required CSU to provide a Progress Report against the Affirmations and Recommendations made in the Audit Report. This Report outlines the

¹Full details of the Cycle 2 audit process are available in the AUQA Audit Manual at: <http://www.auqa.com.au/qualityaudit/auditmanuals/>.

² CSU's Audit Report is available at: <http://www.auqa.com.au/qualityaudit/universities/>.

³ AUQA's Good Practice Database is available at: <http://www.auqa.edu.au/gp/>.

University's response, adopted actions to date, and further proposed actions in relation to each Affirmation and Recommendation.

The development of the University's Progress Report has been overseen by the *Cycle 2 AUQA Audit Steering Committee* as part of managing CSU's audit process. Committee membership consists of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Committee Chair); Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration); Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research); Presiding Officer, Academic Senate; Director, Office of Planning and Audit; and Director, Organisational and People Capability.

For each Affirmation and Recommendation the Progress Report has been utilised to:

- (i) Assign accountabilities and responsibilities to key senior management;
- (ii) Formulate an action plan;
- (iii) Document evidence of progress and further proposed actions; and
- (iv) Report to various University committees.

The Progress Report should be considered in the context of broader developments at CSU including the development of a new strategic plan, the *University Strategy 2011 – 2015* and its underlying plans for three key themes: 'Course Profile', 'Student Experience' and 'Research', and the ongoing changes within the Australian Higher Education sector.

It is CSU's pleasure to provide AUQA and the public with this Progress Report.

CSU looks forward to discussing the University's progress with the AUQA Audit Director at the Follow-up Visit in early 2011.

For further information in relation to this Report please contact:

Office of Planning and Audit
Charles Sturt University
Panorama Avenue
Bathurst NSW 2795
Phone: 02 6338 4103
Fax: 02 6338 4303
pa@csu.edu.au

Commendations

The following are areas where AUQA commends the practices of CSU.

1. AUQA commends CSU for the establishment of the Flexible Learning Institute and related actions to develop flexible learning capabilities among academics.
2. AUQA commends CSU for its recognition of the strategic importance of the human resources function and its thorough implementation of a 360 degree feedback process for senior executives and academic managers.
3. AUQA commends CSU for its continuing emphasis on the provision of professional education courses, including the use of flexible delivery, to support regional communities.
4. AUQA commends CSU for its success in operating as 'One University' across its multiple campuses in New South Wales and for the consolidation of disciplines across its campuses to support its focus on professional education.
5. AUQA commends CSU for its engagement with regional employers and for the levels of satisfaction with CSU graduates expressed by these employers.
6. AUQA commends CSU, with the New South Wales Police Force, for their management and operation of a successful partnership in police education.
7. AUQA commends CSU for its development and use of a single electronic repository for course and subject content and approvals and for the development of a Mandatory Subject Information System to support the use of consistent information across the University.
8. AUQA commends CSU for having implemented a publicly-available credit transfer precedent database.
9. AUQA commends CSU for its engagement with a wide range of Indigenous communities and for its support for Indigenous students.
10. AUQA commends CSU for taking a systematic and comprehensive approach to quality assurance and improvement for fieldwork education.
11. AUQA commends CSU for the development of Fieldwork Education Standards and self-assessment tools, and encourages the University to continue its program of self-assessment against the standards, in order to identify improvements and areas for development.
12. AUQA commends CSU for its serious engagement with professional practice and fieldwork education through a range of initiatives, including the establishment of institutes to advance professional practice and the Fieldwork Education Network.
13. AUQA commends CSU for providing funding to support students on placement, noting that the University is seeking to expand this support.

14. AUQA commends CSU for the actions it is implementing to seek feedback from students on the performance of education agents and suggests these arrangements be extended to its Study Centres.
15. AUQA commends CSU for its commitment to meeting an ambitious target for student mobility and for the opportunities it provides for students to gain international academic experiences.

Affirmations

The following are areas where AUQA affirms the improvement needs identified by CSU.

1. AUQA affirms CSU's focus on student retention and the first year experience, while encouraging CSU to take additional steps to identify and address the causes of student attrition.
2. AUQA affirms the findings of CSU's Academic Senate Self-Review, including the development of a University-wide moderation standard.
3. AUQA affirms the establishment by CSU of the CSU Degree Initiative as a potentially systematic approach to curriculum renewal and implementation of its flexible learning agenda.
4. AUQA affirms the actions being taken by CSU to ensure better oversight and management of fieldwork education including improved practicum management and information management in fieldwork education.
5. AUQA affirms the planned auditing by CSU of admissions and the granting of credit at its Study Centre in Sydney, and encourages CSU to conduct such audits regularly for all teaching partnerships.

Recommendations

The following are areas where AUQA recommends improvements to the practices of CSU.

1. AUQA recommends that CSU adopt more systematic approaches to the development of flexible learning at course level and to ensuring staff are aware of the changes that will be needed to fully embrace flexible learning.
2. AUQA recommends that CSU provide prospective students, including students in professional education courses, with more comprehensive information on the University's academic, time and financial expectations of students in each course.
3. AUQA recommends that CSU develop more comprehensive and systematic approaches to addressing the strategic risks inherent in its goal of leadership in the quality delivery of flexible learning.
4. AUQA recommends that CSU ensure that Academic Senate is better able to actively monitor the quality of academic processes and outcomes across the whole University.

5. AUQA recommends that CSU improve its data reporting to ensure that the retention, progress and grade point averages of students from differing cohorts are routinely considered by Senate and academic managers across the University.
6. AUQA recommends that CSU adopt explicit change management strategies to ensure the effective and coordinated implementation of a range of initiatives in curriculum renewal, flexible learning and fieldwork education.
7. AUQA recommends that CSU clarify for students and staff its definition of CSU graduate attributes, the desired learning outcomes for students across all undergraduate courses and the University's approach to the embedding of these graduate attributes in curriculum design and assessment.
8. AUQA recommends that CSU's Academic Senate keep under active review the credit granted within faculties.
9. AUQA recommends that CSU make stronger efforts to ensure academics and others involved in fieldwork education have an understanding of pedagogical approaches to practice-based education and the desired learning outcomes.
10. AUQA recommends that CSU explore additional means to ensure a consistently high quality of academic experience for students, especially for students studying externally.
11. (urgent) AUQA recommends that CSU ensure that it has thoroughly addressed and implemented the recommendations in its 2008 self-review of internationalisation, particularly those relating to academic quality assurance.
12. AUQA recommends that CSU review the responsibilities within the Faculty of Business for academic quality assurance of offshore teaching partnerships to ensure the use of objective and evidence-based processes.
13. AUQA recommends that CSU use an independent review process, involving academics outside the Faculty of Business or external to the University, to review the effectiveness of academic quality assurance for the Faculty's offshore and onshore teaching partnerships.
14. AUQA recommends that CSU develop a policy on dual awards and that pathways for students to obtain dual awards should be noted in agreements with teaching partners and approved by Academic Senate.
15. AUQA recommends CSU undertake further planning to ensure it is able to provide support and a sense of intellectual community for all international and domestic higher degree by research students.

CHAPTER 2: AFFIRMATIONS

Affirmation 1

AUQA affirms CSU's focus on student retention and the first year experience, while encouraging CSU to take additional steps to identify and address the causes of student attrition.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); and
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration)

Reporting Responsibility: Director, Student Experience Program

Context

The Audit Panel concluded that *'Since the 2004 AUQA Audit Report, CSU has not reduced its rates of student attrition. Accordingly, the Audit Panel finds that CSU has not effectively addressed this issue.'*

The Audit Report acknowledged CSU's commitment to support students, and noted the work recently carried out through the Student Experience Program (SEP) and with the appointment of the Director, Student Experience Program and Director, Transitions. However, the Audit Panel suggested that the academic factors affecting student attrition may require greater consistency in the student learning experience.⁴

University Comment

The University is committed to improving attrition rates for all its student cohorts through actions that are consistent with and supported by the relevant literature.

As such, it has strengthened staffing responsibilities and processes to identify the reasons for, and to address, attrition rates especially in the first year of studies. At the same time, the University expects that some students studying by DE choose CSU courses because of the 'flexibility' that this learning method offers (including the ability to move in and out of enrolment, depending on their individual circumstances at the time).

The University has established the office of the Director, Student Experience Program and the Director, Transitions. A new Student Communications Coordinator has been appointed. Reports on attrition and progression rates are prepared for the main University committees, including the University Course Planning Committee (UCPC) and Academic Senate. The University conducts student surveys, including the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE), to monitor student engagement. The University will introduce a new Annual Course Performance Report (ACPR) which, inter alia, will improve the capacity of senior staff to monitor attrition and student performances in specific courses and will lead to the creation of action plans to address the causes of specific problems, including attrition⁵.

⁴ Recommendation 10 is also pertinent here.

⁵ Refer to Recommendation 4 for further information regarding the ACPR.

At Academic Senate, in September 2010, the VC outlined the University's draft *Student Experience Plan 2011 – 2015*. The Plan outlines the principles and actions for achieving the University's vision of 'providing an enriching and supportive student experience for its diverse range of students' by: excellent teaching; enhanced support services (from first point of contact to participation as alumni); and, improved physical and information technology (IT) facilities (including support for flexible learning for professional education). Measures of quality and success of the student experience over time include improvements in the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) 'Good Teaching Scale' and 'Overall Satisfaction', and improvements in retention and student progress rates (better than the national averages, as well as annual improvements at CSU).

Actions to Date

Identifying the Nature and Causes of Attrition

- The Team Leader, Student Success Team (within SEP) commenced duties in September 2010. The key objectives of the Team are to identify and contact students 'at risk' in the early part of their enrolments to ascertain problems and help to resolve them so that the students continue their studies. This Team was funded as part of the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP) and initially will concentrate on low socio-economic status (SES) students, as well as non-low SES students, enrolled in the identified Student Transition and Retention (STAR) Plan pilot courses. A plan has been developed to contact 'at risk' students:
 - Students will be contacted if they do not access their Mandatory Subject Information (MSI) within the first two teaching weeks;
 - Phone contact will be made addressing specific signs of disengagement as identified by STAR leaders of the pilot courses (e.g. non-attendance at class, non-submission of an assignment); and
 - Students will be contacted if they 'fail' a key subject (at the end of the teaching session).

Each telephone call will be followed up with an emailed plan of action. This program is based on a similar program that has dramatically reduced attrition rates at Queensland University of Technology.

- The University has developed an online exit survey. The Equity Officer in the Division of Student Services (DSS) manages the data evaluation and prepares associated reports which are sent to the UCPC, Deans, and Heads of School for distribution to staff.
- Complaints directed to Student Central⁶ are another source of information on the reasons for attrition. Currently, these complaints are directed to the appropriate faculty for actioning.
- Various reports on student performances and attitudes are prepared by the Office of Planning and Audit and are sent to the UCPC and Academic Senate. Reports to

⁶ Information of Student Central is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/study/student-experience/deliverables.htm#%20A>.

Senate include: CEQ reports; (AS 10/91) 2009 Cohort Tracking (Attrition) Report; and (AS 10/139) 2009 Progress Rates Report.

Addressing Attrition

- Student Central offices at each campus provide the first point of contact for all students, regardless of location or mode of study, for all services provided by the divisions.
- Professional development for staff, explaining the nature of the current CSU student cohort, and making staff aware of the issues of concern for students and the factors driving retention and progression.
- Broad dissemination to staff of the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) first year curriculum principles, which have been accepted as fundamental principles underlying the development and implementation of the CSU Degree Initiative (DI)⁷, including the attendance of 140 staff at a student engagement forum with Professor Sally Kift as the keynote speaker.
- Development of the STAR Plan which is conducted in collaboration with faculties. The STAR Plan is focussing on curriculum renewal with an emphasis on low SES courses. Recruitment of the academic leads of the STAR Plan in each faculty was completed in October 2010.
- The appointment of the Student Communications Coordinator (August 2010). This position provides an integrated and consistent approach to all student communication.
- In order to build a community of practice around the first year experience, the Transition Project funded eight CSU staff to attend the first year experience conference in Adelaide in June 2010. These staff are reporting back to the University through their Faculty Learning and Teaching Committees on implications for faculty practices.
- Orientation Guidelines and good practice principles have been created to provide a framework for the development of future orientation activities. A working party has been tasked with revising *O Week* on the basis of these Guidelines. The online orientation site was launched well in advance of orientation activities, including personalised 'welcome screens' addressing key information for commencing students.
- The CSU Student Engagement Forum took place in September 2010. The large number of registrations received was indicative of the growing interest across the University in this area of strategic importance. Keynotes, and an expert panel, that included national experts on the topic, as well as workshops discussed the first year experience focussed on student engagement and low SES students.
- A review of Indigenous support and programs is being conducted to ensure programs are effective, efficient and contribute to successful outcomes for Indigenous students.

⁷ Refer to Affirmation 3 for information relating to the CSU DI.

- The STUDYLINK program (recipient of the ALTC Program Award) continues to provide preparatory skills and confidence for students commencing University to better prepare them for success.
- The Division of Library Services (DLS) established Learning Commons facilities within their campus buildings, including Orange and Thurgoona. Refurbishments are planned for Bathurst and Wagga Wagga.
- The UCPC has responsibility for monitoring attrition, and reviews annually attrition rates from first to second year for all CSU courses. Deans are required to address the reasons for attrition. Reports are prepared for Academic Senate.

Further Proposed Actions

- Improved student communications through the SEP and the Student Communications Coordinator (2010, onwards).
- Introduction of an ACPR to monitor student concerns and student performances (retention and progression rates) for courses across the University (2011, onwards).
- Implementation of actions relating to the University's new strategic plan which has the 'student experience' as one of three key themes (2011, onwards).

Affirmation 2

AUQA affirms the findings of CSU's Academic Senate Self-Review, including the development of a University-wide moderation standard.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Academic Secretary

Context

The Audit Panel noted that Academic Senate completed a wide-ranging self-review in 2008. As a result, Academic Senate commenced reviews of policies and processes relating to the quality of teaching and learning. Further, the development of a University-wide moderation standard is supported and encouraged by AUQA because *'moderation is employed quite widely as the University uses a significant number of external sessional markers in some disciplines'*.

The development of a University-wide moderation policy is also critical as the University confers awards on CSU graduates taught by teaching partners in other countries and at the Australian Study Centres.

University Comment

The University acknowledges the importance of addressing the suggested actions of the Academic Senate self-review. The Office of Academic Governance has developed an action sheet incorporating the recommendations of the self-review. The status of the 'action' items in this action sheet are updated regularly.

Moderation of assessment and subject learning materials is an integral part of the academic work of the faculties and schools which have put in place their own processes. Further, the Office of International Relations (OIR) and the International School of Business and Partnerships (ISBP) have established academic and administration manuals for offshore and onshore teaching partners and these documents include detailed descriptions of moderation rules and processes that have been operating for some time. These processes are reviewed at least annually. At the time of the AUQA Audit, however, there was no University-wide policy on 'moderation' and the University agrees with the need to introduce such a policy.

In May 2010, Academic Senate established a working party to investigate options for the University-wide moderation policy and to develop a draft policy and guidelines for the consideration of Academic Senate, after consultation with relevant University staff and groups.

Actions to Date

Academic Senate Self-Review

- The Office of Academic Governance has prepared a report, *Action Items for Senate Critical Evaluation*⁸, which has identified all items to be addressed from the Academic Senate self-review. The Report notes action progress for each item and will be updated every six months with reports to Academic Senate.

The University-wide Moderation Policy

- At its May 2010 meeting, Academic Senate agreed (AS 10/48) to establish a working party to develop and advise Academic Senate in relation to a University-wide policy on moderation, particularly in those areas that are identified as a 'high risk' (i.e. international and onshore teaching partners). The draft moderation policy has been prepared by the working party, and distributed widely for feedback. The draft policy was submitted to the Academic Programs Committee (APC) of Academic Senate in September 2010. The APC (APC 10/76) has requested further information on the resourcing implications of implementing the proposed standards on moderation. The draft also has been approved in principle by the Deans who have requested that the working party prepare some good practice guidelines for schools. There has been significant feedback from many parts of the University and this feedback was considered by the working party at its October 2010 meeting.
- The draft moderation policy complements and supports the *CSU Common Teaching Standards* (approved September 2010)⁹.
- At its December 2010 meeting Academic Senate approved (AS 10/149) in-principle the University-wide moderation policy.

Further Proposed Actions

Academic Senate Self-Review

- The action sheet will be updated by 31 December 2010 and again every six months with corresponding reports to Academic Senate via the committees of Senate.

The University-wide Moderation Policy

- The Academic Senate working party will revise the draft policy and guidelines after consideration of all feedback and will submit the second draft to the APC, Deans and Academic Senate for approval (guidelines completed February 2011; ongoing dissemination of the practical aspects of the policy, and appropriate professional development of staff).

⁸ The Report, *Action Items for Senate Critical Evaluation 2009*, is available at:
http://www.csu.edu.au/acad_sec/academicsenate/docs/action_items_from_critical_review.pdf.

⁹ Refer to Recommendation 10 for further information on the *CSU Common Teaching Standards*.

- The University will support the implementation of the moderation policy in the following ways:
 - Widespread dissemination of information on the moderation requirements and the development of 'course-based' practical guidelines for implementing the new processes of moderation; and
 - Staff induction and workshops will provide opportunities to increase familiarisation with the new policy and help to facilitate the sharing of effective moderation practices.
 - The Academic Senate meeting in May 2011 will consider for final approval the revised moderation policy.

Affirmation 3

AUQA affirms the establishment by CSU of the CSU Degree Initiative as a potentially systematic approach to curriculum renewal and implementation of its flexible learning agenda.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Director, CSU Degree Initiative

Context

The University is pursuing its strategic initiatives on 'curriculum renewal' and the CSU DI. The DI aims to implement the CSU Degree Initiative in undergraduate courses. The Degree Principles require the curriculum to include:

- Internationalisation, including opportunities for international experience;
- Ethics, especially professional ethics and citizenship;
- Cultural competence, including understanding the culture and history of Indigenous communities;
- Sustainability in financial, social and environmental senses; and
- Where appropriate, workplace learning.

The Degree Principles also require undergraduate courses to address flexible and blended learning, the ALTC First Year Principles and to include 'capstone' subjects.

The Audit Panel felt that it is '*sensible*' to fund a pilot study of a small number of courses in 2010 in order to build a scalable model of curriculum renewal for full implementation from 2011 onwards.

The Audit Panel also noted the desirability of constructing a database to map the existing coverage of the DI commitments in current courses as well as '*inventories of faculty-specific and discipline-specific case material and instances of best practice*'.

The Audit Panel also suggested that the University should develop a schedule of courses to be revised each year.

University Comment

The University is undertaking a major review of its curriculum of undergraduate courses under the heading 'The CSU Degree Initiative'. The DI is implementing the CSU Degree Principles and establishing new course development processes. The aims of the DI process are to:

- Review the University's current degrees to determine the extent to which CSU already achieves the curriculum objectives of its strategies and plans for 2007 - 2011;
- Develop and implement proposals for the better achievement of the curriculum objectives of the University's strategies and plans for 2007 - 2011; and

- Develop mechanisms for monitoring and reporting on the outcomes of the curriculum objectives of the University's strategies and plans for 2007 - 2011.

The University is adopting an approach to course renewal that is team-based, collaborative, and student-focused.

The DI will result in 'renewed' courses that will better prepare graduates to acquire knowledge, skills and attributes for professionally-oriented careers, to enable them to adapt to changing social, economic and political circumstances, and to understand better the global imperatives for 'sustainable futures'. In this way, the University will be better placed to demonstrate the relevance and currency of its courses, thereby increasing student demand and enrolments in undergraduate courses.

Since the AUQA Audit, the term 'flexible learning' has been replaced by 'blended and flexible learning' (BFL) at CSU. Blended and flexible learning will be appropriately integrated at course, subject, activity and assessment levels. As the Audit Panel noted in its Affirmation, the CSU DI is a systematic approach to curriculum renewal and implementation of the University's flexible learning agenda.

Actions to Date

- The pilot program achievements in 2010 include:
 - In March 2010, five courses were nominated from the four faculties to pilot the 'CSU Degree' through a course level, team-based curriculum renewal strategy. The pilots have been funded, allowing Course Leaders to be seconded for a period of time to participate in the pilot program. The courses were chosen to reflect the diversity of course types at CSU. A pilot process has been implemented, and various levels of support have been provided to the pilot teams, via the Director, Curriculum Renewal; Division of Learning and Teaching Services (DLTS) (Educational Designers); and Sub-Deans (Learning and Teaching);
 - Good Practice Guidelines (GPGs) have been developed by the Education for Practice Institute (EFPI), and the Flexible Learning Institute (FLI). The GPGs will enable Course Leaders/Teams to renew courses to ensure that students *'have an opportunity for international experiences; are prepared for citizenship; are culturally competent; understand the history and culture of indigenous communities; understand "sustainability" in financial, social and environmental senses through an international curriculum with an emphasis on ethical behaviour, and with an enhanced component of clinical and practical experiences.'* The various GPGs reflect the teaching-research nexus at CSU, and provide faculties, schools and Course Leaders with a framework for action, and a basis for the ongoing development of exemplars, through situated practice in 2011;
 - The APC has approved an interim course approval process for the implementation of the CSU Degree commencing 1 January 2011. The interim

approval process will aim to ensure that the CSU Degree design principles (and GPGs) have been considered; and

- The professional development of Educational Designers who will be able to support Course Leaders/Teams in the processes of curriculum renewal.
- As approved by Academic Senate in September 2010 (AS 10/137), the previous three Advisory Groups (Ethics and Global Citizenship, Sustainability, and Internationalisation) have been combined into one Advisory Group, CSU Degree Principles, which is more capable of providing ongoing advisory support in an integrated manner for the implementation of the CSU DI.

Further Proposed Actions

- A formal analysis of the 2010 pilot program (2011 onwards).
- The development of 'examples of practice' derived from the pilots (2011).
- A strategy to integrate the appointment of Course Directors and the mainstream implementation of the CSU Degree (2011 onwards).
- A Professional Development Strategy is being developed by the DLTS for future Course Directors / Teams (2011 onwards).
- Development of an Integrated Curriculum Renewal Strategy that provides a framework for the widespread implementation of the GPGs and the CSU Degree (2011 onwards).
- Development of a Risk Assessment Strategy for Courses to provide a framework for curriculum renewal activities (2011 onwards).
- Review of GPGs (2011 onwards).
- Implementation of the Academic Senate interim course approval process (2011).
- Monitor and report on the implementation of the interim course approval process (2011).
- Development of the schedule of courses to be revised each year (2011).
- Development of a web strategy and curriculum tools to support the University-wide implementation of the CSU Degree (2011 onwards).
- The notion of 'gradual alignment' and ongoing curriculum renewal need to be enabled through course approval and review processes. The APC is considering replacing the five-year course cycle with ACPR, which provides Course Leaders/Team with an opportunity to report progress in the light of a Course Strategy and Course Plan.
- Faculties will provide reports on implementation of the CSU Degree as part of the ACPR process. Substantial progress is expected by 2012 with full implementation for all courses by 2015.

Affirmation 4

AUQA affirms the actions being taken by CSU to ensure better oversight and management of fieldwork education including improved practicum management and information management in fieldwork education.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Reporting Responsibility: Learning and Teaching Committee; and
Director, Education for Practice Institute

Context

The Audit Panel agreed with the University's plans to establish improved central oversight and management of fieldwork education. In particular, the Audit Panel encouraged the University to:

- Maintain a central repository for all fieldwork agreements (including insurance agreements), policy and procedural documents, and an improved practicum management system (which provides for a centralised oversight of agreements);
- Review current agreements, with a view to identifying good practice and the potential for including such agreed 'good' practice in other agreements;
- Ensure that CSU systems more easily identify fieldwork education subjects, in order to keep track of fieldwork education and to assist with any internal benchmarking processes;
- Ensure that all students know the role of CSU academics and support staff in their placements, and that students (especially external students) are assured that placements are allocated fairly and transparently, and receive comprehensive information (at the outset of their courses) about arrangements and conditions applying to placements; and
- Review and clarify existing academic policies and regulations on, among other things, assessment and grading, the responsibilities of external assessors and the processes for students to seek review of assessments made by fieldwork educators.

University Comment

The Audit Panel commended the University on various aspects of fieldwork education policy and practices (see Commendations 10, 11, 12, and 13).

The University is committed to creating a more centralised and coordinated approach to the systematic management of WPL activities, and adopting good practice from within the University and elsewhere. Since the AUQA Audit, significant progress has been made and planned actions over the coming year will deliver significant enhancements.

Actions to Date

Management of WPL

- Two Working Parties were established through the Academic Senate's Learning and Teaching Committee to address aspects of this agenda:

- (i) *The Documentation and Information Management Working Party*

A first step (now accomplished) was to clarify the range of terminology associated with fieldwork education and to recommend the adoption of the term WPL as the standard term across the University, while acknowledging the value of discipline and school specific usage of terms relevant to their constituencies. This recommendation was approved by Academic Senate (May 2010).

A subsequent specification of the characteristics of subjects designated as WPL has been endorsed by the APC (September 2010) to proceed to Academic Senate (December 2010). This definition will be used to specify information required in course and subject profiles in the Course and Subject Information Management System (CASIMS). These recommendations will enable subjects and courses that are categorised as partly or wholly WPL to be identified and, as a result, will enable data and statistics to be produced relating to WPL across the University. In addition, a set of evaluation questions relating to WPL have been identified as part of the Online Evaluation of Subjects (OES) and this subject classification can facilitate more effective evaluation of WPL through the OES system. The subject classification (as WPL/other) will facilitate WPL benchmarking, but some time will be needed to implement this subject classification process.

- (ii) *Workplace Learning Management Working Party*

This Working Party has made recommendations on an improved system for WPL management, following wide consultations. A project conducted through the Faculty of Education and EFPI mapped patterns and systems of WPL management across the University. Continued investigation by the Working Party has resulted in recommendations to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC) (Academic) to establish an Enterprise Architecture project to source different computer software programs and evaluate these against usage priorities and criteria set up by the Working Party.

In October 2010 a budget of \$1.3million was allocated to enable the selection and implementation of a 'workplace learning data management system' that suits the needs of CSU. The budget includes funding for staff and student development in use of the system. The projected timeline is:

- Select an appropriate system and implement in one faculty, including staff training and system review (2011);
- Implement the system in a second faculty (2012); and

- Implement the system in the final two faculties (2013).
- WPL Staff, Resources¹⁰ and Program Development.

EFPI established a Workplace Learning Task Force in 2009 - 2010 to promote the quality implementation, management and evaluation of WPL. The Task Force has worked extensively to provide information, workshops and reviews as well as coordination of initiatives around WPL development, to enable WPL Coordinators to better manage WPL systems and course components.
- EFPI, in partnership with Curtin University, is conducting an ALTC funded project titled '*Building Leadership Capacity for Work Integrated Learning: Developing Fieldwork Coordinators as Academic Leaders*'. The aim of this project is to design and implement an academic leadership development program for academic WPL Coordinators from a wide variety of disciplines. The purpose will be to enhance academic WPL Coordinators' leadership capabilities, enabling them to provide high quality WPL experiences through appropriate pedagogy and management. An expected outcome of the program is to strengthen peer and industry relationships, reduce risks for all parties and ultimately improve student learning. This project addresses some of the priority actions in WPL through:
 - Creating a professional development approach to WPL; and
 - Developing and implementing a WPL leadership program at the institutional level to build staff capacity and capability in WPL.
- WPL Risk Management.

Initiatives have been established to address risk management of WPL:

 - A Teaching Fellowship identified key risks and priorities for action to address these risks;
 - A WPL Risk Management Committee (of EFPI) has been established to coordinate efforts across CSU to address risks associated with WPL;
 - The WPL Network (WPLN – formerly called the Fieldwork Education Network (FEN)) and EFPI are collaborating on the various WPL initiatives;
 - The Coordinator, WPLN is currently working as an EFPI Teaching Fellow to review the policies and procedure at CSU and identify changes recommended as part of the risk management of WPL;
 - The review of the use of the TRIM database as a central repository for agreements; and
 - EFPI has developed a *Practice-Based Education (PBE) Strategic Plan* (including WPL) that identifies priority actions for development of Professional and Practice-Based Education (P&PBE) and WPL at CSU.

¹⁰ WPL Resources are available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/landt/efp/wpln/pages/resources.html>.

Services and Information for Students

A Resource Support for Students on WPL Placements Working Party has been set up under the auspices of the DVC (Administration). Recommendations/actions in progress:

- Faculties and schools will provide more detail about WPL placement support and information and in a more consistent format;
- Development of contact directories for faculties and schools. Student Central will take responsibility for ensuring these directories are kept up-to-date;
- Explore the use of the customer relationship management system (TALISMA) that tracks interactions with students and seems particularly useful for DE students;
- Extend number and promote awareness of practice placement cost scholarships;
- Review of scholarships, allocation and support, particularly to low SES students to be completed by the end of November 2010;
- Enhance mobile technology access to CSU systems; and
- Investigate how insurance cover information is communicated to students on WPL and ensure consistency in information supplied.

Management of WPL – Use of Student Feedback

A key issue identified during the review of WPL (prior to the AUQA Audit) was the need to make better use of student feedback on WPL placements in order to enhance WPL. A working party established by the DVC (Academic) is currently reviewing the system for OES. This system is related to this Affirmation in that the current set of core questions focuses on standard subjects with feedback on WPL being limited to optional and additional questions. The current review will result in setting up a separate set of OES questions for WPL subjects. Data from these evaluations will enhance the critical appraisal of WPL.

Actions to date include:

- EFPI has developed WPL items for the OES Working Party to use for WPL designated subjects;
- EFPI has identified optional WPL items to add to the OES items for standard subjects;
- EFPI has developed a set of qualitative items/questions for OES;
- Schools will utilise future reports on OES WPL items for continuous quality improvement of WPL subjects; and
- The Working Party is reviewing the OES standard items.

Assessment of Students' WPL Performance

A working party with a membership comprised of representatives from the faculties, DLTS and the University Ombudsman has been established to review existing assessment regulations as they pertain to WPL. The recommendations from this working party will be

communicated for consideration by Academic Senate via the Learning and Teaching Committee.

Another aspect of WPL management is being enhanced through the work of the University Clinical Excellence Committee (UCEC). The terms of reference for this Committee are to:

- Advise the University on principles and values for the operation of CSU clinics;
- Review and advise the DVC (Academic), Academic Senate and faculties on policies for the operation of CSU clinics and for teaching based in CSU clinics;
- Identify and promulgate good practice for clinic-based education; and
- Provide advice on matters referred to the UCEC by Academic Senate, DVC (Academic), Deans or CSU clinics.

Professional and Practice-Based Education Standards

A decision was made following the AUQA Audit to combine the PBE and WPL standards into one set of standards to enhance the feasibility of implementation of these standards at course level. These standards have been developed through extensive consultation across CSU during 2010 and were presented at the August meeting of the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate.

In September 2010 Academic Senate accepted the P&PBE Standards as descriptors of excellence and determined that these standards would be incorporated into the *Student Experience Plan* and *Course Profile Plan* in the *University Strategy 2011 - 2015*.

Teaching Fellowships

The CSU Teaching Fellow scheme continues to support the enhancement of professional education at CSU.

Further Proposed Actions

- Classification and information management re WPL subjects:
 - CASIMS identification of all subjects classified as WPL (early 2011); and
 - Updating of CASIMS subject profiles (by June 2011).
- Information for students:
 - The development of a generic WPL placement resource kit. The DSS is currently looking into the possibility of securing HEPPP funding for this;
 - The ongoing implementation of the work of the WPL Taskforce will continue from 2011 via EFPI's WPL Consultative Committee (2011 onwards); and
 - The development of consistent processes for supporting WPL placements through faculties, Student Central and DSS (scholarships). The working party on Professional Experience is looking at this issue, with respect to a consistent quality assurance process in schools.
- OES items review (report due by the end of 2010).

- P&PBE Standards:
 - Commence implementation (2011); and
 - Incorporate in interim and final course approval process (2011 – 2012).
- Introduction of the University-wide WPL data management system (2011 – 2013).

Affirmation 5

AUQA affirms the planned auditing by CSU of admissions and the granting of credit at its Study Centre in Sydney, and encourages CSU to conduct such audits regularly for all teaching partnerships.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration)

Reporting Responsibility: Dean, Faculty of Business; and
Director, Office of International Relations

Context

The internationalisation self-review undertaken by CSU in August 2008 identified that the University did not undertake systematic quality assurance to monitor the admission process for those partners who have delegated authority to undertake admissions via CSU's student administration system interface, Banner Remote Campus Form (RCF). This included the determination of credit. RCF access enables limited web access by approved partner staff to CSU's Banner system to admit, enrol and allocate credit to student enrolments.

CSU locations where RCF access is applicable are:

- CSU Study Centres;
- HELP University College (HUC);
- Holmesglen Institute of TAFE; and
- Tertiary Education International (TEI) (TEI is the agency engaged by CSU to provide administrative support in China).

The AUQA Audit Report stated:

'As for HELP University College, the Audit Panel expresses concern over the extent to which CSU allows its Study Centres to approve entry requirements and credit arrangements without any subsequent checking. This means that CSU cannot be certain that its entry requirements are being adhered to in all cases, a matter that was referred to in the 2004 AUQA Audit Report. CSU has advised that it will shortly undertake an audit of admissions and credit approval at its Sydney Study Centre.

It may be helpful for CSU to base some academic staff at its Study Centre operations to assist in making decisions on entry requirements and credit, as the size of these operations increases. This practice is not uncommon in similar arrangements for other universities and may foster good communication as desired by CSU leadership and the University's partners.'

University Comment

CSU recognises the critical importance of ensuring that the University entry standards are maintained for programs, irrespective of location and mode of delivery and that ensuring robust quality assurance processes for admissions and granting of credit across all partnerships is a key means of ensuring there are no breaches of these standards.

Following the Audit Report, further clarity on the lines of responsibility for the auditing of admissions and credit at RCF locations was agreed between the Division of Student Administration (DSA), the Faculty of Business, and the ISBP. The DSA is clearly responsible for the auditing of admissions, including granting of credit. However, the Faculty holds responsibility for quality assurance of the individual credit determination process. In most cases credit packages are in place with partnership programs and documented in the agreement with the partner. The responsibility for Faculty quality assurance is therefore on credit determinations made by the partner institutions that occur outside pre-approved packages.

Actions to Date

Admissions

The DSA has established a schedule outlining the regular cycle of quality assurance reviews of admissions for all RCF users. These admission reviews examine a range of matters including:

- The application form, student file and its completeness;
- Eligibility, including source documents which support the admission decision;
- Credit precedent (and if no precedent, a record of approval by the CSU Course Administrator);
- Acceptance and enrolment correspondence; and
- Student visa details.

The outcomes of the quality assurance reviews are tabled with the Student Administration Executive Committee and any issues of concerns are addressed directly by the Division with the partner. Where a matter relates to the application of credit these are advised to the ISBP for further investigation.

The planned review of admissions at the CSU Study Centre referred to in Affirmation 5 was undertaken in May 2010. A regular review cycle has now been agreed with admissions reviews to occur twice annually at the CSU Study Centres. A second review occurred in mid-October 2010.

The DSA undertook an onsite review of admissions to CSU courses delivered at HUC in August 2009. This occurred as a direct outcome of the internationalisation self-review. A second review occurred in October 2010 as part of the annual review reporting cycle for the partnership. The DSA will undertake reviews at HUC twice annually either remotely or via site visits using the quality assurance process developed by the Division.

An admissions review was undertaken at Holmesglen in November 2009. The next review is scheduled for November 2010. Commencing in 2011 Holmesglen will also be subject to two reviews per year.

CSU staff (faculty and administrative) travel to China twice annually for each program intake and to oversee the admissions process undertaken by TEI. Following the completion of

admissions data entry by TEI, all original students' files are sent to CSU. Upon the receipt of files, the DSA undertakes a quality assurance review of the files and admissions.

Individual Credit Determinations

A Credit – Quality Control Audit process has been established by the Faculty of Business, ISBP, to establish the quality assurance process for individual credit determination undertaken by partner institutions or staff. The reports generated from the audits are submitted to the Dean, Faculty of Business and the partner for action.

The process is being progressively rolled out to all RCF users. Taking a risk-based approach, the process was tested and implemented initially at the CSU Study Centres, as these are the locations where non-CSU employees undertake the largest numbers of individual credit determinations.

The first quality control audit at the CSU Study Centres occurred in April 2010 and was undertaken by the Head of School, ISBP. The Faculty Quality Assurance Officer and the Head, School of Business conducted a second audit in 30 September 2010. These audits will continue to at least once per year.

CSU has taken additional quality assurance steps to increase the robustness of CSU's credit determination process at the CSU Study Centres. CSU has appointed an Adjunct Administrator at the CSU Study Centre whose role is to assess applications for credit, and to determine the level of credit to be granted, pursuant to the CSU Part A Academic Governance E1 Credit Regulations and E2 Delegation Assigned in the Credit Regulations, for and on behalf of CSU.

The Adjunct Administrator appointment may only carry out credit determinations for those courses approved by the Dean, Faculty of Business. The Adjunct participated in a three-month extensive training program, which involved Course Managers in the Faculty of Business reviewing all credit determinations undertaken during that time.

Commencing in January 2011, CSU will appoint a full time senior academic staff member at Level D employed by CSU, to be located at a CSU Study Centre. This appointment has been included as a contractual requirement in the service agreement with Study Group Australia (SGA) in a response to comments made in the 2009 AUQA Audit Report. This role, amongst other things, will be responsible for credit assessment oversight at the Study Centres.

As the HUC program is now in phase-out, individual credit determinations are not being made. All students affected by the phase-out are completing the program in line with the pre-approved credit package.

As there is no individual credit determination undertaken by the Chinese institutions the process, at this point in time, does not require implementations at those four institutions.

Further Proposed Actions

- The Faculty Credit – Quality Control Audit report and process is to be implemented at Holmesglen, with the first review to be undertaken by the end of 2010. The Audit will then occur twice per year (2011 onwards).
- The Faculty of Business will introduce systematic reviews of approved credit pathways at partner institutions to ensure that the credit packages provided in the agreement with the institution are current and they continue to meet the academic standards initially assessed by CSU. Reports will be presented to the Faculty Board, the partners and to Academic Senate (2011 onwards). Pathway program review is also being added to the Annual Review reporting requirements. An adjunct administrator has been appointed at the CSU Study Centre, Sydney; and recruitment is under way for a full-time senior academic who will be located at the Study Centre and will oversee credit granting processes and decisions at the Study Centre.
- The DSA will continue to enhance and refine the quality assurance processes for admission reviews. In addition, they are establishing a more robust quality assurance framework to address other areas of responsibility including exam invigilation and timely enrolment (2011 onwards).
- The establishment of electronic file storage capability in the student administration system is being investigated which would require partner institutions to store all admission documentation electronically in CSU's systems (this would facilitate more timely review of admissions documentation to occur) (2011 onwards).
- As part of the DSA restructure a Partnerships Services Team has been created and will contribute to more systematic partnership program quality assurance.

CHAPTER 3: RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

AUQA recommends that CSU adopt more systematic approaches to the development of flexible learning at course level and to ensuring staff are aware of the changes that will be needed to fully embrace flexible learning.

Accountability:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Reporting Responsibility:	Executive Director, Division of Learning and Teaching Services; Director, The Flexible Learning Institute; and Director, Curriculum Renewal

Context

The Audit Panel felt that *'much remains to be done before CSU can be confident that all its teaching is adequately directed towards the provision of quality flexible learning. Although the Audit Panel found numerous enthusiastic supporters and users of online learning at CSU, there is a great deal of variability in the use of online technologies by academics, even in regard to use of the online Forum. The Panel notes that many students would appreciate more use of podcasts or videos of lectures, especially external students....the use by CSU academics of online capabilities is highly variable..... A small number of subjects is provided wholly online. CSU believes that many students value supplementation of online delivery with other formats and continues to provide subject material for distance education students in print or on CD-ROM.'*

Furthermore the Audit Panel stated:

- *'In order to consolidate its position in flexible learning, AUQA encourages CSU to use more systematic approaches to developing flexible learning, with a continuing focus of activity on courses rather than on individual subjects.'*
- *'CSU needs to do more to ensure that all staff appreciate that established approaches to traditional distance education may not apply equally well in a flexible learning environment. As an example, the Audit Panel observes that there are differing views among academics on whether internal and distance education students should have access to the same material. On the one hand, there is a concern that if internal students have access to the full subject notes available to external students, they may stop coming to lectures or feel overloaded. An alternate view is that in a flexible learning environment, students should be able to choose from a range of information sources.'*
- *'The Audit Panel notes that there needs to be clarity for staff around the intent and operational consequences, including workloads and time allocation, of realising CSU's vision of leadership in flexible learning. The CSU Degree Initiative ... and the draft paper on flexible learning standards provide ways to commence this process but it will be necessary to ensure that conversations about flexible learning are accessible to a range of internal and external stakeholders.'*
- *'In the view of the Audit Panel, Academic Senate and Senate committees should also consider ways in which their members can become more familiar with developments in flexible learning, so these committees can take a more active leadership role, not least*

in ensuring that policies reflect flexible learning principles. A more detailed Online Learning Environment Plan may also assist the University.'

University Comment

The University aims to be the recognised leader in providing quality flexible learning practices that underpin its course offerings. Further, the University acknowledges that, in a flexible learning environment, students should be able to choose from a range of information sources.

The draft *University Strategy 2011 – 2015* focuses on 'courses' as one of its three themes. The University has also established the FLI and the curriculum renewal process that will work together with faculties, DLTS, and EFPI in implementing systematic approaches to BFL, and its application across the University, with an emphasis on 'courses' rather than on individual subjects. DLTS, with DLS and EFPI, will also concentrate on appropriate professional development activities for CSU staff so that they have a better understanding of pedagogical methodologies and their applications for varying circumstances.

Academic Senate and its committees are taking a leadership role in promoting policy initiatives and engagement with flexible learning developments and options.

The draft *Blended and Flexible Learning Standards* have been endorsed by Academic Senate for consultation with the University. They define 'flexible learning' as providing opportunities to improve the student learning experience through flexibility in:

- Time;
- Pace;
- Place (physical, virtual, on-campus and off-campus);
- Mode of study (print-based, face-to-face, blended and online);
- Teaching approach (collaborative and independent);
- Forms of assessment; and
- Staffing.

A wide range of media, environments, learning spaces and technologies may be utilised for learning and teaching. Blended and flexible learning is a design approach that examines the relationships between flexible learning opportunities, in order to optimise student engagement and equivalence in learning outcomes regardless of mode of study. However, the University recognises that there are caveats on flexibility for some courses created by the requirements of accrediting or registering professional bodies.

Actions to Date

Systematic Approaches to the Development of BFL with a Continuing Focus of Activity on Courses rather than on Individual Subjects; and Equivalent Learning Outcomes

- The Executive Director, DLTS, established a group that includes representatives of the FLI, EFPI, curriculum renewal and Sub-Deans (Learning and Teaching). This group complements the work of the DVC (Academic) with Deans and Heads of Schools in relation to risk analysis and course-based performance requirements. It is working to articulate the interrelationship of learning and teaching initiatives in a simple accessible form, to develop a staged course-based approach to implementation through planning and analysis of course priorities, and to recommend changes that will align institutional drivers more clearly with curriculum priorities. The University's plan to place a greater emphasis on Course Teams is critical to developing a systematic course-based approach to enhance the overall student experience in the online environment.
- Academic Senate has reinforced the principle that Curriculum Advisory Groups of the CSU DI will focus on course-level curriculum design, rather than on individual subject units or small groupings of subjects (AS10/105, September 2010). The *BFL GPGs* have been embedded in course review and approval processes as part of the CSU DI.
- The CSU DI provides a systematic means whereby a 'course strategy', developed by a Course Director and Course Team, provides the governance mechanisms to guide curriculum renewal at course level. Academic Senate has approved (2010) the interim course approval process for all undergraduate degrees commencing 2011. Interim course approval processes are an important element at the governance level relating to incorporating flexible learning in the course development process.
- The *Educational Technology Framework and Plan* has been developed. The documents, and the consultative processes underpinning their development, will provide an overarching framework for the Online Learning Environment (OLE) as requested by the Audit Panel. However, they will also consider emerging technologies (in particular mobile learning) both online and offline. The Framework guides the governance, policy and practice needs for educational technology at CSU, defines educational technology use at CSU, and underpins specific planning over the next five years. This includes strategies for increasing awareness and professional development of academic staff. The Framework and Plan development will be linked to the broader development of the University Strategy and its underlying Plans. As part of the development of the Framework, a CSU survey of students and academic staff needs regarding educational technology was conducted in July 2010 and will inform specific planning.
- Development of the draft *BFL Standards* and the *Educational Technology Framework* will assist CSU staff to manage the risk inherent in a sector characterised by competition and increasing pressures to ensure that students have access to high quality learning environments that engage students in meaningful interactions, including those enhanced by educational technology. The *BFL Standards* also provide CSU with an 'aspirational framework' to ensure that CSU learning and teaching staff are able to continuously improve their capabilities in terms of designing BFL environments.

Cultural Change

- The Teaching Fellowship Scheme and the promotion of good practice concerning BFL. During 2008 - 2010, the FLI funded sixteen Teaching Fellowships. Schools in all faculties are involved, including CSU Ontario School of Education.

- BFL was included as a conference theme at the 2010 CSUED Conference.
- The FLI conducted an online *Thought Pieces Project* in 2009 and a *59Minutes@FLI* virtual workshop series in 2010, both of which aimed to provide opportunities for CSU staff to showcase and debate BFL and teaching, and to participate in workshops.
- Twitter strategy established in 2010 with an aim to grow from twenty-five to one hundred followers by the end of 2011¹¹.
- Educational Designers are undertaking specific professional development around course-level education design and educational technology to better equip them to support course teams involved in curriculum renewal. Educational Designers can contribute to the course level design process both through their developing course-level design skills and their knowledge of online learning and the affordances of the OLE tools.

Further Proposed Actions

- *Guidelines for Continuous Quality Improvement in BFL* will be used by Senate, CSU committees, Deans, Faculty Learning and Teaching Committees, Heads of School, and Course Directors, and reported annually in course plans and course reports to the APC and Learning and Teaching Committee of Academic Senate. The Guidelines are to be developed and implemented by July 2011 for ongoing implementation.
- With Academic Senate's approval, ACPR will be introduced, and the Reports will include progress reports on progress towards alignment to the CSU Degree, including course design related to BFL (2011 onwards).
- An audit of the CSU website and CSU policy concerning 'common messaging' about BFL (2011).
- The FLI Teaching Fellowships will continue, and will involve all schools and faculties (2011, onwards).
- A Professional Development Plan for CSU staff concerning the *Blended and Flexible Learning Good Practice Guidelines*, and *Guidelines for Continuous Quality Improvement in BFL* (developed July 2011 and implemented August 2011, onwards).
- Relevant professional development on BFL for members of Academic Senate and its committees (2011, onwards).
- The online *Thought Pieces Project* and *59Minutes@FLI* will continue.
- A course level approach to the implementation of flexible learning is a requirement of the CSU Degree. Progress and reporting arrangements for implementation are set out in CSU's response to Affirmation 3.

¹¹ FLI Twitter News is available at: <http://twitter.com/FLINews>

Recommendation 2

AUQA recommends that CSU provide prospective students, including students in professional education courses, with more comprehensive information on the University's academic, time and financial expectations of students in each course.

Accountability:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration); and Executive Director, Division of Finance
Reporting Responsibility:	Executive Director, Division of Learning and Teaching Services; Director, Division of Marketing; Sub-Deans, Learning and Teaching; and Academic Secretary

Context

The Audit Panel acknowledged that initiatives to help students to adapt and to understand expectations in a university environment are being pursued as part of the SEP.

However, the Audit Report also found that CSU now needs to consider the adequacy of the information provided to all prospective students, particularly DE students and those undertaking WPL as part of their studies, as well as students in professional education courses. The report stated further that *'many students would not only appreciate more information on the content and requirements of the subjects they choose to enrol in, but would like more comprehensive 'road maps' for their course. External students, in particular, need to be able to plan their commitments, including planning for travel and expenses for fieldwork and residential schools. To do so, they should be provided with information about initial expectations of them, e.g. for laptops and appropriate clothing on some courses, options for fieldwork, and any additional costs they may incur. The provision of this additional information will assist CSU to realise its vision of providing distinctive education programs for the professions.'*

In other words, University materials made available to prospective students should provide specific details on key aspects of a student's enrolment (timetables, likely costs, resource needs, the academic and other expectations of students, and options available to them, if any) so that students can plan, and budget for, their studies.

University Comment

The University has taken a holistic approach to improving communications for prospective and current students. This approach includes the provision of a comprehensive range of information to prospective and existing students so that they know, in advance, what to expect in terms of the indicative costs and resource needs as well as the time involved to successfully completing their studies.

All matters relating to the 'student experience' lie at the heart of the University's mission and are critical to the University's reputation and standing. The University seeks to achieve its goal of exemplary service to all students, through plans and actions that provide an integrated, student-centred experience.

The emerging strategic plan has the 'student experience' as one of its three main themes. The *Student Experience Plan 2011 - 2015* outlines the broad principles, actions and success measures for achieving the University's vision of 'providing an enriching and supportive student experience for its diverse range of students'.

Actions to Date

- The Division of Marketing has developed an action plan, *Process to include more Comprehensive Information on Online Course Brochures (OCBs)*. This action plan includes the following stages:
 - (i) Adding generic information to OCBs (undergraduate, postgraduate and HDR) relating to time, costs and academic expectations when studying at CSU. *[Status: completed]*;
 - (ii) Adding general information to the prospective student areas of the CSU website: academic expectations, teaching methods and subject design, workplace learning, on-campus and distance education, assessment tasks, textbooks and reference materials, additional costs. *[Status: completed]*;
 - (iii) Mapping of all undergraduate and postgraduate courses (via a questionnaire) with additional costs and resource needs (to be completed by the end of December 2010); and
 - (iv) More details provided on OCBs (December 2011 onwards).
- Academic Senate has reaffirmed the AUQA Recommendation of providing more comprehensive information to prospective and current students. The Academic Senate's Working Party on the CSU Subject reported to Senate in May 2010, and the Senate agreed that (AS 10/37):
 - As part of the Academic Senate's subject approval process, all CSU Subject Profiles should be adjusted to include an indication of the prior knowledge assumed in the design of the subject, and an estimation of how many hours of student workload is involved (Recommendation 4 of the CSU Subject Working Party Report);
 - CSU subject outlines shall contain a statement that 'students will normally spend between 140 - 160 hours engaged in the learning and assessment activities provided'. Subjects that are approved with variations from this standard shall provide within the Subject Outline explicit indication of the workload expectation of the subject and reasons for the variation from the standard (Recommendation 5 of the CSU Subject Working Party Report);
 - CSU subjects that require students to expend time and/or money to access specialist equipment or resources, or travel away from their term-time residence in order to complete the specified learning and assessment activities provided need to provide justification within the Subject Profile and the Subject Outline and such information should be included in course brochures and information (Recommendation 11 of the CSU Subject Working Party Report).

Further, Academic Senate (AS 10/38) requested the CSU Subject Working Party to prepare, for approval by Academic Senate, an implementation and communication plan for the introduction of the CSU Subject Definition. In other words, Academic Senate agreed that all CSU Subject Outlines will contain clear advice to students

about the resources, time, travel and prior knowledge required for the successful completion of the subject.

- In September 2010, Academic Senate:
 - Approved the *CSU Subject Implementation and Communication Plan* (AS 10/102);
 - Resolved to provide more information on subjects (such as textbook lists, residential school dates, and assignment due dates) before the commencement of teaching session (AS 10/106); and
 - Reaffirmed the *CSU Subject Outline Policy* requirement that '*Subject Outlines shall be issued to students online (via Subject Outlines within CSU Interact subject sites) and shall be published on the relevant Interact site no later than two weeks prior to the commencement of the session*' (Clause 1.2 of the Subject Outline Policy, at Part L6.3 of the Academic Manual) (AS 10/70).
- Introduction of Student Central in 2010.
- The appointment of the Student Communications Coordinator, SEP (August 2010).
- Orientation Guidelines¹² and good practice principles have been created to provide a framework for the development of future orientation activities. A working party has been tasked with revising O Week on the basis of these Guidelines. The online orientation site was launched in 1 November 2010 well in advance of orientation activities, including personalised 'welcome screens' addressing key information for commencing students. Welcome screens have been developed for, inter alia, DE students, on-campus students, mature age students, Indigenous students, policing students, Technical and Further Education (TAFE) entrants, and for families and parents.

Further Proposed Actions

- The University-wide moderation policy will have requirements for moderators to critically review and monitor the quality of information provided in course materials and subject outlines as well as the appropriateness of the assessment tasks (pre-delivery moderation). Moderation will cover:
 - The appropriateness and currency of materials used;
 - The reasonableness of the subject content for the level of the award;
 - An analysis of the intended course objectives, the learning outcomes and quality of the communication package provided to students;
 - The suitability of pre-requisite learning and the intended textbooks and references;
 - An analysis of resources available to students (such as web-based resources);
 - An appraisal of the extent to which previous moderation reviews, feedback and comments have been addressed;
 - Whether assessment tasks are appropriately spaced throughout the study period and achievable by students in the allocated timeframe; and

¹² Orientation Guidelines is available at:

<http://www.csu.edu.au/student/transition/doc/Charles%20Sturt%20University%20Orientation%20Guidelines.pdf>.

- Whether assessment instructions are clearly presented, and the academic challenge they demand of students is consistent with the level of the award for the course.
- Enhanced communications with students, including DVDs for different cohorts of commencing students, such as TAFE entrants (2011 onwards).
- The Division of Marketing's action plan, *Process to include more Comprehensive Information on OCBs* (2011 onwards).
- Subject Coordinators will include a description of the learning design and associated expectations of students in terms of time and activity in Subject Outlines, using the learning design field available in MSI (2011 onwards).
- CASIMS fields to be expanded to include details of requirements such as travel away from their study base, purchase of specialised resources or equipment (2011 onwards).
- In relation to the Subject Outline, the learning design template will include an indication of any requirements of expenditure of time and/or money to access specialist equipment or resources, or travel away from a term-time residence in order to complete the specified learning and assessment activities that are designed into the subject as part of content, syllabus or assessment. Insurance requirements and processes should also be noted and explained here if the student requires CSU insurance for internship placements (2011 onwards).

Recommendation 3

AUQA recommends that CSU develop more comprehensive and systematic approaches to addressing the strategic risks inherent in its goal of leadership in the quality delivery of flexible learning.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Reporting Responsibility: Planning and Budget Committee;
University Course Planning Committee; and
Director, The Flexible Learning Institute

Context

Notwithstanding the University's attention to risk management, the Audit Panel considered *'there are some strategic risks that require more systematic senior level consideration and greater recognition in the University risk register.'* The risks are:

- *'The risk of competition from the increasing availability of flexible study options from other institutions. It is becoming increasingly easy for many universities to offer courses online. As this means of provision expands, CSU's reputation for providing good distance education by traditional print-based methods becomes less relevant. CSU aims for growth in its share of the Australian market for distance education (and possibly for an expanded share of an international market). This predicted growth needs to be underpinned by strong empirical evidence of factors that will produce that growth, including rewarding learning experiences for students.'*
- Business continuity risks, particularly in relation to the University's IT infrastructure. The Audit Panel noted: *'this will be particularly important given CSU's continuing and increasing dependence on flexible learning as a strategy.'*

The Audit Panel also suggested that the risks inherent in teaching partnership arrangements also may need to be more formally considered (reflected in risk registers and in the thinking of the Audit and Risk Committee (ARC) of University Council).

University Comment

The University acknowledges the strategic risks associated with existing and potential competition from other online/flexible learning providers (especially the providers of professional education), business continuity (particularly in relation to IT infrastructure) and teaching partnership arrangements. The University has taken many steps to more formally identify, evaluate and manage corporate, operational and financial risks associated with competition from other universities, TAFE and private providers in relation to the provision of contemporary and accessible flexible learning options for students.

Most importantly, the University has clarified its goal of leadership in the quality delivery of flexible learning to support professional education.

The ARC, supported by Internal Audit within the Office of Planning and Audit, monitors and reviews all relevant internal and external risk factors impacting on the University's activities and plans. The risks are rated and assessed, and an annual action plan is approved and then followed by Internal Audit. The University also maintains a comprehensive risk register that is regularly reviewed by the ARC and Internal Audit. Faculties and schools also have

developed risk management processes and maintain and update risk registers aligned with their operational plans.

The 2011 – 2015 draft strategic plan has ‘courses’ as one of three specific key themes. The *Course Profile Plan 2011 – 2015* states that CSU will make ‘our courses available in off campus mode, supported by high quality learning platforms’ and expand the ‘profile of professional courses available in flexible modes and off campus settings’.

Actions to Date

- University Council has formally considered a report on CSU’s goals and associated risks for professional education and flexible learning and has reaffirmed the goals as central to CSU’s 2011 - 2015 strategy.
- The DVC (Academic) has invited the University Auditor to participate in the development of the University’s emerging strategic plan 2011 – 2015 (ARC meeting, August 2010).
- CSU has embarked on a project to transform the functionality of Interact through the Interact 2 Project. The project has targeted the development of Sakai 3 by the Sakai Community. The Sakai Collaboration and Learning Environment is an enterprise-ready platform that provides very high quality learning experiences for students. Sakai is a free and open source software package distributed under the Educational Community License. CSU plans to integrate this into its systems for the start of 2012. Community source developments pose very different types of risks to those posed by commercial products. CSU has been working very closely with the Sakai Community to develop appropriate governance, user consultation, project management and resourcing for the Sakai 3 project. As of August 2010 all these elements are firmly in place providing a robust risk mitigation strategy.¹³
- CSU has developed appropriate enterprise architecture standards that ensure IT services are both reliable and scalable. These standards-based approaches (e.g. N-Tier, Redundancy) are utilised heavily, particularly in mission-critical IT services, such as the OLE. IT services are also regularly checked to ensure business continuity capabilities are proved to be functioning as required. A schedule of recovery testing commenced mid-2010.
- The CSU Business Continuity and the Risk Management Plans are being refined (2010 onwards).
- The Information Learning Systems Committee (ILSC) now provides reports on IT systems’ availability and outages, response times, redundancy measures and benchmarking (2010 onwards).
- Implementation of the *Educational Technology Framework and Plan* which guides the governance, policy and practice needs for educational technology at CSU, defines educational technology use at CSU and underpins specific planning over the next five years. This includes strategies for increasing awareness and professional development of academic staff. The Framework and Plan development will be linked to the broader development of the University strategy and its plans (2010 onwards).
- Development of *BFL Standards* which will assist staff to ensure students have access to high quality learning environments, that engage students in meaningful interactions,

¹³ Sakai is available at: <http://sakaiproject.org/>.

including those enhanced by educational technology. The *BFL Standards* also provides an 'aspirational framework' to ensure that CSU staff are able to improve their capabilities in terms of designing BFL environments (2010 onwards).

- Planning for the professional development for CSU staff (Course Directors, academics and Educational Designers) concerning the *Blended and Flexible Learning Good Practice Guidelines*, and *Guidelines for Continuous Quality Improvement in BFL*.
- As part of the CSU DI, there is a shifting emphasis from subject design to course design conducted by Course Directors and Course Teams. The plan to place a greater emphasis on 'courses' is critical to enhancing in a systematic way the overall student experience in the blended and flexible (including online) learning environment.
- The OIR, working with the Faculties, has developed and implemented annual reviews of teaching partners, and the resulting action plans identify risks (and operational matters) that need to be addressed. An operations manual for each partner are being developed that will clarify the roles and responsibilities of the various parties (2010 onwards).

Further Proposed Actions

- The VC has requested Internal Audit to develop and provide the SEC an overarching assessment of strategic risks in implementing the *University Strategy 2011 – 2015*. Issues arising from this assessment will be presented to the ARC in early 2011.
- CSU values higher education research and has concentrations of high quality activity in Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE), FLI and EFPI. The *Research Plan 2011- 2015* has identified 'higher education research' as a priority for CSU (2011 onwards).
- The ARC, supported by Internal Audit, will continue to develop risk management plans, revise risk registers and oversee the implementation of the *Internal Audit Plan* (2011 onwards).
- Faculties and schools will refine their risk management processes and maintain and update risk registers aligned with their operational plans. The assessment of risks of teaching partners will be an ongoing exercise (2011 onwards).
- The Interact 2 Project and continuous improvement of Sakai (2011 onwards).
- Further enhancements to the University's enterprise architecture standards that ensure IT services are both reliable and scalable. IT services will be regularly checked to ensure business continuity capabilities are proved to be functioning as required (2011 onwards).
- Development of the ACPR. The Report will enable senior managers to use course data in developing action plans where key course performances need to be improved¹⁴ (2011 onwards).

¹⁴ Refer to Recommendation 4 for further information on the ACPR.

Recommendation 4

AUQA recommends that CSU ensure that Academic Senate is better able to actively monitor the quality of academic processes and outcomes across the whole University.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Context

Although Academic Senate is responsible for the development of academic policies at CSU, the Audit Panel questioned the devolution to faculties of the oversight of a number of academic processes. The Panel noted that *'although major items, such as new course proposals, are considered by the Academic Programs Committee of Academic Senate, CSU makes it clear that faculty course committees are responsible, within Academic Senate policy, for the approval and review of curriculum, course structure, entry requirements and other matters'*.

The Audit Panel felt that this approach has the risk that Senate and its committees may not know *'the ways in which policy and procedural matters and challenges are being handled across the University as a whole.'* Examples are granting of credit for previous studies and the monitoring of the comparative performances of students across the University.

The Audit Panel believes that Academic Senate, and its committees, should take a more active role in monitoring its policies and their implementation elsewhere within the University. This will involve *'using evidence-based approaches to quality assurance and in identifying gaps in policies'*.

In the Audit Panel's view, some of the consolidated information on students' academic performance (such as attrition and progression rates) viewed by the UCPC also needed to be considered by committees of Academic Senate, including the APC and the Learning and Teaching Committee. The Audit Report states that these two committees *'need to be able to review trends in retention and students' academic performance if they are to be able to assure Academic Senate, and Council, of the academic quality of the University.'*

The Audit Report argued that Academic Senate needs to know that its academic policies are being interpreted accurately and are being implemented effectively across the University.

University Comment

The University's Academic Senate conducted a very insightful self-review in 2008 and the recommendations are being implemented. Further, during 2010, Senate has taken steps to improve its monitoring and interrogation of compliance with academic policies as well as student performances across the University.

Actions to Date

- Academic Senate now receives reports on student performances and attitudes which are prepared for the UCPC by the Office of Planning and Audit: CEQ reports; (AS

10/91) 2009 Cohort Tracking (Attrition) Report; and (AS 10/139) 2009 Progress Rates Report.

- The University has participated in the AUSSE survey since 2007 to monitor student concerns, and reports are made available to Academic Senate (2010 onwards)¹⁵.
- Academic Senate is conscious of the need to communicate its decisions within the University.
 - Academic Senate maintains an Academic Manual which is the official repository of all Academic Senate policy.
 - Academic Senate has dedicated action sheets for decisions, targeting those staff and sections who 'need to know' of its specific decisions. Any matters that are referred to committees of Academic Senate for action/consideration/response are sent to the Committee Secretary via the Academic Senate action sheet (and minutes) following the Senate meeting.
 - Any matters that are referred to faculties are sent to Faculty Board secretaries and Deans via the Academic Senate action sheet (and minutes) following the meeting.
 - The Office of Academic Governance has developed a website for Academic Senate. The website displays the minutes of meetings and the agenda for forthcoming Senate meetings (including supporting papers) and a notice is included in *What's New & News*.
 - The committees of Senate (including Faculty Boards) have a standing item on Senate agendas for a report to Senate. As part of the Faculty Board Report, the Deans table a report at each meeting noting items of interest that are occurring in the faculty.
 - Where there has been a major revision of academic regulations, the Manager, Academic Senate, writes to the Dean, Heads of School and other administration areas to advise them of the changes and provides information about the introduction of the changes.
- Responsibilities of members of Senate have been clarified to enhance the flow (and reliability) of information on Senate decisions. At its July 2010 meeting, Academic Senate (AS10/69) approved a statement on the Roles and Responsibilities of Members of academic committees¹⁶. Regardless of their category of membership (elected, nominated, ex officio), all members of Academic Senate and its committees have a responsibility to *'be the communication point between the committee and the member's School, Faculty, Division or other area in relation to discussions, decisions, policies and other developments of the committee'*.
- At its May 2010 meeting, Academic Senate agreed (AS 10/49) to establish the Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party to advise Academic Senate on ways to improve the monitoring of academic processes and outcomes, including enhanced reporting mechanisms on key indicators on student performance in courses and the credit granted in faculties. Senate also resolved (AS 10/52) that the Working Party should include, as part of its deliberations, consideration of the appropriateness of the reporting requirement for DVCs and Deans in relation to confirmation of

¹⁵ AUSSE reports are available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/plandev/survey/gps/ausse.htm>.

¹⁶ Roles and Responsibilities of Members are available at: http://www.csu.edu.au/acad_sec/academicsenate/roles-responsibilities.htm.

management's compliance with the accountability requirements for the implementation of Academic Senate policy.

- The Working Party has produced a draft set of recommendations to improve communications between faculties and Senate and its committees and Senate's monitoring of the implementation of its policies and student performances. The draft recommendations cover:
 - The nature of reports from faculties to Senate;
 - Induction and training for appropriate users of academic policy to strengthen the University-wide understanding of, and compliance with, Academic Senate's policies;
 - The reporting requirements for DVCs and Deans should be expanded to confirm management's compliance with the implementation of Academic Senate policies;
 - The Terms of Reference of a Senate committee should be amended to include the following functions:
 - (i) Review, draft and monitor the implementation of the policies of Academic Senate; and
 - (ii) Consider and provide comments to Senate on compliance with Senate policies (assessment, moderation, and granting credit); grade distributions; and grade point averages for courses;
 - Academic Senate should conduct regular (at least biennial) 'self-assessment effectiveness reviews' for Senate and its committees. This process would involve a survey of Senate members on their views about Senate's performance and members' overall effectiveness in achieving the terms of reference of Senate and its committees;
 - The University's Internal Audit unit should include in their audit plan, and schedule a review of, compliance with academic policy. Internal Audit will concentrate on policy awareness and adherence throughout the University;
 - Academic Senate should develop and approve an annual calendar of Academic Senate business, aligned with the University's planning cycle, which identifies the nature and timing of key agenda items, including reviews of academic policies;
 - Academic Senate should develop a work plan that identifies the necessary actions and responsibilities for supporting the implementation of the Academic Senate calendar of business. The work plan will include timelines for evaluating data and writing reports for Senate;
 - Academic Senate should provide an annual report to University Council on Senate's broad evaluation of the governance and management of Senate's academic activities including academic policy development and overall compliance with policy, academic strategic directions, risks confronting the academic activities of the University and standards within courses;
 - The introduction of an ACPR. CSU currently produces a report on discipline performances over three years. However, the report does not review course performances or attrition rates. The proposed Report will be produced for each faculty by the Office of Planning and Audit, and will contain a number of key measures/metrics of performance for each course, such as:

- Demand (UAC preferences, direct applications);
- Load;
- Pass rates;
- Attrition rates (especially first year);
- Grade point averages;
- FT employment rate (% Australian residents in FT employment – excludes graduates in FT study);
- Mean good teaching scale (mean of good teaching scale in student course evaluation questionnaire); and
- Mean overall satisfaction.

The ACPR will contain performance data on the set of key measures for every course, showing a comparison of each actual measure of performance to an agreed standard or target measure. If the difference between the actual and target measure (say, for first year attrition) is 'unfavourable' or trending over time in the wrong direction, then an 'alert' would be flagged, and this would require explanation from the faculty and an action plan to address the issue. In other words, targets could be set for the metrics, and a scorecard for each course could be developed with 'colour' schemes (red = poor, yellow = average and green = excellent) and trends could be identified.

Deans will need to conduct a thorough examination of courses that need further attention, and this is likely to involve identifying what aspects of the course (its design, course content, its delivery and support processes) need to be addressed. An improvement plan, including agreed timelines, would be approved by the DVC (Academic). If performance fails to meet agreed performance standards over the agreed period, then its continuation within the University's course profile would be considered by UCPC and APC.

The ACPR will be available to the faculties, schools, UCPC, APC and the Learning and Teaching Committee of Senate and Academic Senate itself.

Further Proposed Actions

- Development of the ACPR – this will be an iterative process (2011 onwards).
- Implementation and review of the Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party's recommendations (2011 onwards).

Recommendation 5

AUQA recommends that CSU improve its data reporting to ensure that the retention, progress and grade point averages of students from differing cohorts are routinely considered by Senate and academic managers across the University.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate; and
Director, Office of Planning and Audit

Context

Despite acknowledging the University's initiatives to address student attrition (such as the SEP and the Transition Project), Affirmation 1 of the 2009 Audit Report encourages CSU to take further actions to identify and deal with the causes of attrition. The Audit Panel *'finds that CSU has not effectively addressed this issue'* (i.e. CSU has not reduced its rates of student attrition).

The Audit Panel encouraged the University *'to undertake further analysis of factors that may influence attrition rates and if necessary modify its administrative systems to ensure that it captures data about students' broad entry pathways'*.

The Audit Panel also noted that the University *'does not routinely report the actual spread of grade distributions by student cohort, although faculty boards of examiners do compare grade distributions across cohorts of students studying at different locations to identify whether the grade distributions at locations such as teaching partnerships are significantly different to those at CSU's home campuses. However, without the ability to compare the actual distributions, committees of Academic Senate are not able readily to identify courses or subjects across the University where the pattern of grade distributions seems abnormal, or to monitor whether or not there may be a tendency to grade inflation. The University's self-review of internationalisation also recommended that CSU 'consider systematic reporting of attrition and progression across international cohorts to enable identification of issues and comparison to domestic cohorts''*.

The Audit Report recommended that enhanced reporting of retention, progression rates and grades may improve decision-making across the University, because the information will better inform judgments at all levels. The Audit Panel urges *'CSU to expand its ability to track and review students' retention and grade performance by cohort and suggests that CSU may find it helpful to examine practice at other universities in this regard'*.

In other words, the Audit Panel is concerned about the adequacy of the information on key information (such as grades and their distribution by different cohorts as well as retention data) that is examined by relevant academic managers and the various committees of the University, especially by the committees of Academic Senate.

University Comment

In addition to the University's initiatives to examine the causes of attrition and to address them successfully, Academic Senate is committed to receiving reports that contain reliable and timely information in order to analyse retention, progress and grade point averages (and other information) of different cohorts. Academic Senate believes that one of its key functions is to interrogate data and to contribute meaningfully to debates on student performances. These reports should also be made available to managers across the University so that key student performance issues can be identified, considered and evidence-based action plans can be prepared. To this end, significant progress has been made, since the AUQA Audit, to develop relevant reports that will assist Senate and others to make the appropriate evaluations and to consider effective, meaningful and valuable ways forward.

Actions to Date

- Various reports on student performances and attitudes are prepared by the Office of Planning and Audit for the UCPC and Academic Senate. The Senate reports include: CEQ reports; (AS 10/91) 2009 Cohort Tracking (Attrition) Report; (AS 10/139) 2009 Progress Rates Report.
- In May 2010, Academic Senate agreed (AS 10/49) to establish the Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party to advise Academic Senate on ways to improve the monitoring of academic processes and outcomes, including the enhanced reporting mechanisms on key indicators on student performance in courses and the credit granted in faculties. The Working Party has suggested the introduction of new ACPR which, inter alia, will alert senior staff to attrition and student performances in specific courses and provide for the creation of work plan strategies to address the causes of specific problems. Academic Senate and other committees (such as the UCPC) will examine the ACPR which will contain information on retention, progression and GPAs of various student cohorts (including TAFE, Indigenous, international students).
- Continued participation in the AUSSE survey.
- Development of the draft *Student Experience Plan 2011 – 2015*. The Plan outlines the principles and actions for achieving the University's vision of '*providing an enriching and supportive student experience for its diverse range of students*' and includes a commitment to introduction of a 'Student Experience Scorecard'.

Further Proposed Actions

- The ACPR will include data on retention, progression and GPAs of various student cohorts (including TAFE, Indigenous, international students). The Office of Planning and Audit is currently working with stakeholders to better identify relevant cohorts upon entry to the University for tracking in reports such as attrition and progression (2011 onwards).
- The Faculty of Business is developing a new annual status and performance report that reviews the activities of offshore and onshore partners. The Report will show brief facts on each partner (locations and courses offered, assessment and moderation management processes enrolments), as well as key academic indicators (attrition, grade distributions, GPAs and progression rates). Action plans emanating from an

analysis of this annual report will be linked to the Faculty's strategic directions and plans (2011 onwards).

Recommendation 6

AUQA recommends that CSU adopt explicit change management strategies to ensure the effective and coordinated implementation of a range of initiatives in curriculum renewal, flexible learning and fieldwork education.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); and
Executive Director, Division of Human Resources

Reporting Responsibility: Director, Education for Practice Institute;
Director, The Flexible Learning Institute; and
Director, Curriculum Renewal

Context

The Audit Panel noted that the University was in the process of implementing the DI, through pilot studies of selected courses in 2010 leading to full implementation from 2011. The Audit Panel agreed that this was a *'sensible way to proceed'*.

The Panel also made the following points:

- Although the University wishes to involve staff at all levels across the University, CSU should be cautious about *'premature mainstreaming'* the DI; and
- The University *'has set itself an ambitious agenda for change'* in its academic initiatives (with curriculum renewal, flexible learning initiatives and fieldwork education), and will need clear priorities and an awareness of any impact on staff and systems.

The Audit Panel concluded by urging the University *'to adopt explicit and robust change management processes for the implementation of these initiatives similar to its well-established change management processes for IT projects.'*

The Audit Panel also observed that Faculty Sub-Deans (Learning and Teaching) were highly enthusiastic and committed, and that they could *'play a valuable role in the change management process and in ensuring the systematic adoption of initiatives in curriculum renewal, together with their colleagues who support flexible learning and fieldwork education.'* The Audit Panel suggested that the University should consider providing these Sub-Deans with special financial support to help with creating *'strategic and systematic improvements within each Faculty'*.

University Comment

The University is committed to continuous improvement in curriculum design and development, leading to distinctive professional courses that involve flexible learning practices with workplace experiences that enable graduates to learn to adapt to change. The University is also well aware of the impact on staff workloads and attitudes of any change processes involving pedagogical initiatives that are necessary to enhance student demand for CSU's courses. The importance of ensuring staff are consulted and engaged in the change management processes are part of the University's established change management procedures. The significance of this aspect of change has been reinforced with those managing these initiatives. The importance of the people aspects to achieve effective

change has been identified as part of the recent Climate Survey and the Vice-Chancellor has identified this as an area for improvement in operational planning.

Currently the University is supporting several course and learning and teaching related initiatives including the Transition Program with a focus on first year curriculum and student support and pathways for non traditional students, implementation of the DI, the Indigenous Education Strategy (IES); and Standards for P&PBE and BFL. The University has also adopted, in-principle, the *Assessment 2020 Principles*.

These initiatives have significant overlap but it is important that the task of creating coherence is not left to course leaders alone. The DVC (Academic) has requested the Executive Director, DLTS to establish a group that includes the leaders of the initiatives, representatives of the Institutes and the Sub-Deans (Learning and Teaching). This group complements the work of the DVC (Academic) with Deans and Heads of School in relation to risk analysis and individual and course-based performance requirements. The group also augments the work of the APC on course reporting and approval processes. It is working to articulate the coherence of the initiatives in a simple accessible form, to develop a staged course-based approach to implementation through planning and analysis of course priorities, and to recommend changes that will align institutional drivers more clearly with curriculum priorities.

Also, each of the Directors of Transition, Curriculum Renewal, FLI, EFPI and the Indigenous Education Strategy Coordination Group has developed 'change management' plans for their own areas and initiatives. They regularly consult each other to ensure that their plans are coordinated, integrated and can be implemented in a timely but sensible fashion.

Actions to Date

Integration

The DVC (Academic) and the Deans, in consultation with the teaching leadership group, have developed and promulgated an integrated approach to implementing the University's initiatives and strategies. The approach is course focused and includes mandatory adoption timelines for some initiatives as well as a risk and aspiration based approach to others. The University has timelines for individual initiatives and intends to promulgate these in a consolidated manner to achieve an integrated approach.

The primary focus for integration is the CSU Degree. The CSU Degree provides a focus for engaging staff. This focus has been reinforced in the Common Teaching Standards.

Workplace Learning

To coordinate change management for WPL at CSU, a WPL Taskforce was established in 2009. This Taskforce coordinates a range of activities and working parties pursuing the advancement of WPL. These include:

- Staff development of WPL staff. A working party was established to investigate avenues to support the educational preparation of WPL Educators (i.e. practitioners

and employees of industry partners who educate and supervise CSU students in the workplace)¹⁷.

- WPL management¹⁸, risk management and information management.
- Change management around University clinics is being coordinated through the newly established UCEC (See Affirmation 4 terms of reference); and
- Change management of P&PBE initiatives is being facilitated via:
 - The preparation of a strategic plan for P&PBE to inform the current strategic planning cycle and provide the background and recommendations for the enhancement of P&PBE;
 - Development of a set of *P&PBE Standards* to support CSU's *The Next Steps* educational development priorities;
 - Development of a set of *PBE Guidelines* (for good practice) that are being used in the curriculum renewal process;
 - Preparation of information documents and folders distributed to schools, faculties and divisions to share information, resources, and guidelines;
 - Information and resources pertaining to each of the above items is being disseminated via the EFPI website, campus visits, the CSUED conference and pre-conference workshops, and publications; and
 - Teaching Fellowships and collaborative or consultative projects with schools and faculties to share expertise and provide mentorship in support of educational initiatives in these units.

The Flexible Learning Institute (change management around BFL)

- Teaching Fellowship Scheme is a core strategic project for fostering innovation and course redesign with BFL.
- A Professional Development Plan for CSU staff concerning the *Blended and Flexible Learning Good Practice Guidelines*, and *Guidelines for Continuous Quality Improvement in BFL* (developed July 2011 and implemented August 2011, onwards).
- Development of *BFL Standards* for during 2010. Implementation will include the development of *Guidelines for Continuous Quality Improvement Strategies* and a *Professional Development Framework for BFL* during 2011. Both will include strategies for auditing and reporting progress.
- The Standards, Guidelines and Framework will provide a change management strategy for continuous quality improvement of BFL at CSU (2011 onwards).
- CSUED Conference and pre-conference workshops.

Curriculum Renewal

In 2010, the DI project, lead by the Director, Curriculum Renewal and governed by the DI Steering Committee, focused on faculty pilots, the creation by advisory groups of sets of

¹⁷ Refer to Recommendation 9 for information on the activities of the working party.

¹⁸ Refer to Affirmation 4 for further information on WPL management.

guidelines on curriculum themes, the design and approval of changes to the course planning processes as well as the commencement of professional development activities for key change agents in the DI implementation.

In 2011, change management will focus on the implementation and evaluation of new course approval processes for courses scheduled for review and a course planning phase of curriculum development for all undergraduate courses. This will include the refinement of change management strategies to support understanding and integration of all aspects of the DI across the faculties and schools.

Transition Program

The Transition Program has been funded to support changes to pathway programs and first year curriculum and student support. Funding supports a Director, Transition; a Manager, Pre-Entry Programs; and faculty based staff. Funding also supports curriculum renewal in first year, including in English language support.

Indigenous Education Strategy

As noted in the AUQA Audit Report, the IES receives annual funding from CSU to support curriculum development, cultural competency programs and fellowships for teaching leaders. An Indigenous Studies Board, based in the Centre for Indigenous Studies, oversees curriculum development.

Further Proposed Actions

- Implementation of integrated course based strategy overseen by APC and DVC (Academic).
- Staff development of WPL staff (2011 onwards).
- WPL management, risk management and information management (2011 onwards).
- Change management around University clinics is being coordinated through the newly established UCEC (2011 onwards).
- Implementation of *BFL Standards* (2011 onwards).
- For the DI, future change management actions will focus on the implementation and evaluation of new course approval processes for courses scheduled for review and a course planning phase of curriculum development for all undergraduate courses. This will include development of change management strategies to support understanding and integration of all aspects of the DI across the faculties and schools (2011 onwards).
- For the DI, monitoring and evaluation of the interim course review template by APC and Senate (2011 and 2012).
- Implementation of Transition (2011 – 2012).
- Continuing implementation of the IES (2011 – 2013).

Recommendation 7

AUQA recommends that CSU clarify for students and staff its definition of CSU graduate attributes, the desired learning outcomes for students across all undergraduate courses and the University's approach to the embedding of these graduate attributes in curriculum design and assessment.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Director, Curriculum Renewal

Context

The Audit Panel felt that the University has not clarified for its staff and its current and prospective students the generic skills which all students should acquire before graduation, and that there is *'little awareness'* of the fundamental Graduate Attributes (GAs) and expected learning outcomes of CSU undergraduate courses. The Audit Report says that *'this lack of awareness may be reflected in the University's comparatively low CEQ scores on the Generic Skills Scale'*.

The Audit Report also noted that the CSU DI was developed partly to ensure that curricula were *'able to support the achievement of the desired attributes'*. The Audit Panel was concerned that CSU had defined GAs in terms of *'outcomes'*, rather than as a *'precursor'*, of the curricula renewal process in the DI. The Audit Panel felt that the justification for such an approach is *'unconvincing'*, and believes that there is an *'immediate need'* for CSU to clarify, *'within the DI'*, its desired GAs and how they can become embedded in undergraduate courses.

University Comment

'Curriculum renewal' through 'courses' is one of three key themes of the University's proposed strategic directions, and the renewal process will provide current and prospective students a common set of skills, knowledge and attributes based on the *CSU Degree Principles*. This will make the CSU undergraduate degrees distinctive, of a very high quality and relevant for all students no matter where they live and work. Wide dissemination of the curriculum principles to students and staff is an important part of the development of the curriculum renewal process.

CSU's strategic plan for 2007 - 2011 defined an ambitious new set of foci for CSU undergraduate degrees as a means to fulfil the University's mission. These foci differed from CSU's previous lists of relatively non-specific GAs and Generic Skills by including a challenging array of substantive content about, for example, Indigenous cultures, environmental sustainability, WPL and global citizenship. This subject-matter could not simply be overlaid on existing subject-content but required a new integrated approach to the inculcation of GAs. CSU therefore embarked on a new initiative to create a CSU Degree for its undergraduates that has a collaboratively-built internationalised curriculum, deliberately designed at course-level and delivered in a way that uses a blend of techniques, including a variety of face-to-face, web-based pedagogies and practice-based learning opportunities, to enrich students' learning experiences.

The basis of the new approach is a commitment to ensure that, over time, all undergraduate courses have been designed according to University-wide curriculum guidelines that securely embed these new foci in the CSU Degree – as well as giving students an in-depth understanding of their chosen disciplines and professions.

The DI has a three-phase process:

- Phase I Review and Planning (2008 - 2009);
- Phase II Piloting (2010); and
- Phase III University-wide implementation (2011 onwards).

The DI incorporates a renewed set of graduate skills, knowledge and attributes and Phase II of the DI is already in progress. Phase II will assist in understanding the key issues of integrating the curriculum principles within CSU courses.

The DI is changing the way CSU approaches embedding GAs in the undergraduate curriculum. CSU's new approach is in common with many Australian universities. For example, ALTC's recently completed National Graduate Attributes Project (2010) notes: *'The most prevalent GA curriculum approach in Australian universities is to integrate the development of GA within the usual discipline-based degree curriculum. Such an approach has the potential benefit of fostering the higher-level, contextualised and disciplinary relevant GA espoused by universities for their graduates'*.

Accordingly, the CSU DI will develop a better resourced, more collaborative, course-level approach to the design of undergraduate degrees than has previously been available at CSU.

The most efficient way of ensuring that GAs are clearly and unambiguously communicated to staff and students is to ensure that they are included in the covering 'objectives' of all undergraduate courses and, therefore, across the subjects comprising each course. As all subjects are required to 'assess' all their stated objectives, this would ensure that students' achievement of GAs is part of the assessment that students are required to fulfil to pass any given course, ensuring not just that students have acquired each GA, but that they know (and the University knows) that they have acquired them (something that might help improve CSU's CEQ scores on 'Generic Skills').

Actions to Date

- At its September 2010, Academic Senate approved (AS 10/137) a new set of Graduate Commitments, that will replace the existing CSU GAs, namely: CSU has made a commitment to all CSU undergraduates that, as well as gaining an in-depth understanding of their chosen disciplines and professions, they will have access to:
 - A supported transition into the first year of university; and thereafter throughout the undergraduate student experience;
 - Employability and generic skills such as effective communication, analytical skills, critical and reflective judgment, problem-solving, team work, and time-management;

- The opportunity for international experiences and to develop an international perspective in their discipline or profession;
 - An engagement with the responsibilities of global citizenship;
 - The opportunity to develop cultural competence;
 - The opportunity to engage meaningfully with the culture, experiences and histories of Indigenous communities;
 - Understandings of financial, social and environmental sustainability;
 - A firm understanding of ethics;
 - Education based in practice;
 - Engagement in activities that foster web-based proficiency; and
 - Threshold disciplinary outcomes (to be developed).
- These new GAs will be the precursors for undergraduate courses developed under the curriculum renewal process.
 - The new GAs will be communicated to staff and to new undergraduate students through the online orientation site and through subject outlines (2010 onwards).
 - Academic Senate also approved (AS10/137) that the three Advisory Groups (Ethics and Global Citizenship, Sustainability, and Internationalisation) should be combined into one Advisory Group (CSU Degree Principles) capable of providing ongoing Advisory support in an integrated manner for the implementation of the CSU Degree Initiative Phase II, Stage 2, 2011. An outcome of the course pilot process has been identification of the need to develop an integrated strategy in relationship to the implementation of the CSU Degree. The formation of a single Advisory Group reflects this integrated strategy and will provide a continuing process for ensuring relevant research advances continue to inform the CSU Degree (i.e. the teaching-research nexus).

Further Proposed Actions

- Dissemination of the new GAs to staff and students (2010 onwards).
- Continuing work of the Advisory Group, CSU Degree Principles (2011 onwards).
- The process of curriculum renewal will ensure that the CSU degree design principles are assessed in all undergraduate courses. This will provide one means of monitoring the effectiveness of the curriculum renewal process.

Recommendation 8

AUQA recommends that CSU's Academic Senate keep under active review the credit granted within faculties.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Context

The Audit Panel noted that CSU has been active in considering ways to improve arrangements for credit transfer in recent years, including ways to address fieldwork subjects.

The Audit Panel also praised the University's publicly-available credit transfer precedent database (see Commendation 8).

At CSU, the faculties have been devolved responsibility for approving credit of specific subjects. The Audit Panel felt that, although this devolution process is *'efficient'*, there needs to be a central monitoring process to ensure that the devolution process works well. The Audit Panel suggested that Academic Senate should have a regular means by which it monitors the process for granting credit and for identifying any possible trends in this area. CSU should also watch closely credit granted by teaching partners. Importantly, the Audit Report mentioned that the granting of credit for Certificate IV courses needs to be monitored carefully and compared to practices across the higher education sector.

University Comments

The University acknowledges that Academic Senate should take a more active role in monitoring credit granted by the faculties, including credit granted by onshore and offshore teaching partners¹⁹.

At its May meeting, Academic Senate agreed that the Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party should consider, among other things, the current communication and reporting mechanisms, and the content of reports, to and from Faculty Boards and Academic Senate and its committees.

The Working Party has developed a draft paper which is now being considered by relevant stakeholders across the University. Feedback will be considered in developing the revised versions of the paper. An important recommendation of the paper is the introduction of an ACPR which will require faculties to discuss credit granting processes and decisions taken. The Faculty responses will be considered and interrogated by Senate or one of its committees.

¹⁹ Also see Affirmation 5.

Actions to Date

- The Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party has developed a draft set of recommendations that includes the introduction of an ACPR. The Report has a section on credit granted by Faculties (October 2010).
- Following the Audit Report, further clarity on the lines of responsibility for the auditing of admissions and credit granted at teaching partners was agreed between the DSA and the Faculty of Business. The DSA is responsible for the auditing of admissions while the Faculty is responsible for quality assurance on the application of credit.
- A Credit - Quality Control Audit process has been established by the Faculty of Business, and has been implemented at two teaching partners (CSU Study Centres, and at HUC as part of the annual review cycle of each partner). The process is being rolled out to all teaching partners. Reports from this process are submitted to the Dean, Faculty of Business and the teaching partners.
- The Academic Processes and Outcomes Working Party has developed a template for an ACPR which includes a section on credit granted by faculties (approved at Academic Senate, December 2010).

Further Proposed Actions

- The Faculty of Business will introduce systematic reviews of approved credit pathways at partner institutions to ensure that the credit package provided in the agreement with the institution are current and they continue to meet the academic standards initially assessed by CSU. Reports will be presented to the Faculty Board, the partners and to Academic Senate (2011 onwards).
- The Deans (or nominee) will meet to discuss credit granted principles, especially in relation to certificates obtained through recognised pathways (2011 onwards).
- The Terms of Reference of a Senate Committee will be amended to include the monitoring of compliance with Senate policies (including moderation).

Recommendation 9

AUQA recommends that CSU make stronger efforts to ensure academics and others involved in fieldwork education have an understanding of pedagogical approaches to practice-based education and the desired learning outcomes.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Reporting Responsibility: Director, Education for Practice Institute

Context

The Audit Panel commended the University for *'its serious engagement with professional practice and fieldwork education through a range of initiatives, including the establishment of institutes to advance professional practice and the Fieldwork Education Network.'* (see Commendation 12).

However, the Audit Panel found that *'an informed understanding of pedagogy of fieldwork education is not widespread among CSU academics.'* Although CSU staff support the role of WPL education in the context of enhancing student learning, the Audit Panel felt that they are not able to articulate clearly the ways in which students benefit from placements, *'aside from a general notion of 'learning by doing'.*

The Audit Report further stated: *'Continued attention to practice-based learning will require academic staff and fieldwork supervisors to better conceptualise the teaching and learning objectives and associated strategies. Good examples of such conceptualisation are available in publications from RIPPLE but have yet to be widely discussed across the University.'*

The Audit Report argued that the University needs to be able to identify evidence of the operational impact from any initiative.

University Comment

At CSU, 'Practice-Based Education' is the broad term for educating students for their roles in practice and WPL is a component of PBE.

The University has asked EFPI, in conjunction with CSU's Workplace Learning Network, to lead the development of practice-based education and WPL at CSU. EFPI reports to the Learning & Teaching Committee on progress. WPL principles developed by EFPI have been endorsed by Academic Senate. EFPI, with the Workplace Learning Network, are implementing comprehensive and systematic processes for assisting the implementation of PBE in all faculties. An important aspect of the work of EFPI is the provision of professional development for all relevant staff so that they understand, and can articulate clearly, the rationale for WPL as well as the alternate pedagogical approaches to WPL and the desired learning outcomes. The DI will also reinforce the principles of PBE and help to disseminate widely the critical aspects of WPL and other initiatives for enhancing the practical skills and knowledge of our graduates.

The University is pursuing three broad strategies in relation to this AUQA Recommendation:

- (i) Identification of good pedagogical practices underpinning PBE;
- (ii) Substantial staff education program on good PBE pedagogical practices across the University; and
- (iii) Periodic review of staff understandings and utilisation of PBE pedagogical practices as part of ongoing review and development of PBE at CSU.

Actions to Date

Identification of Good Pedagogical Practices underpinning PBE

Strategies include:

- EFPI working parties to develop Standards for Professional and Practice-Based Education and Standards for WPL;
- Collaborative or consultative projects with faculties and schools led by EFPI and the Workplace Learning Network to generate knowledge and reports of exemplary PBE practice;
- Development of a set of *PBE Guidelines*;
- Development of PBE flyer;
- International scholarship projects that have resulted in key texts:
 - McAllister L, Paterson M, Higgs J, Bithell C, 2010, *Innovations in Allied Health Fieldwork Education: A Critical Appraisal*, Sense Publishers. Rotterdam, The Netherlands;
 - Higgs J, Fish D, Goulter I, Loftus S, Reid J, Trede F, 2010, *Education for future practice*, Sense Publishers Rotterdam, The Netherlands; and
 - Ewing R, Lowrie T, Higgs J, 2010, *Teaching and communicating: Rethinking professional experiences*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne.
- Engaging in critical appreciation of PBE curriculum and teaching practices using research, scholarship and program evaluation via Teaching Fellowships including Indigenous Teaching Fellowships;
- Expanding networking, collaboration and standards development with national and international practice-based learning centres;
- Expanding research into professional education via schools, faculties, support of ALTC applications, research centres (particularly RIPPLE²⁰), education centres at CSU, DLTS Scholarship in Teaching Grants and promotion of relevant research through CSU competitive grants;
- Promoting research into PBE and WPL via EFPI projects, collaborations and networking and HDR training programs²¹; and
- An ALTC Fellowship is being undertaken by Professor Joy Higgs, Director, EFPI on PBE practices and pedagogy.

²⁰ Information on RIPPLE is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/research/ripple/>.

²¹ Information on EFPI's HDR Program, Cohorts, is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/landt/efp/cohorts/index.html>.

Dissemination of Information and Exemplars of Good PBE Pedagogical Practices

Strategies to achieve this outcome:

- Information provision.

The following information has been prepared/collated and made available directly to faculties, schools, divisions and for open staff access via CSU's news information system, *What's New & News*, the Workplace Learning Network and the EFPI website:

- A strategic plan for P&PBE;
- A flyer on PBE;
- A set of *PBE Guidelines*;
- Publications in journal articles, books and chapters on PBE and WPL; and
- Publications reviews on PBE/WPL topics have produced key resources that are located via the CSU Library on the EFPI website for staff use²².

- Information sharing.

Pedagogy and exemplary practice is shared across CSU and with academic and industry partners via a range of strategies including:

- Online debates are conducted about PBE with CSU staff;
 - On-campus workshops are conducted for CSU staff by EFPI and the Workplace Learning Network;
 - EFPI has hosted a visit from Associate Professor Richard Coll from New Zealand who conducted a number of workshops with CSU staff in June 2010;
 - EFPI will host visits from Professor Anne Kinsella from Canada and Professor Ron Barnett from the UK to work with and talk to CSU staff on a range of PBE topics. Professor Barnett will be the keynote speaker at CSUED in November 2010;
 - The annual CSUED Conference;
 - EFPI workshops, e.g. 10 tips on PBE practice;
 - EFPI Teaching Fellowships workshops;
 - WPLN workshops and networking; and
 - Information on exemplary PBE practice provided across in reports on data collated as part of the 2008 PBE self-review.
- Engagement of staff in integrating good PBE pedagogy in their courses and teaching:
 - The PBE Guidelines are being used by Course Teams piloting the curriculum renewal process;
 - Teaching Fellows have been/are reviewing PBE practices in their courses and revising courses to enhance the use of PBE pedagogy and exemplary practices;

²² PBE/WPL publications are available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/landt/efp/wpln/pages/resources.html>.

- Involving staff across the University in the development and critique of *PBE Standards* (based on sound PBE pedagogy); and
- Incorporation of PBE pedagogy in the design of WPL student assessment and student feedback (via OES) on WPL.
- Staff development of WPL staff:

The working party established to investigate avenues to support the Educational Preparation of WPL Educators. Activities conducted through this avenue include:

 - EFPI, in conjunction with the Workplace Learning Network, has set up a WPL Taskforce to advance WPL across the University. This Taskforce is working to map strategies currently in place to educate WPL staff including WPL Coordinators, WPL Administrators and WPL Educators;
 - A Teaching Fellowship conducted a review of staff development needs for staff involved in WPL, and identified:
 - The need to improve staff induction and development of all academics who have or may have workplace learning in the subjects they teach or coordinate;
 - The value placed by WPL Educators on CSU library access and course information provided by schools; and
 - the need for enhanced education of WPL Educators;
 - Campus visits conducted by EFPI with the WPL Network to provide staff development activities for WPL staff;
 - Participation in the review of the program Foundations of University Learning and Teaching (FULT) for induction of new staff; and
 - A project conducted by Dr Stephen Loftus (EFPI) with the Faculty of Education is focusing on the professional development of site-based liaison staff who facilitate WPL programs for CSU students enrolled in teacher education.
- Recognising, sharing and appraising good teaching practices through Vice-Chancellor's Awards.

Further Proposed Actions

- Continue international scholarship collaborations to produce papers and books about PBE (2011 onwards).
- Invite international scholars to CSU to collaborate on PBE projects and provide educational opportunities for CSU staff to learn more about PBE (2011 onwards).
- Provide Teaching Fellowships to CSU staff with opportunities to work on in-depth projects related to PBE (2011 onwards).
- Provision and sharing of information related to PBE. EFPI to develop a *Professional and Practice-Based Education Strategic Plan* by the end 2010.
- Continue online debates for CSU staff on PBE topics (2011 onwards).
- Staff development of WPL staff. The working party to explore avenues for professional development of WPL Educators (2011 onwards).

- Provide face-to-face campus workshops to CSU staff on PBE topics (2011 onwards).
- EFPI will conduct periodic reviews of staff understandings and utilisation of PBE pedagogical practices as part of ongoing review and development of PBE at CSU (2011 onwards).
- Recognition of good PBE practices: Use Vice-Chancellor's Awards to recognise and acknowledge good teaching practices (2011 onwards).
- Broad dissemination of RIPPLE's research agenda across each faculty's WPL subjects.
- Ensure research findings from RIPPLE's research programs inform future WPL practices.

Recommendation 10

AUQA recommends that CSU explore additional means to ensure a consistently high quality of academic experience for students, especially for students studying externally.

Accountability:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Reporting Responsibility:	Director, Student Experience Program; Director, The Flexible Learning Institute; and Sub-Deans, Learning and Teaching

Context

The Audit Panel found that there is substantial variability in the learning experiences of students at CSU, and urged the University to address the student experience in new ways.

In interviews with students, the Audit Panel received some *'deeply negative comments'* which included:

- Poor communication and feedback from academic staff, including a *'perceived lack of engagement through the CSU Interact forums'*;
- *'Disorganisation in structure and activities of subjects and assessment weightings'*;
- Different expectations and experiences in different subjects;
- Inconsistencies in marking, assessment and feedback from staff;
- *'Outdated information in subjects and duplication of content'*; and
- *'Little use of technology'* to increase interactivity for external students and assist them to become more engaged.

Prior to the 2009 AUQA Audit, the University endeavoured to address the 'student experience' issues in a number of ways including:

- Strengthening mechanisms for student feedback (student evaluations for all subjects);
- Implementation of a Student Experience Questionnaire (SEQ) for second year students and monitoring of SEQ's by faculties and the Learning and Teaching Committee;
- Introduction of a new learning platform (CSU Interact and the MSI which includes compulsory information for all subjects);
- Ensuring that all students having access to the online support services (for the library and student services);
- Induction programs for all staff (permanent, casual staff and the staff of teaching partners); and
- Creation of the SEP and the appointments of the Director, Student Experience Program and Director, Transitions.

However, the Audit Panel urged the University to explore and implement (and then to monitor and modify as required) additional actions to enhance the student experience at CSU.

University Comment

All matters relating to the 'student experience' lie at the heart of the University's mission and are critical to the University's reputation and standing. The University seeks to achieve its goal of exemplary service to all students, through plans and actions that provide an integrated, student-centred experience.

To this end, the University has established a number of initiatives, including the SEP as well as Student Central²³. The draft *University Strategy Plan 2011 – 2015* has the 'student experience' as one its three themes. The draft *Student Experience Plan* outlines the broad principles, actions and success measures for achieving the University's vision of '*providing an enriching and supportive student experience for its diverse range of students*' through:

- Excellent teaching;
- Enhanced support services (from first point of contact to participation as alumni); and
- Improved physical and IT facilities (including support for flexible learning for professional education).

Measures of quality and success of the student experience over time include improvements in CEQ 'Good Teaching Scale' and 'Overall Satisfaction', improvements in retention and student progress rates (better than the National averages, as well as annual improvements at CSU) and maintaining CSU's strong scores for learning support and work integrated learning in AUSSE.

Actions to Date

Monitoring Student Concerns and Improving Student Communications

- The University conducts student surveys, including AUSSE, to monitor student concerns.
- Introduction of Student Central in early 2010. Student concerns received by Student Central are forwarded to the appropriate faculties for actioning.
- The commencement of the Student Success Team.
- The appointment of the Student Communications Coordinator in August 2010. This position provides an integrated and consistent approach to all student communications.
- *Orientation Guidelines* and good practice principles have been created to provide a framework for the development of future orientation activities.

²³ Refer to Affirmation 1 for further information on the SEP and Student Central.

Staff Engagement and Enhancing Learning Materials

- The DVC (Academic) approved (September 2010) the CSU *Common Teaching Standards*. Staff are expected to meet the five standards in their teaching, and the standards are linked to staff performance expectations and accountability. The five CSU *Common Teaching Standards* are:
 - Currency.

Currency is demonstrated by the currency of content of subject materials AND by the staff member meeting research, creative or professional activity performance criteria.
 - Responsiveness to Students.

Responsiveness is demonstrated by the quality of feedback on assessment, meeting timelines for assignment turn around, and adherence to CSU protocols for online and student contact availability.
 - Timeliness.

Meeting timelines for learning materials preparation and for assessment and grading.
 - Assessment.

Assessment practices should demonstrate alignment with learning outcomes for the subject AND with course based patterns of assessment.
 - Subject–Course Linkages.

The subject coordinator is expected to participate in course based curriculum development and planning and to have aligned the subject to support these.

(2010 onwards).

- The DLTS collects data relevant to some *Common Teaching Standards* (responsiveness; currency; timelines) and will provide this to Heads of Schools. DLTS is also working to refine data collection and useability, including information of staff usage of Interact (2010 onwards).
- The University's DI will enhance the academic experience of students through its focus on curriculum renewal (2010 onwards).
- Academic Senate has approved recommendations on the CSU Subject and its implementation plan. This requires improved course and subject information on the expectations of students (time, costs and resource needs). The Division of Marketing is assisting meet the implementation plan (2010 onwards).
- Academic Senate established a review of the OES to improve alignment of items with CSU priorities and the *Common Teaching Standards* and to develop OES items for WPL subjects. OES results will continue to be available to Heads of School as well as Subject Coordinators. Results will also be available to Course Teams.
- The STUDYLINK program (recipient of the ALTC Program Award) continues to provide preparatory skills and ways to build the confidence of students commencing University to better prepare them for success.

- The proposed new moderation policy (currently in draft form) will have requirements for moderators to critically review and monitor the quality of information provided in Subject Outlines as well as appropriateness of the assessment tasks (pre-delivery moderation)²⁴.
- The draft *University Strategy 2011-2015* and its underlying plans were tabled at the University Council meeting on 23 September 2010 for comment (they will be finalised following receipt of the comments from Academic Senate and Council and after further consultation).
- Improved student communications through the SEP and the Student Communications Coordinator (2010 and ongoing).

Further Proposed Action

- Implementation and refinement of the *CSU Common Teaching Standards* (2011 onwards).
- Approval of the draft moderation policy by Academic Senate (late 2010).
- Approval of the strategic directions of the University (early 2011).
- Review of the reporting to Heads of School on the staff usage of Interact (early 2011).
- Enhanced communications to students (including DVDs for different cohorts of commencing students, such as TAFE entrants) (2011 onwards).
- Professional development for staff, explaining the nature of the current CSU student cohort, and making staff aware of the issues of concern for students and the factors driving retention and progression (2011 onwards).
- The DLTS collects data relevant to some *Common Teaching Standards* (responsiveness; currency; timelines) and will provide this to Heads of School. DLTS is also working to refine data collection and useability, including information of staff usage of Interact (2010 onwards).
- As part of the Transition Project CSU has reviewed orientation arrangements. A new orientation website for distance education students has been launched. This aims to improve engagement of students with the university and its support services.
- The Transition Project has established new processes for monitoring engagement and working with Faculties to improve this. The Project also aims to develop improved links within cohorts of students to improve engagement.
- Division of Marketing plan implemented to enhance information in course materials (especially OCBs) (2011 onwards).
- Implementation of a revised OES (2011 - 2012).

²⁴ Refer to Recommendation 2 for further information regarding the moderation policy.

Recommendation 11

(urgent) AUQA recommends that CSU ensure that it has thoroughly addressed and implemented the recommendations in its 2008 self-review of internationalisation, particularly those relating to academic quality assurance.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration)

Reporting Responsibility: Dean, Faculty of Business; and
Director, Office of International Relations

Context

An internal self-review of internationalisation at CSU was undertaken in early 2008, with the final report released in August 2008. The review identified 42 actions that the University should address to enhance the quality assurance of its internationalisation activities. At the time of the audit on October 2009, 19 of these actions had been resolved, 14 had significant progress made and 9 had little progress made towards resolution.

The 2009 CSU AUQA Audit Report referred to the internationalisation self-review throughout the body of the report, in particular:

- *'AUQA finds that the University has acted quickly to implement many of the improvements suggested by the self-review, but is concerned by the lack of attention by CSU in the period since 2004 to maintaining quality assurance arrangements to safeguard the integrity of its academic programs. AUQA recommends that the University ensure it has fully implemented the recommendations from its self-review.*
- *The University has acted quickly to make many of the improvements suggested in the self-review, including implementation of a transnational education program reporting and review policy, and the reallocation of quality assurance responsibilities for administrative services delivery at partner operations from faculties to administrative divisions. Administrative manuals are being prepared for all partnerships. Some other improvements that are being implemented by CSU are mentioned in section 4.4, together with recommendations for additional improvements.*
- *AUQA congratulates CSU for undertaking a comprehensive self-review and for making this review available to the Audit Panel. The findings of the self-review caused the Audit Panel to consider closely whether CSU could now be regarded as compliant with that part of National Protocol D4 for universities that requires them to demonstrate, among other things, quality assurance processes which ensure the integrity of the institution's academic programs. Given the improvements made by CSU since 2008 and ongoing action, the Audit Panel decided that CSU should be regarded as compliant but that the governing body should satisfy itself that the self-review recommendations had been fully addressed.*
- *The University's 2008 self-review of internationalisation revealed a lack of thorough and systematic quality assurance in the period since 2004 for many elements of internationalisation, including offshore and onshore partnerships. Although the University has begun to address many of these matters, AUQA makes several recommendations and affirmations for further improvements to academic quality assurance processes in respect of partnerships, which should become standard practice at CSU.'*

University Comment

Following the release of the AUQA Audit Report, work has continued systematically on addressing issues identified in the self review. Areas of duplication with regard to the recommendations of the Audit Report and outstanding recommendations from the self-review were apparent. These particularly relate to academic quality assurance – Recommendations 12 and 13.

Further, as it has been over two years since the self-review was undertaken, it has been necessary to reconsider and assess some actions from the self-review in light of the University's current context.

Actions to Date

At the time of this Progress Report thirty-two of the original forty-two actions have been closed, eight have significant progress made towards completion and two are planned for resolution by early 2011. Five of the eight open actions will be closed upon release of the course and operations manuals in session one, 2011.²⁵

The attached action list provides the status of each action from the internationalisation self-review.

Actions of note:

- CSU reviewed the role and responsibilities of the Head of School, ISBP in 2010. As a result, academic quality assurance and quality engagement with partner institutions and their staff have been strengthened.
- There has been significant improvement in the engagement between CSU with teaching partners to build relationships and to quality assure service delivery. Evidence of this can be seen from the improvements in the second cycle of annual reviews which have been completed in 2010 for the majority of partners.
- The second cycle of annual reviews has been undertaken and has reinforced the value of the review framework in enhancing the quality assurance of partnership delivery programs.
- In February 2009, CSU entered into phase-out with its partner in Malaysia, HUC. A detailed annual review of the HELP Graduate Schools has occurred in October 2010.

Further Proposed Actions

- The course and operations manuals are in final drafts and will be in place for the commencement of session one, 2011.
- The development of moderation standards and strengthening the moderation process for partnership programs²⁶ will continue, led by the Head of School, ISBP.

²⁵ See Appendix 1 for AUQA 2009 Internationalisation Self-Review Action Sheet.

²⁶ Refer to Affirmation 2 for further information.

- CSU is currently considering the need for another internationalisation review at the end of 2011 as part of its commitment to continuous improvement in internationalisation activities. This may be undertaken by an independent or external consultant.

Recommendation 12

AUQA recommends that CSU review the responsibilities within the Faculty of Business for academic quality assurance of offshore teaching partnerships to ensure the use of objective and evidence-based processes.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Reporting Responsibility: Acting Dean, Faculty of Business

Context

The Faculty of Business teaches some of its courses through offshore partners and therefore carries much of the responsibility for academic quality assurance. As a consequence of the recent restructure of the Faculty of Business, the ISBP is now responsible for a significant part of the administrative function for teaching partners.

However, the Audit Panel felt that, although *'the restructure may have assisted in better coordination between academic requirements and course administration, the Audit Panel considers the current structural arrangements do not facilitate sound academic quality assurance for offshore programs.'*

The Audit Panel further stated that:

- The demarcation of responsibilities between the staff of the ISBP and the other parts of the Faculty is not clear, and not well-documented.
- Staff of the ISBP may not understand what constitutes sound academic or administrative quality assurance processes. Therefore the Audit Panel *'considers that ISBP may find it difficult to work productively with OIR to identify risks or gaps in current practices.'*
- The University should move to *'an evidence-based system of checks and balances to ensure appropriate objective quality assurance for its teaching partners. This is likely to involve a different structure of responsibilities within the Faculty of Business, as well as some changes in processes.'*

The Audit Panel also expressed some serious concerns about the administrative and academic arrangements relating to one offshore partner, HUC.

University Comment

The University has established several important teaching partnerships both onshore and offshore, and acknowledges the essential need to put in place sound quality assurance structures and processes. Since the AUQA Audit, there have been changes to University and Faculty processes, a stronger demarcation of the roles and responsibilities, and enhanced reporting and review mechanisms have been implemented. Further changes within the Faculty are in train as a result of a recent comprehensive review of the offshore partnerships.

Further, the University is developing a new moderation policy which will improve quality assurance processes especially in relation to assessment and the oversight of learning materials that are provided to students studying in all teaching partners.

Actions to Date

- CSU has reviewed the role and responsibilities of the Head of School, ISBP. As a result there has been a strengthening of academic quality assurance and engagement with partners and their staff.
- The Faculty of Business has introduced systematic reviews of approved credit pathways at partner institutions to ensure that the credit package provided in the agreement with the institution are current and they continue to meet the academic standards initially assessed by CSU. It is known as the Credit - Quality Control Audit process and has been implemented at the CSU Study Centres and at HUC (as part of the annual review cycle for that partner). The process is being rolled out to all teaching partners. Reports from this process are submitted to the Dean, Faculty of Business and the teaching partners. Reports will be presented to the Faculty Board, the partners and to Academic Senate (2010 onwards).
- The Faculty of Business commissioned a report on AUQA Recommendation 12, and the Acting Dean signed off on all but one of the resulting ten recommendations at the end of November 2010. The one recommendation that was deferred related to possible structural options, and that has been held over for consideration by the incoming Dean in 2011. The recommendations include the clarification of the roles and responsibilities of relevant staff in the Faculty in relation to administrative and communications' functions, academic management (assessment, moderation, grading, and oversight of quality assurance), the nature of reporting on student performances at each partner, as well as other arrangements applying to offshore teaching partners. Key recommendations included:
 - Developing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Faculty, the ISBP and other Schools of the Faculty. The MOU will contain an overarching set of principles and will:
 - Cover all teaching partners, with particular emphasis on offshore partners;
 - Clearly identify the broad responsibilities, expectations and accountabilities of all parties within the Faculty, especially in relation to the responsibilities for the moderation of assessment tasks;
 - Provide for induction programs for staff; and
 - Include protocols for staff so that they understand their roles and responsibilities when visiting partners, clarifying the nature of any discussions they may conduct with partners.
 - Compiling academic operations manuals for each offshore partner and a brief information sheet for staff for each offshore partner, using the approach recently implemented for the Sydney Study Centre.
 - Establishing an Academic Management Committee (AMC) for each offshore partner, with terms of reference similar to those of the AMC for the Study Centre. It was proposed that each AMC be convened and chaired by the Head of School, ISBP, and the meetings should include (where possible) relevant staff of the offshore teaching partner. By 2011 Academic Management

Committees had been established for all partners, with the exception of CSU's Chinese partners. These will be set up at the appropriate time in 2011, and in conjunction with re-negotiation of the Chinese agreements.

- Establishing improved intra-Faculty reporting and consultation processes.
- Producing an annual Faculty 'status and performance' report that reviews the activities of all offshore partners. The report will show brief facts on each partner (locations and courses offered, assessment and moderation management processes, enrolments), as well as key academic indicators (grade distributions, GPAs and progression rates). Action plans emanating from an analysis of this annual report will be linked to the Faculty's strategic directions and plans.
- Introducing regular student experience questionnaires for courses and subjects at each partner. The results of the surveys will be analysed formally by the relevant Heads of School and Course Managers and the outcomes of the analysis should be presented to Faculty Board (through the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee).
- Conducting regular (at least annual) comprehensive financial and risk analyses of all teaching partners.
- Pursuing actions that will enhance collegial working relationships with the staff of partners and builds capacity in learning and teaching and research, and results in a 'team approach' to assessment and the design of learning and teaching materials.

The report also contains a discussion of the structural options available to the Faculty and recommends that the Faculty should debate which option will enhance the effective management of its teaching partnerships. When implemented, these actions will help to establish clearer responsibilities and better reporting on the partners' compliance with policies and processes. They will also assist in identifying gaps in policies and procedures (2010 onwards).

- The Acting Dean, Faculty of Business wrote to HUC outlining the Faculty's concerns about the AUQA Audit Report issues. The Director, OIR and the Head of School, ISBP travelled to HUC in early September 2010 to discuss the issues (and other matters of relevance to the contract and the ongoing quality assurance mechanisms). The annual review of the partnership was also conducted during the visit. A follow-up meeting was held in late October/November 2010. Outcomes of this process include:
 - More regular meetings to discuss operational matters;
 - Greater interaction between staff, especially academics; sharing of information and staff discussion of possible actions to improve student performances;
 - Improved oversight of HUC's undergraduate and postgraduate pathway programs; and
 - The development of an operations manual for all courses (undergraduate and postgraduate) outlining clearly the roles and responsibilities of CSU and HUC staff, as well as the rules and processes that both parties will follow for students.
- A revised CSU annual review process for all teaching partners (2010).

- The drafting of a new University-wide moderation policy (2010 onwards).

Further Proposed Actions

- The Faculty of Business commissioned a report on AUQA Recommendation 12, and the one recommendation that was deferred related to possible structural options. This recommendation will be considered by the incoming Dean (2011).
- Roll-out of the Credit - Quality Control Audit process for all partners (2011 onwards).
- Further monitoring of the quality assurance processes for HUC (2011 onwards).

Recommendation 13

AUQA recommends that CSU use an independent review process, involving academics outside the Faculty of Business or external to the University, to review the effectiveness of academic quality assurance for the Faculty's offshore and onshore teaching partnerships.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

Reporting Responsibility: Acting Dean, Faculty of Business

Context

The University reviews regularly the administration arrangements and the academic quality assurance aspects of teaching partnerships, both onshore and offshore. However, the Audit Panel observed that *'there is often no separation between the reviewers and those who are responsible for academic management of the courses.'*

The Audit Panel considers that a more *'credible and thorough'* approach to reviewing teaching partnerships of the Faculty of Business should be developed. This should involve academic reviewers who are external to the Faculty or to the University *'with experience in the academic quality assurance of teaching partnerships.'*

In this way, reports on the quality assurance aspects of the Faculty's partnerships would be considered as impartial, objective and independent.

University Comment

The University, through the OIR and the ISBP, has renewed its processes for conducting annual reviews of teaching partners and this involves all administrative and academic features of the arrangements. The Director, OIR and the Head of the School, ISBP now conduct the annual reviews together with the senior executive of each of the teaching partners. Detailed reports are prepared along with action timeframes and responsibilities.

The Faculty of Business is also developing operations manuals for each partner and conducts regular meetings with staff of the Faculty and the partners. The Faculty also conducts audits of credit granted by each partner.

The University acknowledges the importance of a regular independent analysis of the quality assurance processes for all of its teaching partnerships. These reviews will be undertaken by experienced academic staff from outside the Faculty or the University.

Actions to Date

- The Credit - Quality Control Audit process has been implemented at the CSU Study Centres and HUC (2010 onwards)²⁷.

²⁷ Refer to Recommendation 12 for further information on the Credit - Quality Control Audit process.

- The Faculty of Business has commissioned a report on AUQA Recommendation 12 (2010 onwards)²⁸.
- The Faculty has appointed an experienced senior academic manager from outside the University to undertake the independent review of quality assurance processes of all teaching partners of the Faculty of Business. The external consultant is an ex-DVC (Academic) and former Dean of Faculties of Business and Commerce at NSW and Queensland universities. The consultant has already reviewed all teaching partnership arrangements and is familiar with the academic models and the administrative approaches used at all the Faculty partnerships.

Further Proposed Actions

- The external consultant will report to the Faculty by February 2011.
- The process of independent reviews of academic quality assurance processes of teaching partners will be ongoing (2011 onwards).

²⁸ Refer to Recommendation 12, second bullet under Actions to Date, for further information on the commissioned report.

Recommendation 14

AUQA recommends that CSU develop a policy on dual awards and that pathways for students to obtain dual awards should be noted in agreements with teaching partners and approved by Academic Senate.

Accountability: Presiding Officer, Academic Senate

Reporting Responsibility: Academic Secretary

Context

The AUQA Audit Panel observed that the University does not have a policy on 'dual awards', where a student, upon graduation, may receive two awards for '*common elements of study undertaken through CSU and another institution*'. This issue is particularly relevant because the University has overseas teaching partnerships where the contractual arrangements include the possibility of students receiving dual awards.

Consequently, the Audit Report recommended that Academic Senate needs to give explicit recognition of the circumstances where dual awards will be granted. Specific contracts with partners and others need to identify any pathways leading to dual awards that can be awarded, once they have been approved by Academic Senate.

University Comment

The University will continue to foster and develop collaborative teaching and research arrangements with reputable offshore and onshore partners, and recognises that various types of policies will be required to facilitate and oversee these arrangements.

Since 2001, the University has operated under a policy which was (until recently) entitled *Content and Design of Testamurs for CSU Awards and Other Awards in which CSU has an Interest*. Since it was first approved by Academic Senate, the policy has been revised and amended on several occasions. This policy covers:

- A CSU award where some of the units are taught by a third party;
- A CSU award offered through another body and/or in cooperation with another body;
- A joint award of CSU and another university or body; an award conferred by CSU as part of an 'integrated program' with another award-conferring institution that also may confer an award with its own testamur; and
- An award conferred by another body and in which CSU has an academic involvement in the course.

The policy includes details of the responsibilities within CSU for the quality assurance processes, and the circumstances for including relevant parties on the official University testamurs of graduating students.

A 'dual award' is one where, after the successful completion of a course of study involving subjects and common elements of study offered by both CSU and another institution, the

student receives two testamurs – one from CSU and one from the other institution. The course of study may be concurrent or sequential.

Actions to Date

- The Academic Secretary has reviewed:
 - The content of the policy (especially the wording of the ‘integrated program’ section) to ensure that it covers dual awards; and
 - The wording of existing contracts with teaching partners to ascertain the extent of dual award arrangements.

The AUQA recommendation has been addressed (2010).

- The policy entitled *Content and Design of Testamurs for CSU Awards and Other Awards in which CSU has an Interest* has been amended; its name has been changed; ‘dual awards’ have been defined and the policy now specifically mentions the conditions under which ‘dual awards’ can be approved (AS 10/78). The policy is now named *Awards Involving Third Parties* (published at Part L16.1 of the Academic Manual) and the recognition of ‘dual awards’ has been included in Category D: *An Award Conferred by CSU as part of an Integrated Program with Another Award-Conferring Institution*.

Further Proposed Actions

- The Academic Secretary will oversee the examination of the existing and proposed contracts with partners to ensure that they identify any pathways leading to dual awards and that they state clearly the implications for CSU testamurs (2010 onwards).
- As in the past, Academic Senate will approve arrangements with teaching partners. In future, if the University expands its range of integrated programs, the policy will be amended to cover these new arrangements (2011 onwards).
- Changes to University policy will take into consideration any relevant revisions to the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF).

Recommendation 15

AUQA recommends CSU undertake further planning to ensure it is able to provide support and a sense of intellectual community for all international and domestic higher degree by research students.

Accountability: Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research); and
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Administration)

Reporting Responsibility: Director, Student Experience Program; and
DVC (Research), Centre for Research and Graduate Training

Context

The Audit Panel noted that, in relation to Higher Degree Research (HDR) students: *'there are some inconsistencies in the allocation of space and resources, and some students express concern over a lack of technical support for science-based studies or a lack of valuing of research over teaching requirements. Collegial networks and good supervisor support were reported by specific groups of research students, yet others do not have these networks or know how to access them, and for some students there is a clear risk of physical and academic isolation.*

Many international research students indicated that they find library resources to be inadequate or not able to be provided in a timely fashion. In a number of instances, students use 'work arounds' to ensure they have access to the material they need. Research students are concentrated in particular areas at CSU, including University research centres and students working with supervisors in new discipline areas, but not all fields have an established group of research students. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that some research students may feel isolated or feel that resources are made available to them in an ad hoc manner.'

AUQA encouraged CSU *'to undertake further planning to better meet the needs of its research students, given the specific circumstances in which these students are undertaking their research programs.'*

University Comment

The University, the Centre for Graduate Research and Training (CGRT), University support areas and faculties are committed to supporting HDR students by providing the best possible academic supervision, learning resources, essential infrastructure and support for their research activities. The University endeavours to ensure that HDR students meet and communicate with staff and other HDR students with similar research interests.

Since the visit of the AUQA Audit Panel the University has commenced a restructure of CRGT. The aim of this review has been to realign research and research training administrative processes that support staff and students at the University. The new research office will have an emphasis on cross-skilling of team members and an overt component of liaison in all job roles. This means that there will be a team of people supporting HDR students. In 2011 this new structure and team will review policies relating to research and

research training with a view to streamlining and enhancing a facilitative supportive environment for students.

The University provides ~~offers~~ HDR students with access to basic infrastructure such as computing, photocopying and telecommunications facilities. The University aims to ensure that all HDR candidates have access to facilities including workspace and a computer with email and internet access.

HDR students are also offered:

- Targeted workshops to support their research progress and to facilitate peer interaction and support;
- Quality research supervision and mentoring support;
- Opportunities for social contact to assist their involvement in the broader research culture;
- Opportunities to be linked with the research centres which represent areas of strength and focus;
- Financial assistance;
- Access to the Library Liaison Services²⁹ where Faculty Liaison Librarians provide support in locating resources for research;
- Access to the Quantitative Consulting Unit³⁰ which assists in providing mathematical, statistical and information technology support; and
- Access to the Spatial Analysis Unit (SPAN)³¹ which coordinates research, consultancy and training in image processing, remote sensing, airborne videography, geographic information systems and related spatial data processing technologies.

Actions to Date

CRGT Initiatives

- Establishment of a HDR Interact site which includes announcements, forum discussions and chat room.
- An 'opting in' process for students who want to directly contact and maintain discussions with fellow students.
- HDR induction workshops (some sessions developed to explicitly establish links and connections).
- Scholarship-funded HDR students can use part of their maintenance allowance to attend conferences to garner a sense of the wider academic community.

²⁹ Information on Faculty Liaison Services is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/research/faculty/>.

³⁰ Information on the Quantitative Consulting Unit is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/faculty/business/qcu/>.

³¹ Information on SPAN is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/research/span/>.

The first three bullet points above were developed in response to feedback from International HDR students.

Division of Library Services

- Access to all online services and support anytime, anywhere through the library website³².
- Access to the Faculty Liaison Services where Faculty Liaison Librarians provide support to researchers and postgraduate students in locating resources for research, tailored training and off-campus support.
- Online orientation resources for researchers new to CSU³³.
- Free document delivery services through Free Interlibrary Loans Service (FRILLS)³⁴.
- Special services for DE postgraduate students onshore and offshore, including loans' services³⁵.
- Access to Researcher's Rooms on-campus in the Learning Commons. These are already available at Albury-Wodonga and Orange and will be available at Bathurst and Wagga Wagga when the Learning Commons building refurbishment is complete in 2011. These Rooms are designed to complement University facilities for HDR students by providing a secure space for social interaction, research and writing.
- Advice and support for matters relating to Excellence in Research Australia (ERA)³⁶, including the institutional repository CSU Research Output (CRO) and journal impact factors, citations and research publishing.
- Lending made available to DE students located offshore.
- Email request of physical collection materials to the research node at Wagga Wagga (pilot this year for Veterinary Science). Students make their request via email, with delivery and return via internal mail. If the pilot works, it will be extended to all research staff and students.

Student Central

- Student Central is available for HDR students in each Learning Commons, and via a range of electronic channels.

³² The CSU Library homepage is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/>.

³³ Researcher's Checklist is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/research/researchers-checklist.html>.

³⁴ Information on FRILLS is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/research/ill/frills.html>.

³⁵ Information on such services is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/how-to/info-for/students/deup.html>.

³⁶ Information relating to ERA is available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/division/library/research/faculty/era.html>.

Faculty Initiatives

- All faculties encourage HDR students to present their research at Doctoral Workshops, as well as in school-based seminar series.
- Faculties have appointed Sub-Deans for Research, Graduate Studies and Honours students. They can thus provide a high level of personal contact to students who are in need of help or information.
- Most Schools have a Research Student Coordinator who conducts inductions for commencing students.
- International students based in Europe (mainly undertaking CSU DBA) are encouraged to present their research at the workshops organised in Switzerland. At least once per annum, the Faculty's Associate Dean (Research) works with student cohorts in Switzerland and Germany delivering workshops on academic writing, qualitative data capture and analysis, developing arguments and building a research framework. Each student presents their work completed during the year with a full discussion of their achievements and past and future challenges. The Associate Dean (Research) also undertakes a number of one-on-one appointments with the students and works through full drafts of individual theses to ensure they are ready for submission. These sessions and support are deemed to be extremely helpful and motivational by all the students.
- There are five research centres with the majority of staff coming from the Faculty of Science. Each centre has its own seminar program and HDR students located in Centres are expected to present their research to the Centre staff. The Centres are: EH Graham Centre for Agricultural Innovation, Institute for Land Water and Society, National Wine and Grape Industry Centre, Centre for Inland Health, and International Centre of WATER for Food Security. Each Centre also offers a collegial home for research students and some Centres have funding available to support students with conference travel and operating costs of projects.
- Technical support is provided to HDR students in Science in the form of advice, maintenance and servicing of instrumentation and equipment in specialist areas, worksites in laboratories, assistance with purchasing consumables, and OH&S management.
- The Faculty of Education has a dedicated Faculty Research and Graduate Studies Office, with experienced staff who have the time/resources to develop personal relationships with students. This is one of the most important strategies for engaging students and making them feel part of a research community that cares about and supports them (not only throughout their candidature, but also when they are enrolling and when they are graduating).
- Where possible, all HDR students are linked with a Faculty research priority area so that they have a 'ready-made' community of researchers with similar interests.

- A *Graduate Studies Bulletin*³⁷ is sent via email on a fortnightly basis to all HDR students in Education; it informs them of current events, scholarships, tips and provides some stress releasing humour.
- The establishment of campus-based meetings of student cohorts (e.g. the Bathurst cohort meet regularly to support each other).
- Faculties provide strategic funding for staff doing PhDs.
- All DE HDR students in the Faculty of Arts, including international offshore students, are required to visit a campus of the University at least once during their candidature. Ideally, this is the campus on which their supervisor is located or where their discipline is concentrated. During the visit, students are required to present and defend their research proposal at a colloquium. While the main aim of the visit is to ensure that the student's proposed research is appropriate, it also provides the student with an opportunity for more concentrated engagement with their supervisor and the opportunity to be immersed in an academic milieu for a period of time, albeit short.
- The Faculty of Arts is currently developing a strategic plan on increasing HDR student numbers and an integral part of that plan will be how to better support students and hence enhance the completion rate.

The Student Experience Program

The Student Communications Coordinator commenced in August 2010, and is currently working on the needs of HDR students.

Further Proposed Actions

- The Student Communications Coordinator will work with CRGT to help develop the *HDR Communication and Engagement Plan* by the end of 2010.
- Master Planning for CSU campuses will include consideration of the provision of suitable postgraduate accommodation on each campus (2011 onwards).
- The University has provided \$1 million additional funding in each of the next three years for library collection development in priority research areas. These funds will be allocated in consultation with the Office of the DVC (Research) (2011 – 2013).
- The Library is addressing the issue of support for HDR students located offshore where internet access is not adequate to access the full range of online support services offered (2011 onwards).
- Additional Faculty Liaison Librarian in Wagga for increased support at that research-intensive campus, and a Library Officer at the Dubbo Campus providing onsite support and document delivery services, with backup from the Faculty Liaison team member at Orange (2011 onwards).

³⁷ Bulletins are available at: <http://www.csu.edu.au/faculty/educat/research/bulletins/graduate-studies-bulletins.htm>.

- Faculties will provide advice to HDR students on the technical and other support services available to them (2011 onwards).

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: AUQA 2009 Internationalisation Self-Review Action Sheet

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	1	Review IES to include definition of 'internationalisation' – what does it mean in the CSU context? Consideration in the development of the definition should be given to external reference points such as the OECD.	CSU definition of internationalisation agreed and included in the Internationalisation Strategy.
Completed	2	Review and reconfirm responsibilities for review and monitoring of IES (refer memo DVC (Academic) 13 June 2007).	Policy statement finalised and online.
Completed	3	Increase staff understanding of internationalisation at CSU: a. Promulgate international education strategy to all staff and partners to increase knowledge and understanding. b. Undertake information sessions on internationalisation during 2008 & 2009.	A range of activities has occurred on this item including presentations to the Vice-Chancellor's Forum, a workshop on partner programs with divisional staff, an internationalisation presentation to University Council. Communication of CSU Internationalisation Strategy for the 2011 - 2015 period will occur in 2011, with communication and information sessions for staff.
Completed	4	Increase staff knowledge of internationalisation at CSU: a. Undertake information sessions on internationalisation during in 2008 & 2009 to increase knowledge of responsibilities and accountabilities for internationalisation at CSU. b. Update web sites to ensure that DVCs, faculties and divisions articulate responsibilities for internationalisation.	a. Refer Action 3. b. Completed. Web sites have been updated.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	5	Review and establish standards and benchmarks for internationalisation and ensure that these are reflected in CSU strategy, policy and processes.	Policy statement finalised and online.
Completed	6	Undertake a mapping exercise to determine the courses that have international standards embedded as part of the course accreditation process.	This action is for consideration by the DI project which is addressing internationalisation of the curriculum. International accreditation and standards is one good practice example which can be included in the resources which are being generated from the DI project.
Ongoing	7	<p>The DSS has identified that it needs to implement a PIRI cycle for its international support operation. In order to do so the Division will undertake the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An understanding within the Division of CSU's current "International" mission and strategy will be prioritised; • A methodology to enable the CSU community to contribute to that strategy will be developed; • A defining statement about the roles and responsibilities relating to the support of International students will be developed; • A divisional "service catalogue" will be developed; • The service catalogue will be mapped against responsibilities; and • KPIs and a methodology for the evaluation) will be developed in order for CSU to benchmark this activity. 	Item to be discussed and reviewed with DSS in early 2011.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Ongoing	8	Develop purpose and philosophy statements for all existing programs including MOU's, TNE and Student Mobility, and test for alignment with IES.	The link to CSU strategy and purpose is included in the Annual Review template for all delivery partners which OIR oversees. OIR will be undertaking a review of all non delivery international linkages to test their productivity over the past strategic period and alignment with the University Strategy 2011 - 2015. This is planned for completion by early 2011.
Completed	9	Office of International Relations to review templates for all international activity requests to ensure that they contain a statement of purpose and philosophy and reference the IES key principles.	Request for agreement form implemented which requires details on the link to the internationalisation strategy.
Ongoing	10	Finance to review the policy on 'Costing of Offshore Programs' to enable Faculties to ensure the programs they develop and deliver are at least self sustaining.	Review has not yet occurred and will be reviewed in 2011 when new Executive Director, Division of Finance appointment is made in early 2011. The costing process continues to be refined with every business case prepared. Since the self review, detailed revised costings have been undertaken for all programs. Based on sector feedback, CSU appears to be undertaking more detailed costing than occurs in some other Australian universities. An updated documented policy would be beneficial if TNE expansion is sought by faculties in the 2011 - 2015 international strategic period.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Ongoing	11	As a matter of urgency CSU must resolve the long outstanding issue of responsibility for the definition and quality assurance of non academic service delivery at partner operations and document these requirements in a project administration manual for distribution to partners.	Responsibility has now been assigned to divisional areas and they continue to work through establishing processes for effective quality assurance of services offered to CSU students by partners, and documenting this for compilation by OIR in the administration manual. There has been a significant increase in divisional to partner engagement. Representatives from a number of divisions have now met with partner staff and undertaken quality assurance reviews. Ongoing engagement by the DLS and Division of Marketing is of note and is apparent from outcomes of the second cycle of Annual Reviews. Item to be closed upon completion of administration manual.
Completed	12	Edit the IES to reflect actual partner programs in China, removing reference to TEI and including reference to 'public' institutions not only universities. Consider inclusion of more detailed reference to financial sustainability requirements.	Completed - Internationalisation Strategy updated.
Ongoing	13	Undertake an external review of CSU baseline contracts to ensure reflection of external standards and sector best practice.	A full review of CSU's baseline contracts has not yet been undertaken. Agreements continue to be reviewed and modified on as a needs basis by the CSU Legal Office.
Completed	14	The role of Academic Senate in the review and approval of agreements to be agreed.	Role has been agreed by Academic Senate and minuted in resolution AS09/04.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	15	Provide more detailed information and templates to faculties on the process for requesting contracts for international activities and access where required to existing contracts.	Policy implemented and request template available online.
Completed	16	All offshore and onshore partner programs to be under current contracts by May 2009.	All delivery programs are now under current contracts.
Completed	17	TRIM files to be reviewed for each program to ensure relevant information is contained including agreement, approval etc.	Office of International Relations has reviewed files and holds all available key documents in both TRIM and the S Drive.
Completed	18	Confirm and communicate the delegation for contract negotiation at the senior level. If negotiation is authorised at various levels within the organisation, professional development in negotiation should be considered for these staff.	The DVC (Administration) will be responsible for the contractual management, including negotiation, of onshore and offshore delivery programs and portfolio responsibility for the OIR. This is documented in the Internationalisation Responsibilities.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	19	Develop and implement a University policy for the review of offshore and onshore partner programs based on good practice.	Policy and procedure in place with partner programs being reviewed in 2009 and a second cycle of reviews undertaken in 2010. The policy and procedures was developed with reference to other Australian university programs, AEI Good Practice projects and AUQA TNE publications. The policy and process will be reviewed and refined on a regular basis by International Relations following the experiences learnt from the reviews.
Completed	20	Exit strategies to be documented for each activity TNE program and other international activities defined as high risk.	Risk registers are in place. Following further consideration, formal exit strategies for each partner will not be documented by OIR, as they often depend on the nature of the reason for removal and a 'point in time' context. CSU has undertaken a number of phase outs over past years. The exit strategy for HUC was documented and provides a framework for future phase outs if required. The phase out of HUC followed this process and has worked effectively.
Ongoing	21	Policy and process for phase out of programs to be completed.	The process flow has been mapped by OIR. In addition the contract specifies a number of phase out requirements and obligations of both parties. A policy has yet to be written to reflect the process. The policy will be based on the model applied for the HUC phase-out in 2010.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	22	Seek confirmation of MOE approval for delivery programs in China.	All MoE certificates received and stored in TRIM and International Relations S drive.
Completed	23	Ensure that Malaysian course registrations reflect the current mode of delivery and MQA requirements.	All Malaysian course registrations have been received from the MQA and MOHE, and both organisations informed of the phase out process.
Completed	24	Review template for international activity requests to ensure that host country approvals are considered.	Host country approval verification is listed as part of the annual review template.
Completed	25	Ensure all relevant host country approvals are stored in TRIM, including expiry and review dates.	All host country approvals are stored in TRIM and S drive.
Ongoing	26	Take necessary actions to ensure that CSU policies and rules are being applied to CSU students studying via onshore and offshore collaborations. Where exceptions are agreed, ensure that this is clearly communicated to students.	This item has been reviewed and discussed with partners. This is an area that requires frequent review and communication as CSU introduces or modifies policies or processes. The specific matter identified by AUQA in the report regarding charging for appeal of grade at HUC has been investigated. Clarification to HUC of CSU policy that an application for a review of a passing grade must be accompanied by the prescribed fee which is refundable should the decision be other than that the original grade stand. No fee is payable for an application for a review of a failing grade. A review of the application of CSU policy has also been undertaken in the Annual Review and actions noted. The HUC Student Handbook makes clear to students that in cases where HUC and CSU policy vary, CSU policy will always override. This item remains open until documentation in the administration and course operations manuals.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Ongoing	27	Review and reaffirm the Academic Senate policy CSU Award Courses Offered in Collaboration with a Third Party: Quality Assurance.	This policy has not yet been rewritten to reflect the transfer of responsibilities from faculty to divisions, this has however occurred in practice. The policy will be rewritten following completion of the report referred to in AUQA Recommendation 12, which will provide clarification and demarcation of the roles and responsibilities of staff in a faculty in relation to academic management (assessment, moderation, grading, and oversight of quality assurance), the nature of reporting on student performances at each partner, and protocols to apply to teaching partners. This will also assist in identifying gaps in the current policy and practice.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	28	Seek resolution of expectations, responsibilities and funding to support professional development of partner staff.	<p>Funding was provided by the DVC (Academic) and International Relations to enable specific professional development activities to occur at some partners i.e. funding to attend China annual meeting and make visit to HUC and EFI. In addition a number of partners have visited Chinese partner operations in 2010.</p> <p>A planning meeting has been held between LTS, ISBP and other stakeholders to agree and develop a model for professional development of partner staff. The FULT Online program is now available to partners and they have been informed of this. The Faculty of Business and DLTS are discussing the development of a partner symposium to be held annually at CSU, to bring partner staff and CSU staff together for professional development. Some individual professional development has been undertaken by CSU staff at partner locations HUC, HKU SPACE and EFI. The China visiting staff program is continuing.</p>
Ongoing	29	The University needs to clarify the expectations in relation to the quality assurance of the content of its learning materials, particularly in consideration of use by partner institutions.	The introduction of MSI has changed the quality assurance processes for academic content. Action will remain open until partners have documented information on the use of MSI in the course operations manual.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	30	Where procedures are used for quality assurance, the University needs to ensure that these make effective provision for due consideration and/or implementation of any recommendations from reviews.	Closing the loop of feedback or actions from moderation is improving including via the establishment of more regular academic meetings between subject conveners at CSU and partner locations. The model being expanded where possible is that which has been implemented at CSU Study Centres for the establishment of regular academic management meetings. This item is closed and moderation dealt with in Affirmation 2.
Ongoing	31	Faculties need to ensure that there is a demonstrable and effective process of quality assurance of the academic content of its learning material.	The introduction of MSI has changed the quality assurance processes for academic content. Action will remain open until partners have documented information on the use of MSI in the course operations manual.
Completed	32	Request each partner to provide copies of all current marketing materials and web site links for review and approval by CSU.	Partners have provided marketing material as requested.
Completed	33	Confirm responsibility for quality assurance of marketing aspects as per Action 11.	As per Action 11 - marketing policy and approval process for partners has been implemented by the Division of Marketing.
Completed	34	Review and approve confirmation of enrolment letters that are provided to students by RCF partners to ensure they are consistent with CSU's requirements.	DSA has been provided and reviewed enrolment letters used by RCF partners.
Completed	35	Academic Senate to undertake a thorough review of section 5.6 of the admission regulations English language proficiency.	Academic Senate reviewed the English language proficiency component of the admission regulation at its 25 January 2009 meeting. Refer resolution AS 09/23.

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	36	Confirm responsibility for quality assurance of admissions as per Action 11.	As per Action 11 with regard to policy and procedures being documented.
Ongoing	37	Define the minimum services for pastoral and student support that is required by partner programs.	A service catalogue has been developed by DSS. An assessment of partner provision of services against this catalogue has occurred across partners. The item will remain open until all partner service provision is mapped against the catalogue and processes/requirements are documented in administration manual.
Completed	38	Undertake a review of pastoral support provided by partners to assess the pastoral support provided against CSU's minimum requirements, identify gaps and identify specific program needs.	The DSS has visited all partners to undertake a review of service provision against its service catalogue.
Completed	39	Confirm CSU's position on the importance of establishing a strong teaching-research nexus between its home campuses and offshore and onshore partners.	CSU wishes wherever possible to establish a teaching-research nexus at locations where its courses are delivered. This is occurring in some locations such as China, and has potential to expand at CSU Study Centres with the appointment of a senior CSU academic in 2011. This action is now embedded in the CSU Internationalisation Strategy objective three, Action 18. <i>'Engage international partner staff in collaborative research and doctoral supervision.'</i>

Status	Action Number	Action Description	Progress Update
Completed	40	Develop and implement strategies for improved participation in CSU online evaluation process.	Strategies have been agreed and implemented for EFI, HUC, HKU SPACE and Chinese partners. This item is reviewed as part of the Annual Review process to ensure an evaluation mechanism is implemented. Alternate methods of collecting evaluation information have been introduced if required, for example a paper based evaluation in Cambodia and use of a modified partner evaluation to include CSU core items.
Completed	41	Confirm and document the contractual management process that is in place for international research activities.	Office of International Relations now prepares and holds agreements for linkages with international institutions requested by Research Centres. This is documented in the Policy for the Establishment of Agreements with Overseas Institutions
Completed	42	Consider systematic reporting of attrition and progression across international cohorts to enable identification of issues and comparison to domestic cohorts.	Systematic and detailed reporting of progression across cohorts is occurring through UCPC (refer report item: 5.4 UCPC date: 12.8.09 and UCPC 4.08.10). During the 2010 Annual Review meetings the ISBP also presented data to partners on grade distribution. This will become a regular item of reporting in the Annual Review meeting with partners from 2011 onward.

Acronyms

ACPR	Annual Course Performance Report
ALTC	Australian Learning and Teaching Council
AMC	Academic Management Committee
APC	Academic Programs Committee
AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework
ARC	Audit and Risk Committee
AUQA	Australian Universities Quality Agency
AUSSE	Australasian Survey of Student Engagement
BFL	Blended and Flexible Learning
CAPPE	Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics
CASIMS	Course and Subject Information Management System
CEQ	Course Experience Questionnaire
CRGT	Centre for Research and Graduate Training
CRO	CSU Institutional Repository
CSU	Charles Sturt University
DE	Distance Education
DI	Degree Initiative (also referred to as the CSU Degree Initiative)
DLS	Division of Library Services
DLTS	Division of Learning and Teaching Services
DSA	Division of Student Administration
DSS	Division of Student Services
DVC	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
EFPI	Education for Practice Institute
ERA	Excellence in Research for Australia
FEN	Fieldwork Education Network
FLI	The Flexible Learning Institute
FRILLS	Free Interlibrary Loan Service

FULT	Foundations of University Learning and Teaching
GAs	Graduate Attributes
GPGs	Good Practice Guidelines
HDR	Higher Degree Research
HEPPP	Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program
HUC	HELP University College
IES	Indigenous Education Strategy
ILSC	Information Learning Systems Committee
ISBP	International School of Business and Partnerships
IT	Information Technology
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSI	Mandatory Subject Information
OCBs	Online Course Brochures
OES	Online Evaluation of Subjects
OIR	Office of International Relations
OLE	Online Learning Environment
PBE	Practice-Based Education
P&PBE	Professional and Practice-Based Education
RCF	Remote Campus Form
RIPPLE	Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education
SEC	Senior Executive Committee
SEP	Student Experience Program
SEQ	Student Experience Questionnaire
SES	Socio-Economic Status
SGA	Study Group Australia
SPAN	Spatial Analysis Unit
STAR	Student Transition and Retention
TAFE	Technical and Further Education

TEI	Tertiary Education International
UCEC	University Clinical Excellence Committee
UCPC	University Course Planning Committee
VC	Vice-Chancellor
WPL	Workplace Learning
WPLN	WPL Network