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On behalf of the AAIR 2012 Forum Organising Committee — Welcome to Terrigal, NSW! The Committee extends a special welcome to our speakers and delegates from New Zealand and further afield.

The Committee appreciates the effort you have made to attend during this busy time of year and given the budget constraints our institutions are facing. We trust your decision to participate in the Forum will be rewarded with a program that connects with the challenges you face and provides you with insights you can apply when you get back to work.

Last year we gathered on the Gold Coast in QLD with the theme of “Let the Sunshine In”. This year’s Organising Committee decided to extend that theme by letting light in on the way we design the Forum program. As a result we have incorporated some new elements into this year’s Forum:

- A welcome session for presenters new to AAIR
- A plenary discussion with a panel after each keynote address
- Grouping parallel sessions around eight themes
- Offering the option of workshop mode for parallel sessions
- Launching two new Special Interest Groups (SIGs) - ‘Quality and Risk’ as well as ‘Surveys and Evaluation’
- A plenary report back from the chairs of each SIG
- An opportunity for delegates to provide online feedback on parallel sessions.

The Committee members and I will be keen to know what you think about these innovations. We will give you an opportunity to provide anonymous feedback at the close of the Forum. However, please feel free to communicate your thoughts directly to me or another Committee member while we are here.

The core elements of our annual Forum are the keynote addresses and the parallel sessions. This year we are fortunate to be joined by Commissioner Michael Beaton Wells from TEQSA, Dr Victor Borden from Indiana University Bloomington, United States and Phil Augles from DISRTE as our keynote speakers. We are also fortunate to have a packed program including 30 parallel sessions. As a conference run for practitioners, by practitioners, it is a great sign for AAIR that the Committee had no trouble filling the program with quality presentations and workshops.

Naturally the program provides many opportunities for you to connect with colleagues. I hope to see many of you at our Forum dinner on Tuesday evening at Reef Restaurant, Terrigal.

This year’s Forum would not be possible without the generous support of our corporate and University sponsors. I would like to thank eXplorance, Graduate Careers Australia, Altis and Tableau Software as well as the University of Newcastle, Griffith University and the University of Western Sydney. Finally, I would like to extend a special thank you to our partners, Leishman Associates for their longstanding support of the Forum.

Martin Hanlon
Chair, 2012 Forum Organising Committee
# PROGRAM

**SUNDAY 11 NOVEMBER 2012 – CROWNE PLAZA TERRIGAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600-2000</td>
<td>Forum Registration Opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800-2000</td>
<td>Welcome Drinks and Canapés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900-2000</td>
<td>New Presenters briefing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MONDAY 12 NOVEMBER 2012 – CROWNE PLAZA TERRIGAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800-1700</td>
<td>Registration Desk Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-0910</td>
<td>Opening Comments: Martin Hanlon, 2012 Forum Chair, University of Technology Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0910-0915</td>
<td>Official Welcome: Dave Marr, Acting AAIR President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915-0920</td>
<td>Welcome to Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0920-0930</td>
<td>Day One Opening: Associate Professor Anne Young, University of Newcastle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0930-1030</td>
<td>Keynote Speakers: Commissioner Mr Michael Beaton-Wells, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1030-1100</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: How is the existence of TEQSA changing how planning and quality units in Australian institutions operate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1130</td>
<td>Morning Refreshments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USING STUDENT & STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK**

| Session 1.1 | Perception is Reality
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Dutschke, American University of Sharjah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1.2</th>
<th>Disruptive Innovation in Higher Education - What is it and how does it impact on our planning?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Young, University Of Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVOLUTION OF IR PRACTICE & USE OF IR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2.1</th>
<th>Approaches to using qualitative and quantitative data to make effective change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Kirby, University Of Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2.2</th>
<th>Institutional Research, Scholarly Articles and Individual Knowledge: A Balancing Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Dunk, Australian College Of Theology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 2.3</th>
<th>Feeding hunger for meaningful data in the new regulatory framework: dashboard solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lyndal Ross, The University Of Queensland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3.1</th>
<th>Exploring the applicability of maturity models to assess maturity of IR practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Hanlon, University Of Technology Sydney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3.2</th>
<th>Using Palo to Tame the Excel Chaos – A collaborative Approach to Student Load Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Laverde, Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY & PROMOTING BI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 1.3</th>
<th>Developing an implementing an approach to research &amp; PG activity reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dorje McKinnon, Lincoln University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPROACHES TO ADMISSIONS & LOAD MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3.1</th>
<th>Utilising Benchmarking to Inform Institutional Decision Making at the Institutional Level: A Research Informed Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara Booth, University Of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 3.2</th>
<th>An evaluation of undergraduate course (unit) enrolment projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ian Robinson, University Of Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 4.1</th>
<th>Exploring the applicability of maturity models to assess maturity of IR practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Hanlon, University Of Technology Sydney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 4.2</th>
<th>Session 4.2 Using Palo to Tame the Excel Chaos – A collaborative Approach to Student Load Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan Laverde, Macquarie University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session Details</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Special Interest Group</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Special Interest Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-1530</td>
<td>Afternoon Refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>USING STUDENT &amp; STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quality and Risk Management SIG</td>
<td></td>
<td>Datawarehouse/Business Intelligence SIG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1530-1600</td>
<td><strong>Session 5.1</strong> When the stars align: enhancing AGS outcomes at CQUniversity</td>
<td>Henry Kendall Ballroom</td>
<td>1530 – 1720, 1 hour 50 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>1530 – 1720, 1 hour 50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jo Miller, CQUniversity</td>
<td>Wamberal</td>
<td>Inaugural Chair: Anne Young, University of Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caretaker Co-Chairs: Michael Rothery, University of Technology Sydney, Andrew Bradshaw, Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1610-1640</td>
<td><strong>Session 6.1</strong> Monitoring &amp; improving University Experience of Commencing Student Cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion topics include:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion topics include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Leonid Grebennikov, University of Western Sydney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Is there a gap left by AUQF that AAIR can fill?</td>
<td></td>
<td>How mature are business intelligence solutions in Australasia? (eg. are we pushing beyond reporting into meaningful predictive analytics or is it just talk?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1650-1720</td>
<td><strong>Session 7.1</strong> Understanding, Analysing, and Summarising Likert Response Structures</td>
<td></td>
<td>As practitioners how do we respond to TEQSA's regulatory risk framework?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Are they all being developed in the context of overarching information strategies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David De Bellis, Flinders University</td>
<td></td>
<td>How can we strengthen information sharing between directors/managers of planning/reporting/IR/quality units across Australasia?</td>
<td></td>
<td>What actual decision making are we supporting with our business intelligence solutions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Free evening for delegates – see Registration Desk for group dinner bookings (eg. by university group/network)

---

### THEME COLOUR KEY:

- **Collecting, Reporting and Using Student and Stakeholder Feedback**
- **Critiquing Evolution of IR Practice and Promoting Business Intelligence**
- **Leveraging Innovative Approaches to Student Admissions and Load Management**
- **Linking and Exploiting Institutional Data Collections**
- **Undertaking Student Retention Studies and Predictive Modelling**
- **Supporting Workforce Planning/Integrating Strategic Planning and Budgeting**
- **Developing and Reporting Key Performance Indicators**

Please note: the 2012 AAIR Forum Organising Committee reserves the right to amend or alter any advertised details relating to dates, program and speakers if necessary, without notice, as a result of circumstances beyond their control. All attempts will be made to keep any changes to a minimum.
### PROGRAM

**TUESDAY 13 NOVEMBER 2012 – CROWNE PLAZA TERRIGAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Special Interest Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800-1700</td>
<td>Registration Desk Open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-0915</td>
<td>Day Two Opening: Kathie Rabel, Victoria University of Wellington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915-1015</td>
<td>Keynote Speaker: Dr Victor Borden, Associate Vice-President and Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Indiana University, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015-1045</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: Are we making progress with student cohort tracking and retention strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045-1115</td>
<td>Morning Refreshments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVELOPING & REPORTING KPIs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Institution</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1115-1145</td>
<td>Session 8.1: Little fish in a big pond: Towards research performance metrics for smaller institutions</td>
<td>Sharon Kitt, Jonathan Wearne University of Ballarat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1155-1225</td>
<td>Session 9.1: Developing an Academic Standards Framework &amp; Online Evaluation &amp; Reporting Tool</td>
<td>Cassandra Saunders, Sara Booth, University of Tasmania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235-1305</td>
<td>Session 12.1: Assigning a SES variable to student records – a useful tool for planning, reporting &amp; IR</td>
<td>Robert McCormack, University of Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**USING STUDENT & STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Institution</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1155-1225</td>
<td>Session 8.2: Mythbusters: Exploring teaching staff beliefs about student feedback in evaluation surveys</td>
<td>Carolyn Newbigin, University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235-1305</td>
<td>Session 12.2: Student Staff Ratios: A Critique and Start of a Conversation?</td>
<td>Wendy Marchment, Deakin University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Chair/Institution</th>
<th>Discussion Topics Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1155 – 1305</td>
<td>Australian Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Jeff Holmes, QUT</td>
<td>Do funding agreements limit, define or allow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400 – 1610</td>
<td>Surveys and Evaluations SIG</td>
<td>Justine Fritsch, USQ</td>
<td>You expect to improve retention and lower attrition. Will you build that into your budget?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY & PROMOTING BI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Co-Chair/Institution</th>
<th>Discussion Topics Include</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1155-1225</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
<td>Do funding agreements limit, define or allow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1235-1305</td>
<td>Understanding Student Experience: visualising qualitative data</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
<td>You expect to improve retention and lower attrition. Will you build that into your budget?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UNDERTAKING RETENTION & MODELLING STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Institution</th>
<th>Chair/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1305-1400</td>
<td>Attrition: is it really a problem? The word out there on the streets assigning</td>
<td>David Marr &amp; Camilla Nicoll, Deakin University</td>
<td>Justine Fritsch, USQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1510</td>
<td>Assigning a SES variable to student records – a useful tool for planning, reporting &amp; IR</td>
<td>Robert McCormack, University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SURVING STRATEGIC PLANNING & BUDGETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Institution</th>
<th>Chair/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1305-1400</td>
<td>A vision for integrated planning, budgeting and reporting</td>
<td>Philippa Johnston, University of Newcastle</td>
<td>Justine Fritsch, USQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400-1510</td>
<td>Student Staff Ratios: A Critique and Start of a Conversation?</td>
<td>Wendy Marchment, Deakin University</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPLORING INSTITUTIONAL DATA COLLECTIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Speaker/Institution</th>
<th>Chair/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1400-1430</td>
<td>Surveys and Evaluations SIG</td>
<td>Justine Fritsch, USQ</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1430-1510</td>
<td>Student Staff Ratios: A Critique and Start of a Conversation?</td>
<td>Wendy Marchment, Deakin University</td>
<td>Chandrama Acharya, Macquarie University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM

1510-1540 Afternoon Refreshments

1510 – 1525 Brief 15 minute afternoon tea break for SIG attendees

1510-1540 UNDERTAKING RETENTION & MODELLING STUDIES

1510-1540 EVOLUTION OF IR PRACTICE & USE OF IR SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP

Room Henry Kendall Ballroom Wamberal

1540-1610 Session 13.1 Tracking Student Success: a comparative case study

Julie Arthur, Don Johnston, Southern Cross University
David Marr, Camilla Nicoll, Deakin University

Dick Audley, University of Technology Sydney

Session 13.2 Analysis of First Year Subjects to Determine Fitness for Purpose

1530 – 1610 Surveys and Evaluations SIG continues

How are we using M&E frameworks? (e.g. to support widening participation).

How can IR units assist other areas (e.g. equity practitioners evaluate HEPPP projects)?

1610-1625 Presentation by Forum Major Sponsor – eXplorance

1625-1705 Report back from SIG Chairs (4x10 mins)

Free time for delegates

1900-2300 Forum Dinner (including Announcement of 2013 Forum) Reef Restaurant

THEME COLOUR KEY:

COLLECTING, REPORTING AND USING STUDENT AND STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK

CRITIQUING EVOLUTION OF IR PRACTICE AND PRACTITIONERS/ BUILDING CAPACITY TO USE IR FOR DECISION MAKING

LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY AND PROMOTING BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE

EXPLORING INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND LOAD MANAGEMENT

LINKING AND EXPLOITING INSTITUTIONAL DATA COLLECTIONS

UNDERTAKING STUDENT RETENTION STUDIES AND PREDICTIVE MODELLING

SUPPORTING WORKFORCE PLANNING/ INTEGRATING STRATEGIC PLANNING AND BUDGETING

DEVELOPING AND REPORTING KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Please note: the 2012 AAIR Forum Organising Committee reserves the right to amend or alter any advertised details relating to dates, program and speakers if necessary, without notice, as a result of circumstances beyond their control. All attempts will be made to keep any changes to a minimum.
## PROGRAM

**WEDNESDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2012 – CROWNE PLAZA TERRIGAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0800-1300</td>
<td>Registration Desk Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0900-0915</td>
<td>Day Three Opening: <strong>Martin Hanlon, University of Technology Sydney</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0915-1015</td>
<td>Keynote Speaker: <strong>Mr Phil Aungles, DISRTE Higher Education Division</strong> (Topic: “The role of institutional research in higher education reform”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1015-1045</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: How are planning and quality units in Australian institutions coping with supporting the Government’s Higher education agenda?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1045-1115</td>
<td>AAIR Annual General Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1115-1145</td>
<td>Morning Refreshments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145-1215</td>
<td><strong>LEVERAGING TECHNOLOGY &amp; PROMOTING BI</strong> EXPLOITING INSTITUTIONAL DATA COLLECTIONS SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room Henry Kendall Ballroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wamberal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoca Terrigal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1145-1215</td>
<td><strong>Session 14.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian Graduate Survey Management System (AGSMS) – CQUniversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Session 14.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          | Panel data investigation into relationship between graduate job search & employment outcomes  
|          | **Government Reporting SIG**                                         |
|          | 1145 – 1255, 1 hour 10 mins                                          |
|          | Chair: **Don Johnston, Southern Cross University**                   |
|          | Discussion topics include:                                            |
|          | How are institutions building capacity to meet future government reporting needs? |
|          | How can we leverage reporting requirements for internal improvement?  |
| 1225-1255| **Session 15.1**                                                     |
|          | Disruptive BI technologies and why you should embrace them!          |
|          | **Session 15.2**                                                     |
|          | Graduate Mobility: a spatial analysis                                |
|          | **Government Reporting SIG**                                         |
|          | 1145 – 1255, 1 hour 10 mins                                          |
|          | Chair: **Don Johnston, Southern Cross University**                   |
|          | Discussion topics include:                                            |
|          | How are institutions building capacity to meet future government reporting needs? |
|          | How can we leverage reporting requirements for internal improvement?  |
| 1255-1345| Lunch                                                                |
|          | **UNDERTAKING RETENTION & MODELLING STUDIES**                       |
|          | Room Henry Kendall Ballroom                                         |
|          | Wamberal                                                             |
|          | Avoca Terrigal                                                      |
| 1345-1415| **Session 16.1**                                                     |
|          | Fuzzy Data Mining Approaches to Predicting Student Success and Retention  
|          | **REPEAT PRESENTATION OF POPULAR SESSION**                          |
|          | **REPEAT PRESENTATION OF POPULAR SESSION**                          |
| 1415-1430| Presentation of Prizes and Forum Close                               |
| 1500     | Buses Depart to Sydney                                               |
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Monday 12 November 2012
0930 – 1030

MR MICHAEL BEATON-WELLS
Commissioner, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)

Before becoming a Commissioner, Michael Beaton-Wells held senior roles in the higher education and management consulting industries. He was also a board member of the Australian National Academy of Music (ANAM).

From 2009 to 2011 Michael was Executive Director, Finance & Planning, at the University of Melbourne, where he was a member of the Senior Executive, and responsible for leading the University’s annual budget and business planning cycle, strategic risk assessments, management reporting and information stream, and major project gate reviews. He was closely involved in all aspects of higher education funding and policy reform during this time. Michael was also acting Chief Financial Officer when required, and was a key business adviser to the Finance Committee.

From 2005 to 2008 Michael was Director of University Planning at the University of Melbourne, where he was responsible for the Accountability Cycle, including the planning, reporting and quality assurance cycles of the University. Michael was closely involved in the planning and implementation of the Melbourne Model curriculum reforms, including student profile planning, financial modelling and risk analysis.

Michael has participated as a member of a number of sector national working parties, and has been a regular presenter on higher education leadership programs, such as the Master of Tertiary Education Management course.

Prior to joining the University of Melbourne, Michael spent ten years in management consulting, with particular focus on marketing-led strategy, forensic marketing and brand valuation. He is admitted to practice as a barrister and solicitor in Victoria, and is a member of the Australian Market and Social Research Society. He holds degrees in arts/economics (BA), law (LLB) and marketing (MMktg).

Tuesday 13 November 2012
0915 – 1015

DR VICTOR BORDEN
Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and Senior Advisor, Indiana University Bloomington, US

Victor (Vic) Haifleigh Borden, Ph.D. is Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Indiana University Bloomington. He is also a senior advisor to the Executive Vice President for University Regional Affairs, Planning, and Policy. Previously, Dr. Borden served as the Associate Vice President for University Planning, Institutional Research and Accountability at Indiana University (2005-2010), and in senior institutional research positions at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI, 1992-2005), George Mason University (1987-1992), and the University of Massachusetts at Amherst (1984-1987).

Dr. Borden’s general area of scholarship is on the assessment of organizational performance within higher education institutions. Within this general area, he has pursued four themes: student progress and performance; organizational performance assessment and accountability; diversity and equity within higher education; and organizational learning and development as a framework for institutional research. Dr. Borden has published over 100 articles and book chapters, secured over $1 million in research grants and contracts, consulted with over 20 institutions and organizations, internationally, served on more than a dozen national and regional research advisory panels, delivered over 40 workshops and seminars and delivered more than 150 keynote, peer-reviewed and invited presentations throughout the U.S. and in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Dr. Borden was awarded a Fulbright Specialist project and is an active contributor to several professional associations, most notably, the Association for Institutional Research, of which he is a Past President.
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Wednesday 14 November 2012
0915 – 1015

MR PHIL AUNGLES
Director of Performance Section, Higher Education Division in the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education.

Phil Aungles is the Director of the Performance Section, Higher Education Division in the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education. He leads a team responsible for Reward Funding and the development of a suite of Government endorsed measures of teaching and learning in higher education. Phil has previously worked in labour market analysis, implementation of the National Literacy and Numeracy Assessment Program (NAPLAN) and student income support.

PANEL SESSIONS
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PANEL DISCUSSION: HOW IS THE EXISTENCE OF TEQSA CHANGING HOW PLANNING AND QUALITY UNITS IN AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTIONS OPERATE?

Tuesday 13 November 2012
1015-1045

PANEL DISCUSSION: ARE WE MAKING PROGRESS WITH STUDENT COHORT TRACKING AND RETENTION STRATEGIES?

Wednesday 14 November 2012
1015-1045

PANEL DISCUSSION: HOW ARE PLANNING AND QUALITY UNITS IN AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTIONS COPING WITH SUPPORTING THE GOVERNMENT’S HIGHER EDUCATION AGENDA?
CONCURRENT SESSION 1  
Monday 12 November 2012, 1130-1200

Session 1.1  Henry Kendall Ballroom

Perception is reality

DR. CINDY DUTSCHKE, MR AHMED ABOUBAKER
American University of Sharjah, Sharjah, United Arab Emirates

Dr. Cindy Dutschke is currently Director of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning at the American University of Sharjah in the United Arab Emirates. Cindy holds a PhD in Statistics from the University of North Texas. Prior to coming to AUS, Cindy was Assistant Vice President for Institutional Studies and Texas A&M University in College Station, TX. She held that position for 11 years and has a total of 26 years experience in institutional research. Mr Ahmed Aboubaker is Associate Director off Institutional Effectiveness and Planning at AUS where he has worked for 10 years. Ahmed holds a MBA from Southeastern University in Cypress.

How many times have administrators looked at survey results and said “But that’s not the way it really is”? Well, to the survey respondents, that is the way it is! How can we change these in accurate perceptions? This presentation will discuss the use of “gap analysis” to identify areas where there is a gap between student perceptions of certain areas and the university perceptions on that same thing. The resulting analysis is then used by various offices to discuss why the students have these perceptions and how the university can bring these perceptions more in line with reality as perceived by the university. The surveys that use this type of analysis, and that will be discussed, are an Entering Student Survey, an Early Leaver Survey, an Admitted but Did Not Enroll survey, a Graduating Student Survey, and an Alumni Survey, all used and developed by this university.

Session 1.2  Wamberal

Disruptive Innovation in Higher Education – What is it and how does it impact on our planning?

A/PROF ANNE YOUNG
The University of Newcastle

Associate Professor Anne Young is the Director of Planning, Quality and Reporting at the University of Newcastle. In this role, Anne leads a unit that is responsible for coordinating strategic planning, quality assurance, data governance and performance reporting. Anne has a PhD in statistics and many years of experience as a teaching and research academic, with a strong track record of publications and research grants, governance and service to the academic community. Anne has a strong interest in using quantitative and qualitative institutional data to monitor performance and create reports that support effective decision making and continuous improvement.
Session 1.3  Avoca Terrigal

Developing and implementing an integrated approach to research and postgraduate activity reporting

PROFESSOR SHEELAGH MATEAR, DORJE MCKINNON
Lincoln University

CRAIG NOWLAN
Montage

Dorje McKinnon presents, speaks, organises, agitates and chairs within the intranet space and has done so since 1999.

Increasingly his interests lie in user advocacy, service design and how these two things can facilitate an organisation’s goals. Dorje works as the ‘Applications and Online Services Manager’ for Lincoln University. He is less heavily involved in the intranet world online and in person than he has been due to his applications manager role. Dorje worked in the intranet / online workplace space with with StepTwo Designs Australia, Jane McConnell in France and the IBF globally.

Dorje’s applications group manager role has provided new opportunities, particularly in the Business Intelligence space.

Where again his user advocacy and vendor management skills have helped focus on the value from the project rather than just delivering projects.

In New Zealand Dorje started and facilitates the Kiwi Intranets online forum for intranet professionals based in New Zealand. He has contributed to projects in related fields, such as Optimal Usability’s product, Optimal Chalk and Michael Sampson’s book ‘Seamless Teamwork: Using Microsoft SharePoint Technologies to collaborate, innovate and drive business in new ways’ . In 2012 he spoke at the New Zealand Tertiary ICT conference and attended the CAUDIT Leadership Institute.

Dorje has a wide ranging interests professionally and personally. Giving great presentations is one of his passions, an interest that came out of years as an educator.

Research is an integral component of any university and at Lincoln University it contributes almost 30% of revenue. Effective management of research activity however was complicated due to data being managed by three separate systems. Management challenges were compounded by lack of user-friendliness of the systems and low levels of capability of systems use which generated a series of local solutions throughout the University. Time and effort was then spent in reconciling differences between central and local understanding of important issues.

This paper describes a reporting initiative to provide an integrated reporting system for research and postgraduate activity. The project has been deliberative in its engagement with Faculties and committed to developing reports that will be of assistance to researchers and Faculty administrators.

This project was seen as a pilot project to develop an improved approach to and discipline of reporting across the University. It should assist in shifting the reporting and decision-making cultures of the University towards consistent use of evidence for decision-making. It should also assist in making standardised information more consistently available, allowing analyst time to be used for more complex analyses and less on reporting. It is expected that further effort, championing and reinforcement will be required to change behaviours. However, it is hoped that this project will provide a useful starting point.

This presentation will report on the approach taken by the University, identify key success factors, challenges and make recommendations for future initiatives.
CONCURRENT SESSION 2
Monday 12 November 2012, 1210-1240

Session 2.1  Henry Kendall Ballroom
Approaches to using qualitative and quantitative data to make effective change

MARK KIRBY
University of Newcastle

Mark Kirby is currently Manager Planning and Quality at the University of Newcastle. He oversees institutional feedback, and program and course quality assurance. He understands most aspects of tertiary education, having been an academic for several years, associate head of an art school, program leader, consultant to NZQA and several tertiary institutions in New Zealand.

This presentation will discuss a new approach to evaluating and improving the performance of programs at the University of Newcastle and demonstrate how qualitative and quantitative data have informed the approach.

Data on performance of programs has little value unless it stimulates engagement and effective change. For this to happen, the data needs to be credible, comprehensive, accessible, and timely. In addition, in the education sector, too much is assumed of the end users of data, specifically that everyone knows how to interpret the data and how to respond to it.

For these reasons the University of Newcastle has, over the past two years, refined the nature, style and delivery of data and reports to faculties regarding the performance of their academic programs. This has included the establishment of a centralised system to assist with the distribution and transparency of information, the development (in consultation with faculty stakeholders) of new ‘one stop’ reports on program performance, and a new program performance dashboard.

Support for academic staff is central to the new processes, and includes workshops and bespoke one-on-one advice for those engaged with program improvement, as well as guidelines that identify satisfactory and unsatisfactory threshold points.

Follow-up support assists Faculties to develop appropriate responses to the data, particularly in terms of improving learning and teaching quality. Furthermore, each Program Annual Report and Action Plan is evaluated centrally, and feedback is provided to Faculties as to how they can effectively revise their action plans.

Although the value of student feedback has been debated by some, many staff now agree that comments are the most important part of the student feedback process. According to one academic in statistics, comments are where you discover what a number means: “Okay, the numbers tell me that the students don’t like something, but I don’t know what it is that they don’t like, what isn’t working for them or what they don’t understand, and more importantly what I need to do to improve what we are doing. If I don’t know what they are thinking, I can’t test their judgement, because I don’t know where that judgement comes from. A comment is much more useful than a number.”

These initiatives are assisting faculties analyse and improve the quality of their academic programs. They enable benchmarking to occur and the identification of university-wide and program-specific strengths and weaknesses, and provide targets, direction and support for effective change.

Session 2.2  Wamberal
Institutional Research, Scholarly Articles and Individual Knowledge: A Balancing Act (Building capacity to use IR to inform decisions)

MS STEPHANIE DUNK
Australian College of Theology

Stephanie is the Quality Officer of the Australian College of Theology. She focuses on analysing and disseminating academic data and best practice. She previously worked in strategic planning and quality management at the University of Sydney. She holds a Bachelor of Arts (Advanced)(Honours) and is currently working towards a Masters of Commerce.

This paper will explore the balancing act that faces higher education institutions who seek to use institutional research to inform academic decisions.

In the first instance, there is a large and constantly increasing body of scholarly literature. Each academic decision could be informed by many reputable studies empirically testing theories of teaching, theories of learning and theories of assessment practice. There are also many articles available describing ‘best practice,’ supported by varying levels of research.

Each institution also has its own records. With the increasing accessibility of high-quality data from sources such as student records, staff records, and financial records. Institutional decision-making bodies are able to access detailed information about the choices and performance of their own students.

A third source of information, which can sometimes be forgotten as processes become systematised, is the institution’s internal expertise in the experience of staff. This is often tacit knowledge residing in individuals, and can be difficult to access until it is challenged in some way.

These three rich sources of information demonstrate that higher education institutions that take the time could consider a vast amount of information relevant to each decision. But how much data is enough? And what weight should be accorded to each source?
This paper will explore the balancing act through a case study in a consortium of theological colleges as the Academic Quality Committee wrestles with the necessity of assessing core units by examination. How much of the scholarly literature can be applied in this context? How can we incorporate the views of the individuals who will design and sit the assessments? What weight should we give to our own academic data? And what, indeed, does our own academic data tell us?

Institutional researchers can be the key integrative points for these sources, and this paper will seek to further equip them in the task.

Session 2.3     Avoca Terrigal

Feeding the hunger for meaningful data in the new regulatory framework: solutions through dashboards

LYNDAL ROSS
The University of Queensland

Lyndal Ross is part of the Planning and Performance Analysis team in the Office of Planning and Management Information Systems at The University of Queensland. She has worked in performance reporting for six years in both education administration and the insurance industry. Much of her recent work has been focussed on visual intelligence, dashboard development and performance reporting. Lyndal is currently studying for a Masters in Development Economics.

Planning and statistics offices across the Australian higher education sector have a long history of preparing and providing data and analysis that are used to monitor academic performance and support quality improvement. The introduction of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Act has created an environment in which the focus on academic quality and standards has become progressively more acute. With the introduction of threshold standards and the regulatory risk framework, it will be imperative that universities closely monitor their performance in a wide range of areas from teaching quality and student experience through to infrastructure suitability and financial viability.

In this environment, the development of streamlined processes that provide quality indicators in a form that is easy to access and understand but still meaningful and comprehensive is a key challenge for planning and statistics departments. The Office of Planning and Management Information at the University of Queensland has approached this challenge through the development of several performance reporting tools that deliver collated data sets and Key Performance Indicators at individual, school, faculty and portfolio levels. In the area of teaching quality, The Office developed a dashboard to directly support the University’s annual Curriculum and Teaching Quality Appraisal (CTQA) process. As part of this process, each faculty is required to report to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on key issues and areas of strength and weakness, particularly as they relate to the University’s Strategic Plan. The CTQA Dashboard, developed in conjunction with the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), is a suite of graphs and reports that are used to inform these annual reviews. The indicators span the breadth of the student life cycle, from undergraduate demand, student load profiles, student satisfaction, success rates, and graduate outcomes.

The delivery method of Xcelcius dashboards linked to custom-made BusinessObjects reports has been a significant factor in its success. The collation of data by the Planning Office means each report is based on the same set of definitions - in line with national guidelines to facilitate external benchmarking where possible - and reduces the need for data experts in individual schools or faculties. The dashboards contain a refined set of indicators presented in visually appealing graphs which help tell the right story, and the linked reports contain the hard numbers for those more comfortable with spreadsheets, and expand on the data shown in the dashboards if the story needs more detail.

This presentation will cover where the CTQA process sits in the University’s planning and quality process, an overview of the data contained within the dashboards, and how the use of Xcelsius, BusinessObjects and visual intelligence has made the data accessible and user-friendly.
WORKSHOP
Monday 12 November 2012, 1350-1500

Henry Kendall Ballroom

New approaches to course and subject improvement through qualitative analysis of student comments in evaluation surveys

CAROLYN NEWBIGIN
University of Technology, Sydney

Carolyn is the Social Research Specialist at the University of Technology, Sydney working in the Planning and Quality Unit. Her current work includes: qualitative analysis of student feedback to inform faculty-lead subject and course improvement activities, assisting with evaluation strategies for widening participation and first year experience programs, investigating effective strategies on ‘closing the loop’ on the uses of student feedback data, and other process improvement projects.

Carolyn previously worked coordinating research for the Social Psychology research group at Department of Psychology, Australian National University where she worked on three Australian Research Council grants from 2008 to 2011. Her main research interests include social identity, risk and resilience in adolescents, gender psychology, evaluation methodology and psychometrics.

Carolyn also is a consultant in social and educational interventions and evaluation. She has degrees in philosophy (BA), psychology (B Psych, GradDip Psych) and social research (GradCert Social Research, ADRSI).

This workshop aims to share practices used across institutions in analysing student comments to inform subject or course improvement.

The workshop will include:

- Presentation of an approach taken by the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) using a summative content analysis
- Group discussion with participants of alternate approaches in their institution.
- Presentation of the common themes that tend to emerge from student comments - both positive aspects of the learning experience and ‘ideas for improvement’
- Group discussion with participants around their own common themes
- Are there similarities and differences based on the characteristics of the institution or courses undertaken? E.g. Go8, regional and metro, ATN, Science student comments compared with Communications or Design students.
- An overview of the issues that arise when conducting an in-depth analysis of student feedback. Issues such as:
  - What kind of comments should/could trigger mandatory reporting and follow up actions?
  - What actions should be taken if indications of staff misconduct are discovered in student comments?
  - Issues around protecting student privacy, confidentiality and institutional complaints policies
- An overview of how these comments are currently being used to improve teaching and learning at UTS

To conclude the workshop, participants will be encouraged to share their reflections on the use of student comments and the approaches currently used in their own institutions.
Dr Sara Booth has a background in learning and teaching, originally based in the Faculty of Education, at UTAS. She began her university teaching career in 2004 and was awarded a Faculty Mentoring Award (2005), an Early Career Researcher Award (2007), and a UTAS Teaching Excellence Award (2007). Her expertise is in project management, standards and benchmarking at the institutional level. From 2009-2011 she led and coordinated three institutional wide benchmarking projects for UTAS which included formal benchmarking partnerships with the universities of Wollongong (UOW) and Deakin. Sara has recently been appointed Head of the recently developed Student Evaluation, Review and Reporting Unit at UTAS. She provides policy advice and support to the Senior Executive and University committees on a range of institutional strategic priorities such as learning and teaching performance, promotions, academic standards, quality, benchmarking and the reporting of institutional data.

Institutional research (IR) units have been prominent in US universities for a number of years (Longden and Yorke, 2009). With the widening of student participation and the increasingly competitive markets, Australian universities are now following suit and turning to institutional research to compete for students and funding (Yorke, 2004). The University of Tasmania (UTAS) has recently developed a strategic institutional unit, Student Evaluation, Review and Reporting Unit (SERRU), to support the University in building capacity to undertake institutional research to inform strategic decision making. This unit is responsible for researching and reporting data in student evaluation, academic standards, reviews and benchmarking.

Benchmarking is commonly seen as a way to compare data only, however, it can include a more investigative, research informed process to add rigor to decision making processes at the institutional level. UTAS has undertaken three such institutional-wide benchmarking projects and is currently involved in an international benchmarking project with the Higher Education Academy (HEA) on promotions policies. Each of these projects has informed institutional improvements. A review of Cycle 2 AUQA audit reports (Booth, 2011) found that Australian universities are at three stages of development towards benchmarking: 1) early implementation, 2) further refinement and alignment, and 3) full embedding. The key identifiers of a mature benchmarking process include: a university-wide approach to benchmarking aligned to strategic areas, alignment with an institutional data strategy and data warehouse, mechanisms for selecting appropriate institutions, and the resources to support the process. This paper outlines how UTAS has built capacity to inform strategic decision making using benchmarking as a research informed process.

In recent years, Universities have increasingly moved to a fully integrated, online, real-time student enrolment system. By providing such a system, Universities are better able to cater to the needs and expectations of students, irrespective of location and circumstance. In addition, such a system can drive administrative efficiencies.

In 2012, the University of Newcastle implemented an upgrade to the enrolment system, whereby enrolment into courses (units of study) and associated tutorial and laboratory sessions opened concurrently. Prior to the upgrade, enrolments into tutorial and laboratory sessions would open after students had enrolled in courses, so as the required number of tutorial and laboratory sessions could be calculated. To implement the upgrade and help estimate the number of tutorials and laboratory sessions to offer, a set of robust, comprehensive course enrolment projections were needed. In the absence of accurate projections, the University may not achieve administrative efficiencies and may in fact harm the student experience through having too many/few tutorials and laboratories available.

To meet this requirement, a method was devised to adapt student load projections, which have been shown to be accurate at the course field of education level, to produce course enrolment projections. This presentation will discuss, in detail, the course enrolment projection method, and by applying data from Semester 1 2012, evaluate the results. Further adjustments, designed to improve the timeliness and accuracy of the projections, will also be discussed.
Session 4.2  Avoca Terrigal
Using Palo to Tame the Excel Chaos: A Collaborative Approach to Student Load Planning
JUAN LAVERDE, GARY LAU
Macquarie University
Juan Laverde is originally from Colombia and has been working at Macquarie University for the last 10 years. He currently manages a forecasting and planning team that provides strategic information for management decision making. The team reports to the Information Director who looks after analytical capability at the University. Prior to this, Juan worked for many years in the International department where he successfully developed a Market Intelligence unit.

This presentation aims to show a simple, low cost option for institutions with business modelling, reporting or budgeting challenges. If Excel is ingrained into the institutional culture, then Palo may be a suitable alternative to transition to.

The examples that will be used are:

UAC Student Load Planning process - This used to be a confusing and complex process. A master spreadsheet would be sent to different faculties before every simulation round to record changes to ATAR and load targets, and then each faculty would return this via email for collation and update into UAC. After a few simulations, multiple versions of the spreadsheet would be floating around the university email system, making it very hard to determine the current version. Issues relating to security, access, version control, multiple users, accuracy and timeliness were rife.

Academic Work Load Planning – Proto-type to help Faculties and Provost understand and manage academic workloads. Currently being managed by each faculty using different methods e.g. Excel or PHP.

Fee Setting – Proto-type to help Fee Setting Committee and Marketing to determine what the student charges should be. Currently being managed by Office of Financial Services via Excel.

PALO, an extremely efficient In-Memory OLAP database for professional BI solutions was chosen as the platform to solve this and other reporting, budgeting and business modelling conundrums at Macquarie University.
When the stars align’ – enhancing AGS outcomes at CQUniversity

MS JO MILLER, MS SHARON LIDDELL
CQUniversity

Jo has been employed for 20 years in various roles in the Higher Education sector in Australia and made a career change in 2002 from sciences to quality, a change that has been extraordinary. Jo’s responsibility is to provide high-level University wide support in the identification and enhancement of the various quality management practices, quality assurance measures, and quality enhancement initiatives in place or identified as needing to be put in place across the University. Jo is a Fellow of the Association of Tertiary Education Management (ATEM).

As the result of an organizational restructure in 2010, the Office of Learning and Teaching (OLT) was formed and became responsible for the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS) collection and reporting. With low response rates, labour intensive data collection methods and minimalist internal data reporting and usage, it became apparent that enhancements to the AGS outcomes at CQUniversity required attention.

The effect of the organizational restructure was the determination to have the AGS data seen by the University as significant to the development, review and enhancement of academic programs, and for the broader dissemination of the AGS outcomes across CQUniversity.

The planets aligned with the appointment of a Pro Vice Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) (PVC (L&T)) with an understanding of the importance of data as evidence for enhancement of academic programs, the appointment of a Quality Manager with a resolve to ensure investment of budget and resources to significantly improve AGS data collection and reporting and the opportunity to undertake a values based recruitment of an AGS Officer to ensure data collection and reporting to improve outcomes for CQUniversity – due to the alignment of the stars.

Since 2010, OLT as enabled through effective survey management, considerable improvement in AGS response rates, increased dissemination of reports and reporting across the University, integration of AGS data into program development and reviews and an expected enhancement in stars in the Good Universities Guide.

This presentation will share with the audience the advantages and benefits of enhancing AGS data collection and reporting at CQUniversity for the reason that the ‘stars aligned’.
CONCURRENT SESSION 6
Monday 12 November 2012, 1610–1640
Session 6.1 Henry Kendall Ballroom

Monitoring and Improving the University Experience of Diverse Commencing Student Cohorts

DR LEONID GREBENNIKOV
University of Western Sydney

DR MAHSOOD SHAH
RMIT University

Dr. Leonid Grebennikov is a Research and Quality Analyst in the Office of Strategy and Quality, University of Western Sydney. He is responsible for providing expert advice with regards to strategy, management and design of planning and quality surveys and institutional research within the University. He undertakes the statistical analysis of data, the development of management information and institutional research reports, and assists with producing refereed articles and conference papers. Leonid’s position also gives oversight to the UWS Tracking and Improving Community Engagement online system. Under his supervision, an internal UWS team designed, delivered and currently monitor this university wide online tool. His previous work included interdisciplinary research projects in the areas of psychology, education and human performance.

This paper investigates whether surveying students after the first four weeks of their studies can be informative and help universities manage proactively student expectations to optimise first year engagement and retention. Further, the paper analyses, benchmarks and provides insights about expectations and experience of diverse groups of commencing students with different needs, learning abilities and barriers. The cohorts include: Indigenous students, students from non-English speaking backgrounds, first in their family to attend university, students from low socio-economic backgrounds and international students.

A total of 8,228 first year undergraduate students participated in the Commencing Student Survey conducted by a large multi-campus Australian university in 2010 and 2011. The results have significant implications for the university’s first year retention strategy and consistently suggest the importance of: quick and convenient enrolment, helping new students with learning methods; staff accessibility and responsiveness; course flexibility; implementing a wide range of formal and informal peer support activities and systems; giving students better prior training on what will happen at university; and providing new students with guides on how the university works and how to do well, written by experienced and successful students from their group.

CONCURRENT SESSION 7
Monday 12 November 2012, 1650–1720
Session 7.1 Henry Kendall Ballroom

Understanding, Analysing, and Summarising Likert Response Structures.

MR DAVID DE BELLIS
Flinders University

David De Bellis has been the Head of Planning Services at Flinders University for over 10 years. He currently serves on the AGS Survey Reference Group, is a member of the Australian Statistical Society, committee member of AAIR, and member of the National Strength and Conditioning Association. He recently completed a Masters of Tertiary Education Management at the LH Martin Institute and his main professional interests are in the areas of measurement for planning and business analytics.

Likert response structures are widely used in survey instruments as an attitudinal measure of student perception. What is the nature and correct interpretation of these response structures. What are their problems? What are the alternatives for reporting including summary statistics? How does one measure uncertainty? How are results best used for benchmarking? Can one control for non-response bias?
CONCURRENT SESSION 8
Tuesday 13 November 2012, 1115–1145

Session 8.1  Henry Kendall Ballroom

Little fish in a big pond: Towards research performance metrics for smaller institutions

MS SHARON KITT, MR JASON FELLO, PROFESSOR FRANK STAGNITTI
University of Ballarat

DR JONATHAN WEARNE
Collaborative Research Network, Ballarat

Sharon Kitt is currently the Emeritus Professor Robert HT Smith Research Fellow (Rural and Regional Research) at the University of Ballarat. Sharon is a recent convert to academia, having spent the last 15 years working within the higher education sector in the areas of performance measurement and strategic planning. Sharon has a honours degree in Health Sciences and a Masters in Information Management and Systems. Her cross-institutional work and passion for data integration and management saw Sharon awarded with the 2011 Swinburne University of Technology Vice Chancellor’s Award for Leadership and Service, in recognition of her work in doubling the number of HERDC publications claimed in 3 years. Outside of the world of metrics and planning, Sharon spends 10 hours per week training for her other passion, flat track roller derby. She says roller derby is very like higher education - it’s all about statistics, strategy and flattening the opposition.

Shanghai jiao Tong, Times Higher, QS, ad infinitum are international rankings of university performance that institutions await eagerly each year. For better or worse, these rankings are viewed as a proxy measure of quality and standing both within the national and international research sectors. Once the rankings are published, university senior executive juggle the fine line between publicizing improved results or explaining why the rankings are flawed. Some institutions have responded by producing their own version of rankings. Unfortunately these international performance rankings also act to segregate Australian institutions into the haves (‘we have a ranking!’), versus the have nots (‘we don’t rate a mention’).

The metrics behind rankings - research income, research staff, number of doctoral candidates, numbers of publications - are common to other measures of research performance. Invariably, these ‘four pillars’ of research somewhat unsurprisingly demonstrate that quantity of research seems to impact on quality of research: size does matter. For smaller and regional institutions, not listed in the Top 100, or not even a player in the Top 500, it is difficult to demonstrate and measure quality when quantity is such a factor. What metrics are available to give useful comparisons of research activity, intra and inter-institutionally, when you are a little fish in a big pond?

This paper and presentation gives an overview of the work that currently being conducted by the University of Ballarat to investigate research performance metrics that are valid, reliable, repeatable and meaningful in a regional context. The presentation will give an overview in to the investigation so far and invite comment from participants regarding the work to date.

Session 8.2  Wamberal

Mythbusters: Exploring teaching staff beliefs about student feedback in evaluation surveys

CAROLYN NEWBIGIN, DR PETER KANDLBINDER
University of Technology, Sydney

Carolyn Newbigin is the Social Research Specialist at the University of Technology, Sydney working in the Planning and Quality Unit. Her current work includes: qualitative analysis of student feedback to inform faculty lead subject and course improvement activities, assisting with evaluation strategies for widening participation and first year experience programs, investigating effective strategies on closing the loop on the use of student feedback data, and other process improvement projects. Carolyn previously worked coordinating research for the Social Psychology research group at Department of Psychology, Australian National University where she worked on three Australian Research Council grants from 2008 to 2011. Her main research interests include social identity, risk and resilience in adolescents, gender psychology, evaluation methodology and psychometrics. Carolyn is also a consultant in social and educational interventions and evaluation. She has degrees in philosophy (BA), psychology (B Psych, GradDip Psych) and social research (GradCert Social Research, ADRSi).

Peter Kandlbinder is a Senior Lecturer in the Institute for Interactive Media & Learning where his main responsibility is academic staff development in curriculum design, assessment and evaluation. He has experience in supporting academics in developing their capabilities in digital media, assessing student learning, problem-based learning, postgraduate supervision and other forms of small group learning. Peter co-ordinates the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education Teaching and Learning and the UTS new academic staff development program. He works with faculties and course teams on course and subject design to create effective learning environments for students and assists academic staff in developing their scholarship in teaching and learning by co-ordinating the annual UTS Teaching and Learning Forum. Peter also sits on a range of university and faculty committees related to curriculum review and renewal.

There is a sizeable literature on the misgivings of staff about the value of teaching evaluation surveys. Common sentiments
include: questioning the validity of the survey instrument, doubt over whether student responses provide an accurate reflection of the quality of teaching, suspicion that higher satisfaction ratings are given in easier classes, or that ratings are just a ‘popularity contest’.

Attempts to change attitudes to student evaluations of university teaching have tended to focus on the validity, reliability and utility of the instrument (Marsh, 1984; 1987). Student open-ended comments are widely acknowledged as helpful in reviewing classroom practices, yet after decades of survey evaluation scepticism of statistical analysis remains. Given that there is a large amount of evidence to the reliability and validity of student evaluations of teaching it remains puzzling that university lecturers continue to maintain such views in the face of evidence to the contrary. Less research examines the reasons behind staff resistance to using student evaluation data or strategies that will change beliefs and lead to improved teaching practices.

This presentation outlines a study conducted by the University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) which attempted to change staff attitudes to teaching evaluation surveys. Pre-post surveys were conducted with staff. One group received a summary of empirical evidence on the dominant staff concerns about teaching evaluation surveys; one group received detailed analyses of student feedback from the Student Feedback Survey (SFS - an internal subject level survey); and a control group received no feedback. The results of this study and implications for broader university policy will be discussed.

Dr Sara Booth, Dr Cassandra Saunders
University of Tasmania

Cassandra graduated with a Bachelor of Biomedical Science (Honours) in 2004 from the University of Tasmania. She then went on to complete a Doctor of Philosophy in the areas of Pharmacology and Immunology. From 2009-2011, Cassandra worked as a lecturer and unit coordinator in the School of Human Life Sciences at UTAS, with a focus on Cell Biology and Biochemistry. She completed a Graduate Certificate in University Learning and Teaching in 2011.

Cassandra’s primary role within SERRU is the research and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data related to students and education, and the provision of reports and discussion papers to the University’s Senior Executive and Committees. Current projects that Cassandra is involved in include the; UTAS Academic Standards Project and the development of an online Academic Standards Framework software tool for evaluation and reporting purposes.

The Australian government, the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) and universities are currently engaged in conversations on key performance indicators. The period from 2008-2009 saw the national discussion focus on the development of performance indicators for a range of purposes [e.g. the Bradley Review (2008)]. In 2010, the discussion shifted to identifying performance indicators within a national Higher Education Standards Framework. Indicators are most powerful when they are located in a multidimensional framework (Coates, 2010). A clear message is that universities need to be more explicit in their use and measurement of performance indicators for funding, regulatory and quality assurance purposes.

Universities, in response, are developing their own institutional frameworks (Charles Sturt, Curtin, Macquarie, RMIT, Canberra, South Australia and Western Sydney). The University of Tasmania (UTAS) has developed its own Academic Standards Framework (ASF). The UTAS ASF encompasses 6 key dimensions: Teaching, Learning, Curriculum, Student Support, Research and Research Training. Indicators and performance measures for each standard have been developed based on their capacity to measure and improve practice. The ASF project also includes the development of an online evaluation and reporting tool. The framework and online tool is currently at the trial phase across one faculty (Student Support dimension) and campus (Teaching dimension). This paper will report on the findings and utilisation of the performance indicators to measure quality. What has emerged during the project is the realisation that ‘developing indicators to measure complex phenomena is a complex task’ (Coates, 2010).
WORKSHOP
Tuesday 13 November 2012, 1155–1305

Workshop Wamberal

Australian Graduate Survey Workshop

MR BRUCE GUTHRIE
Graduate Careers Australia

Bruce Guthrie is the Policy, Strategy and Stakeholder Relations Adviser for Graduate Careers Australia. He doesn’t like long introductions.

This workshop will give the staff from institutions who work with the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS) a chance to hear about changes to the management of the survey and to discuss issues and problems they encounter during their work. Of particular note will be recent developments in the move to centralise management of the AGS over the next few years arising from developments in Government policy.

These sessions are very informal and generally feature an update of changes in AGS methods and policy followed by a round of Q&A on a broad range of matters.

Graduate Careers Australia
making a difference to graduates for over 40 years
www.graduatecareers.com.au

- Research reports and findings
- Salaries and employment rates
- Career information booklets
- Graduate Opportunities jobs directory
Session 10.1  Henry Kendall Ballroom  

Understanding Student Experience: visualising qualitative data

MS CHANDRAMA ACHARYA, MR GARY LAU  
Macquarie University

Chandrama Acharya is the Manager, Surveys at Macquarie University and responsible for administration and reporting of all institutional surveys of the university in compliance with the Commonwealth Government’s survey requirements. In most of her working career Chandrama has been involved in various institutional research viz., measuring student experience and improvements, quality assurance and accreditation, monitoring institutional performance, and stakeholder surveys. Prior to joining Macquarie University Chandrama worked at the National University of Singapore and has background in higher education, international business, marketing research, and statistics. Her research areas range from higher education to international business and published extensively in several reputed peer-reviewed international journals.

This presentation aims to cover:

- Understanding student experience and surveys in the context of performance indicators
- The ongoing journey of how textual analytics and visual presentation can help understand student experience and improve it

The recommendation from the Advancing Quality in Higher Education (AQHE) Reference Group report in June 2012 is to use student experience data in performance based funding possibly in the future and providing the results to the general public via the My University website. Universities will need to increasingly focus on improving student experience outcomes.

Different institutions use different methodologies to analyse the qualitative data in surveys, and a standard methodology in the sector is not present. The pre-existing CEQuery software is limited to CEQ comments, and only produces counts on key words and rudimentary visualisations.

Macquarie University is currently evaluating a number of textual analytics tools to fully understand student feedback. This presentation will demonstrate one of these tools called Leximancer, and illustrate the benefits of combining visualisations with textual analytics.

Session 11.1  Henry Kendall Ballroom

Attrition: is it really a problem? The word out there on the streets

MR DAVID MARR, CAMILLA NICOLL  
Deakin University

Dave Marr is the Research Fellow on the ALTC Project, ‘Tracking Student Success: who is falling through the cracks?’ and is currently Vice-President of AAIR. Camilla Nicoll has recently completed her honours degree in Psychology at Deakin University and is the Research Assistant on the OLT Project.

The focus of institutions on viewing attrition as a problem and trying to firstly understand it and then to do something about it, is quite a recent phenomenon. During the period 1945 to 1970, known as American higher education’s ‘Golden Age’, a high attrition rate was often seen as confirmation that a college’s faculty and curriculum were demanding, with little tolerance for ‘slackers’. In the 1970’s however, this view altered as institutions considered their financial losses, as well as the loss to the individual and to society. Academic leaders were urged to look within their institutional data, as well as examining the institution’s culture, to better understand why so many students were dropping out, what institutional practices may underlie this attrition problem and how best to support students to complete their degrees.

It was during this period that sociologists Ernest Pascarella and Vincent Tinto, amongst other higher education researchers, developed student tracking and prediction methodologies to analyse attrition. Combating attrition though is expensive, difficult and historically a persistent challenge. One suggestion though is that our expectations are perhaps unrealistic and that institutions may need to live with widespread attrition as an on-going problem (Thelin, 2010). Despite such a thought, research into the various models, tracking systems and intervention programs have been continually evolving since the 1970s and therefore warrant a closer look.

This presentation will report on an international systematic review recently conducted of the available literature as part of the ALTC Project, ‘Tracking Student Success: who is falling through the cracks’, which was discussed at the 2011 AAIR Forum. The session will focus on the various tracking and prediction models and methods that have been developed to identify and track ‘at-risk’ student cohorts. We’ll introduce you to the five domains of student tracking characteristics as well as review a range of interventions, transition programs and early intervention strategies that have been commonly used to assist ‘at-risk’ students’ engagement.
Session 11.2 Wamberal

A vision for integrated planning, budgeting and reporting

MRS PHILIPPA JOHNSTON
The University of Newcastle

As a Planning and Quality officer, Philippa Johnston leads the coordination of strategic and operational planning processes at the University of Newcastle including the University's management of institutional performance against its strategic objectives and targets. Her role also focuses on analysis and insight of qualitative and quantitative information of the University's quality assurance processes, including the External Program Reviews.

Philippa has vast experience across the public and private sector, where she has advised on workforce planning initiatives as well as analysing workforce information to provide insight for people based decisions for organisations such as Department of Human Services (Federal), National Australia Bank, Ausgrid, and the University of Technology Sydney. Philippa has also designed and lead workshops throughout Australian, New Zealand and South-East Asia for SuccessFactors and the Australian Human Resource Institute. A self-confessed data nerd, she hopes to share her enthusiasm for evidenced based decisions in strategic planning initiatives.

Strategic planning is hardly a new concept, and public and private organisations have been grappling with it since its inception in the 1960s. Searching the website of any University or tertiary institution is likely to uncover a plethora of plans – strategic, operational, and financial – which range in focus from the overall Institution, Faculty and division levels to targeted principles in key areas such as equity, international or innovation. But how these plans fit together or even have meaning to staff, students or the wider community in which a University operates, is often the undoing of the best intentioned strategic plan.

The University of Newcastle's Strategic Plan is informed by a sense of what the University hopes to be in the longer term as well as how the University must position itself into the future if it is to sustain its vision. To be successful in its strategic objectives, we must give consideration to all planning activities that occur across the University. An integrated planning framework helps to ensure efficiency in the execution of all University activities, particularly teaching and learning and research, and assure the appropriate investment of University resources.

During 2012 the Vice-Chancellor at the University of Newcastle is leading a process to articulate what the University wants to be by 2025, when the University is 60 years old, and to implement a rolling triennial planning process. This process commenced with senior leadership discussion and has included consultation at the Unit and School level, open forums and focus groups for staff and students and engaging with broader community stakeholders.

This presentation will discuss the experience and approaches applied by the University of Newcastle to consolidate and align the University's planning, budgeting and reporting processes to deliver an integrated `Corporate Planning Cycle'. The Corporate Planning Cycle details the performance of the institution against agreed performance targets for the next three years towards the University's 2025 Vision. A challenge in strategic planning is ensuring that the Plan is executed. Barriers and enhancers to sustained engagement with the Strategic Plan will be discussed.

Special Interest Group Avoca Terrigal
Tuesday 13 November, 1400 – 1610

Surveys and Evaluations

CO-CHAIR: JUSTINE FRITSCH, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN QUEENSLAND
CO-CHAIR: CHANDRAMA ACHARYA, MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

Discussion Topics include:

- What practices are survey managers implementing to cope with the increased load of national and internal surveys?
- What practices are working to close the loop with staff and students?
- How are we using M&E frameworks? (e.g. to support widening participation).
- How can IR units assist other areas (e.g. equity practitioners evaluate HEPPP projects)?
CONCURRENT SESSION 12
Tuesday 13 November 2012, 1440-1510

Session 12.1 Henry Kendall Ballroom

Assigning a Socio-Economic Status variable to student records – a useful tool for planning, reporting and Institutional Research

ROBERT MCCORMACK, JULIE DELANEY
University of Western Australia

Assigning a socio-economic status variable to the record of a student provides data which is useful in a planning and reporting context and also in general Institutional Research. A methodology, developed using free Geographic Information System (GIS) software and spreadsheet tools, was compiled based on locational data of home address provided by the student and Australian Bureau of Statistics data. The methodology was automated into a useful tool providing a low cost, rapid and accurate solution to assigning a social-economic status variable to a student record.

Session 12.2 Wamberal

Student Staff Ratios: A Critique and Start of a Conversation?

MS WENDY MARCHMENT
Deakin University

Wendy has been a member of AAIR since its inception in 1988 and is currently editor of the AAIR e-newsletter. She currently works at Deakin University’s Geelong Waterfront campus in the Strategic Intelligence and Planning Unit.

Student Staff Ratios (SSRs) have been around for a number of years. In Australia, SSRs were originally produced by the then Australian Vice-Chancellors’ Committee (now Universities Australia). In recent times, there has been tacit acceptance of their validity, being used as part of various world university rankings and by the Federal Government (DIISTRE) in reporting including Institutional Performance Portfolios and on the myUniversity website.

On 25 May 2012, DIISTRE released an issues paper for the Higher Education Staff Data Collection Review. Many of the proposed changes related to concerns raised about the data used for SSRs. This presentation offers a critique of SSRs and suggests some possible alternatives in regard to performance measures.

CONCURRENT SESSION 13
Tuesday 13 November 2012, 1540-1610

Session 13.1 Henry Kendall Ballroom

Tracking Student Success: a comparative case study

DAVID MARR, CAMILLA NICOLL
Deakin University

JULIE ARTHUR, DON JOHNSTON
Southern Cross University

Both Deakin University and Southern Cross University are currently implementing a number of Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Program (HEPPP) projects supporting better access and participation outcomes for a diverse range of students through targeted intervention programs. Both Universities have a diverse student body with regional and low SES participation proportions above the national higher education average.

Deakin University has approx. 30 Participation and Partnerships Program (DUPPP) projects which encompass such things as community, school (Access Express) and TAFE/VET partnerships, embedding academic skills and inclusive support programs. These are being achieved through eight strategies involving initiatives such as ‘Succeed at Deakin’, ‘CReaTe’ (Curriculum Review and Transformation Initiative), Peer Assisted Study Support (PASS), and mentoring and orientation schemes. Deakin is also implementing impact evaluation utilising a unique cohort tracking methodology aimed at measuring the impact of activities on student learning outcomes from point of contact at Year 7 in partner schools through to completion of their bachelor degrees.

Southern Cross University, through its i-Ontrack project, is developing a tracking system that will follow cohorts of students coming from diverse backgrounds in order to identify those factors in their life that impede or boost academic excellence. They also want to identify the most effective ways of extending the foundation of technologies and data sets available at SCU to build a platform for identifying and monitoring ‘at risk’ students.

Key informant interviews (N=14) were thematically analysed and have informed a case comparison of these two institutions. Implications for institutional practice across Australia will be discussed. This study is part of an OLT-funded project being jointly undertaken by AAIR, Deakin University and Southern Cross University.
**Session 13.2**

**Wamberal**

**The analysis of first year subjects to determine fitness for purpose**

**MR DICK AUDLEY**

**University of Technology, Sydney**

Dick Audley has worked in the discipline of Strategic Course Analysis through most of his career, and after retirement commenced a PhD in the Faculty of Business at the University of Technology, Sydney where he is investigating improvements to the instruments used for the assessment of courses and units.

First year subjects are not simply the foundation upon which undergraduate degrees are constructed, but represent the student's first exposure to tertiary education and may seriously influence their attitude to study. For this reason it is essential that these subjects be “fit for purpose”, and that this be verifiable at the point of accreditation.

New modes of institutional research have been developed for this purpose. Earlier approaches where experts were asked to make subjective judgements have become obsolete in the face of “evidence based” course approval and have required the development of objective tools to confirm quality.

The presenter is one of the pioneers in the emerging science of Strategic Course Analysis (the systematic comparison and evaluation of academic products, used by universities to gain advantage over competitors, and by quality agencies to monitor standards) and has developed a range of instruments for this purpose, the majority of which were previously restricted as the ability to identify vulnerability through “deconstructing” the programs of rivals gives enormous competitive advantage.

Procedures for subject analysis are replicable by assessors working independently, and include investigating the nature of the subject, its place in the curriculum, the intent of the subject developer, the knowledge (or worse, misconception) that students may bring to class, the reception the subject is likely to receive, and the impact that the offer of that particular subject might have on the institution.

---

**CONCURRENT SESSION 14**

**Wednesday 14 November 2012, 1145-1215**

**Session 14.1**

**Henry Kendall Ballroom**

**Australian Graduate Survey Management System (AGSMS) – CQUniversity**

**MRS SHARON LIDDELL, MR BENNY SUBRAMANIAN**

**CQUniversity**

In 2010, the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS) became the responsibility of CQUniversity Office of Learning and Teaching (OLT) as the result of an organizational restructure. With low response rates and an ageing Microsoft Access database it became apparent that there was an urgent need to address the university’s AGS data collection and reporting method.

OLT engaged the services of the university's Information and Technology Division (ITD) to develop a new AGS database which would gain efficiencies in business processes. Working collaboratively, the AGS Database Project team and the AGS Officer took a common sense and client focused approach to design this new system.

Several existing systems were utilized to develop a suite of tools for AGS management which included cohort creation, efficient email and SMS communication, data importation, response file coding, data validation and final submission. The ability to monitor and manage response rates has enabled particular cohort targets to be met. Reduced manual data collection and processing, has enabled more emphasis on promoting the AGS and engaging staff with results.

The project team are currently working towards an improved Business Intelligence data capture and reporting in the University Dashboards which will provide management with the ability to strategically target areas needing improvement within the course (program) experience.

The presentation will offer the audience an insight into the challenges faced in developing a new technology solution using existing information communication technology systems, with a minimal budget and timeframe to achieve a positive outcome for the university.
CONCURRENT SESSION 14
Wednesday 14 November 2012, 1145-1215

Session 14.2 Wamberal

A panel data investigation of the relationship between graduate job search and employment outcomes

MR DAVID CARROLL
Graduate Careers Australia

David Carroll is a Senior Research Associate at Graduate Careers Australia (GCA). David joined the GCA research team in 2008, having spent the previous five years working at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ). David holds bachelor and masters degrees from USQ, and is currently completing a PhD in economics at Macquarie University. His primary research interests concern the economics of Australian higher education, focusing specifically on the graduate labour market. David was awarded ‘Best Paper’ at the AAIR Annual Fora held in 2010 and 2011.

The transition from study to work is an important one. The jobs that graduates secure after completing their studies may shape the trajectory of their future careers, so an understanding of how job search can influence employment outcomes has important implications for both theory and higher education practice. This paper specifically examines the monetary outcomes associated with different job search methods in the context of the Australian graduate labour market, based on a rich sample of bachelor degree graduates from the 2011 Beyond Graduation Survey. Our sample contains two observations for each graduate: one taken shortly after course completion and another taken three years later. Our use of panel (repeated-measures) data allows us to control for unobserved individual-specific effects, which may otherwise confound our wage estimates. We do this using a fixed-effects estimation methodology. Five broad types of job search method are considered: job advertisements, university-based methods, networking, direct employer contact, and other methods not listed on the survey. We conclude by discussing the implications of our results and estimation methodology for practice.

CONCURRENT SESSION 15
Wednesday 14 November 2012, 1225-1255

Session 15.1 Henry Kendall Ballroom

Disruptive BI technologies and why you should embrace them!

CHRIS KEARNS
Altis

Chris Kearns has been involved in the IT industry since 1990 and has been focussed on Data Warehousing & Business Intelligence since 1997.

Chris joined Altis Consulting as their first employee in 1998 and has worked as a Consultant, Quality Assurance Manager, Training Manager, Account Manager, Tableau Certified Trainer, Tableau Practice Lead and Higher Education Practice Lead. He has helped to deliver solutions to a wide range of customers, across many industries, using many different technologies, in Australia and New Zealand.

When not at work, Chris can be found on the tennis court, playing the guitar, singing or swing dancing ... usually not all at once.

There’s a new breed of “disruptive” BI tools on the block which can collectively be referred to as Data Discovery BI tools. Some are embracing Disruptive BI with great enthusiasm while others are steadfastly sticking to what they know.

This presentation will describe the current BI landscape, the divisions that exist between the two camps, and propose that we should all ultimately embrace Disruptive BI to everyone’s satisfaction.

This presentation is not pushing/selling a specific toolset (Altis Consulting is vendor agnostic and does not sell software). Rather, it is providing commentary about the BI landscape based on Altis Consulting’s extensive experience in the BI industry.

Special Interest Group Avoca Terrigal
Wednesday 14 November, 1145-1255

Government Reporting

CHAIR: DON JOHNSTON

Discussion topics include:

- How are institutions building capacity to meet future government reporting needs?
- How can we leverage reporting requirements for internal improvement?
Session 15.2
Wamberal

Graduate Mobility: a spatial analysis

MS NAOMI DONCASTER
Southern Cross University

Naomi Doncaster is the Strategic Information Research Officer in the Office of Planning, Quality & Review at Southern Cross University.

As part of this role Naomi co-ordinates student surveys such as the AGS and also undertakes analysis & reporting of institutional performance data.

Southern Cross University is a regional multi-campus institution located in northern New South Wales & southern Queensland. Courses offered across a broad range of disciplines are producing graduates into professions such as nursing and education and also into the creative industries such as visual arts and music with additional areas of business, tourism and environmental science. The SCU student population is typically mature age (with an average age of 25) with a high proportion of students being the first in family (to attend university) and from low socio-economic backgrounds.

Results from the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS) indicate that SCU has one of the lowest rates of (full time) graduate employment across the sector (MyUniversity). Anecdotal evidence suggests one factor behind these statistics could be that graduates are choosing to stay in the region at the expense of securing full time graduate employment.

A spatial analysis of linked institutional data sets, including data from the AGS, was undertaken to explore patterns of student and graduate mobility. Initial analysis of a small cohort of graduates from two discipline areas indicated minimal differentiation between pre and post enrolment postcodes. Using data from a wider set of study disciplines this paper examines graduate mobility by comparing where students are located geographically at the time of application to SCU, and where they are living (or working) post graduation.

Implications for the way the institution can improve graduate outcomes will be outlined.

Session 16.1
Henry Kendall Ballroom

Fuzzy Data Mining Approaches to Predicting Student Success and Retention

DR KAREN BLACKMORE
The University of Newcastle

Karen is a Project Officer within Planning, Quality and Reporting at the University of Newcastle. Her current projects focus on predictive modelling of student outcomes using data mining techniques and the analysis of university ranking schemes. Her PhD involved the use of agent based modelling techniques to predict organisational resource needs change and she has a number of publications in the areas of data mining and predictive modelling.

Understanding the factors that enhance student success and retention has never been more important. Uncapping the number of available undergraduate student places in Australian universities has seen an increase in undergraduate enrolments in recent years. This growth is in part being driven by an increase in enrolments by students from low socio-economic and Indigenous backgrounds and also people who are the first in their family to go to university. Consequently, the characteristics of the student population are changing over time. These changes are leading to the need for adaptive systems to identify both the factors affecting student success and retention, and the students in need of support.

Risk based approaches have been popular in analysing and predicting student success and retention, with a long history in the US college system. Recent years have seen the implementation of a number of automated or semi-automated systems to identify “at risk” students at Australian universities. The factors considered, and the analysis approaches used vary, however the vast amount of data generated in interactive learning environments, computer-supported collaborative learning, and university administrative systems provides valuable input to such systems. The University of Newcastle is evaluating the use of data mining techniques such as rule based classification and neural networks, and the use of fuzzy logic, to identify students at risk of attrition. This presentation will include the results of some preliminary analysis, and discuss the key issues in the application of these techniques.
SOCIAL PROGRAM

The Welcome Reception and Forum Dinner are included in the cost of each Full Forum Registration. Places for additional guests for these events may still be available. Bookings can be made at the Registration Desk subject to availability.

Official Welcome Reception
LORD ASHLEY LOUNGE, CROWNE PLAZA
Date: Sunday 11 November 2012
Time: 6.00pm – 8.00pm
Dress: Smart Casual/Informal Business
Additional Tickets Cost: $70.00 per person
The Welcome Reception is a great opportunity to network with new colleagues and to catch up with friends. The evening will include canapés and beverages in a relaxed environment.
The Welcome Reception is included in the cost of a full registration.

Forum Dinner
Sponsored by eXplorance
REEF RESTAURANT RESORT
Date: Tuesday 13 November
Time: 7.00pm – 11.00pm
Dress: Smart Dress
Additional Tickets Cost: $120.00 per person
Join us for an evening at Reef Restaurant, one of the Central Coast’s most scenic locations. Enjoy the fresh produce the region has to offer in an ocean side setting with magnificent views of Terrigal beach. The dinner will include a three course meal, beverages and entertainment.
The Dinner is included in the cost of a full registration.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION: Seating will be based on allocating your name to a specific table number. Each delegate who is registered to attend the dinner will have a label with their name on it available at the registration desk. Each delegate will be asked to place their label on the table plan which will be displayed from 1600 on Sunday. There is only one label per person, so if you don’t have a label you aren’t registered to attend the dinner. Please only allocate your own label. Under no circumstances can you remove someone from a table plan without their permission.
FORUM GENERAL INFORMATION

AAIR MEMBERSHIP

Benefits of AAIR membership include:

- A reduced members’ registration fee to the Annual Forum
- A monthly e-newsletter
- Journal of Institutional Research
- Access to an Australasian network of IR specialists
- The opportunity to join one of the AAIR Special Interest Groups:
  - Data Warehouse SIG
  - DEEWR SIG
  - Survey and Evaluation SIG
  - Load Management SIG

Affiliation with the US Association for Institutional Research (AIR), the European Association for Institutional Research (EAIR), Southern African Association for Institutional Research (SAAIR), and South-East Asian Association for Institutional Research (SEAAIR)

To Join AAIR:

A full registration to the 2012 AAIR Forum includes a one year membership of AAIR. Further information on membership is available from the AAIR web site at www.aair.org.au

Accommodation

If you have any queries relating to your accommodation booking first speak to the staff at your hotel or alternatively Leishman Associates staff at the registration desk.

Your credit card details have been supplied to the hotel you have selected, as security for your booking. If you have arrived 24 hours later than your indicated arrival day you may find that you have been charged a fee. You will be responsible for all room and incidental charges on check out and may be asked for an impression of your credit card for security against these charges. This is standard policy in many hotels.

Banking

There are two ATM's located on the Ground Floor in the Florida Beach Bar and there are also a number of banks & cash machines within walking distance of the venue.

Bus Transfers

Bus transfers from Sydney Airport to Terrigal return are available to delegates. Buses will depart from Sydney Airport terminal 2 at the following time

Sunday November 11 2012, 3:15pm

Meeting Point Sydney Airport: All those travelling on the Sydney Airport transfer must meet inside Terminal 2 (T2) at carousel number 5. If you are arriving at Terminals 1 or 3 please make your way to T2. Buses will depart Hornsby Station, Sydney at the following time: 4:00pm

Hornsby Meeting Point: Please meet the bus at the Bus Interchange, at the Western side of the Hornsby Station on Station Street.

Mobile phones: If you have a mobile phone, please ensure it is switched on to ensure you can be contacted. If you have any problems finding the meeting points please call the Conference Manager, Victoria Chapman, on 0459 347 833.

The return bus will depart Crowne Plaza, Terrigal on November 14 at 3:00pm. Delegates to meet at the entrance of Crowne Plaza Terrigal. This bus will drop off those going to Hornsby at approximately 4pm and should arrive at Sydney Airport, Terminal 2 by approximately 5pm.

Dinner Seating

Seating and table allocation for the Forum dinner on Tuesday 13 November (included in full registration) and will be by way of sticker allocation, as in previous years.

All delegates registered to attend the Forum Dinner (included in full registration) will receive a GREEN sticker to be placed on the table sheets near the registration desk.

These sheets will be available from Monday and will be taken down at the end of lunch on Tuesday 13th.

If you do not have a sticker please see the registration desk staff, do not write your name directly on the board, as you may not be allocated a seat.

Disclaimer

The 2012 AAIR Forum reserves the right to amend or alter any advertised details relating to dates, program and speakers if necessary, without notice, as a result of circumstances beyond their control. All attempts have been made to keep any changes to an absolute minimum.

Dress

Dress throughout the day is smart casual or informal business.
FORUM GENERAL INFORMATION

Emergency Medical Care
The Australia wide ‘000’ emergency telephone number connects with the 24 hour communications centre for emergency response from ambulance, fire brigade and police services anywhere in Australia.

Entry to Forum Sessions
It is suggested that delegates arrive at preferred sessions promptly to ensure a seat. If sessions become full then delegates may not be allowed entry.

Forum Name Badges
All delegates and exhibitors will be provided with a name badge, please wear your Name Badge at all times as it will be your entry into all sessions and all social functions.

Internet Cafe
Free Wireless Internet will be available to delegates for the duration of the AAIR Forum. The password and login details will be available at the registration desk (updated daily).

An internet café will be available in the Speakers Prep Room and is free for all delegates to use. We ask that during peak time delegates keep to a 15 minute maximum time usage.

PLEASE NOTE: The internet is intended to allow delegates to check email and quickly browse the web. It is not to be used to view or download any movies, music etc. or any illicit material.

Mobile Phones
As a courtesy to other delegates, please ensure that all mobile phones are turned off or in a silent mode during all sessions and social functions.

Parking
Parking at Crowne Plaza Secure parking is available in Crowne’s underground premises; a fee of $18.00 per car per day for self parking and $28.00 per car per day for valet parking is applicable.

Free Parking: Available in the multi-deck carpark behind Crowne Plaza Terrigal, next to the bowls club, off Wilson Drive. Please note that car park security ends at midnight and your car may not be secure overnight.

Registration Desk
Please direct any questions you may have regarding registration attendance, accommodation or social functions to the Leishman Associates staff at this desk.

The Registration Desk will be open at the following times

Crowne Plaza Terrigal
Sunday 11 November 1600 - 1700
Monday 12 November 0800 - 1700
Tuesday 13 November 0800 - 1700
Wednesday 14 November 0800 - 1330

Smoking
Smoking is not permitted in any of the venues associated with the Forum. Designated smoking areas are available at each venue. Delegates should check with the venue staff.

Speakers and Speakers Preparation Room – Important Information
All speakers should present themselves to the Speakers Preparation Room, located in the Forrester’s Room, Crowne Plaza Terrigal at least four hours before their scheduled presentation time, to upload their presentation.

Speakers are requested to assemble in their session room five minutes before the commencement of their session, to meet with their session chair and to familiarise themselves with the room and the audio visual equipment. For information on the chairperson attending your session, please see the registration desk.

A technician will be present in the Speaker’s Preparation Room during registration hours. There will be facilities to test and modify your presentation as required.

Speakers Gifts and Youth Connections
The Organising Committee for the 2012 AAIR Forum would like to advise that in lieu of presenting speakers with gifts as a thank you for their contribution to the program, the 2012 AAIR Forum will be making a donation to the Youth Connections Program, located on the Central Coast, NSW. For more information or to make a donation please visit the website.


Special Diets
All catering venues have been advised of any special diet preferences you have indicated on your registration form. Please identify yourself to venue staff as they come to serve you and they will be pleased to provide you with all pre-ordered food.

For day catering, there may be a specific area where special food is brought out, please check with catering or Forum staff.
SPONSORSHIP AND EXHIBITIONS

FORUM DINNER SPONSOR AND USB SPONSOR

eXplorance

eXplorance is a global Course Evaluation and Surveys software provider counting colleges and universities like the University of Pennsylvania, Georgian College, the University of Toronto, the University of Louisville, RMIT University, UAE University, Boston College, Ursinus College and Hong Kong City University among our many satisfied clients.

Today, the Blue suite of products provides educators with web-enabled software for all enterprise-class feedback management processes allowing for the full automation of:
- surveys
- course evaluations
- voting campaigns
- performance appraisals
- 360 degree feedback reviews

www.eXplorance.com

SATCHEL SPONSOR

Graduate Careers Australia

Researching the graduate labour market, and not simply promoting it, is what keeps Graduate Careers Australia at the forefront of the graduate recruitment sector. This research includes the Australian Graduate Survey (AGS), which focuses on the activities of recent higher education graduates, the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), which gathers feedback from graduates about their higher education experience, the Beyond Graduation Survey (BGS), which focuses on the activities of graduates three and five years after course completion, and the Graduate Outlook Survey (GOS), which reviews the state of the Australian graduate labour market from the employer’s point of view.

www.graduatecareers.com.au

TRADE EXHIBITOR

Altis Consulting

Altis Consulting was founded to be the best independent provider of business intelligence, business analytics, data warehousing and data management services. Today, we claim that title, and with over 90 exceptional staff – nurtured and developed with world-class training and instilled with our ethos ‘Connecting with Courage, Heart, and Insight’ – we’re also one of the Top 10 places to work in Australia (2011 Best Places to Work Study).

We have particular expertise in the Higher Education vertical. Evidenced by:
- Our work with thirteen universities over the last few years.
- Our continued support of AAIR events.
- A proven approach to providing Higher Education organisations with access to information that enables decision making.
- Partnership with acknowledged world experts that provide us with direct access to thought leadership:
  - Kimball University
  - Stephen Few
  - William McKnight
- Our ability to attract and retain the very best people in the industry.

www.altis.com.au

TRADE EXHIBITOR

Tableau Software

Tableau Software helps people see and understand data. Tableau’s award-winning software delivers fast analytics, visualization and rapid-fire business intelligence on data of any size, format, or subject. The result? Anyone can get answers from data quickly, with no programming required. From executive dashboards to ad-hoc reports, Tableau lets you share mobile and browser-based, interactive analytics in a few clicks. More than 9,000 organizations, including some of the world’s largest enterprises, rely on Tableau Software.

www.tableausoftware.com
The University of Newcastle

The University of Newcastle is ranked in Australia’s top 10 for research, with strengths in health and medical, science and engineering, and energy and the environment. Internationally, the Academic Ranking of World Universities places Newcastle in the top four per cent of universities in the world. Key to Newcastle’s success is a commitment to equity, excellence and engagement. The University partners with local and global corporate and community agencies and delivers strong research led teaching and learning in its academic programs. With more than 35,000 students, the University is recognised nationally for its ability to produce graduates who are well prepared academically and practically to enter the workforce.

www.newcastle.edu.au

University of Western Sydney

The University of Western Sydney (UWS) is a major peri-urban university spread over 6 campuses across Greater Western Sydney. UWS provides this growing and culturally diverse region with a unique learning environment and courses designed for the knowledge economy of the 21st century. From professional education in vocationally-based disciplines through to critical scholarship in higher degree programs, UWS courses are focused on the future. With over 2500 staff and approximately 40,000 students, the University ethos is based on combining opportunity and excellence, reflecting critical and questioning enquiry and an emphasis on equity and innovation. The success of our students is testimony to the quality of a UWS education.

www.uws.edu.au

Griffith University

Griffith University ranks among Australia’s top-ten research universities, according to the latest Excellence in Research for Australia results relating to specific ‘discipline-level’ research fields.

Griffith offers more than 300 degrees across five campuses and is home to more than 43,000 students from 131 countries.

Today Griffith’s strategic research places it on track to be a world leader in the fields of Asian politics, trade and development; climate change adaptation; criminology; drug discovery and infectious disease; health; sustainable tourism; water science; music and the arts.

www.griffith.edu.au
Rapid Fire Business Intelligence for Institutional Research

Education institutions have data everywhere. Tableau can help you make sense of this data.

+ Analyze student data: enrollment statistics, achievement, and demographics.
+ Target areas of the country for alumni activities and development.
+ Prepare Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and other reporting.

Visit us at AAIR for a live demo of how you can start exploring your data today!

www.tableausoftware.com
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