
Mahsood Shah
Mark Wilson
Sid Nair
Presentation at Glance

- Current framework
- What has changed since 2000?
- Success of the current framework
- Deficiencies of the current framework
- Bradley review
- Commonwealth response
- Progress made post Bradley review
- Institutional dilemma
- Setting scenario post 2012 - 2013
- Way forward
Current framework

- States/Territories Accreditation (based on national Protocols)
- AUQA (Australian Universities Quality Agency) Audits
- Universities Responsible for academic standards
- Commonwealth Funding, performance data and quality assurance/research plans
- AQF (Australian Qualifications Framework)
What has changed since 2000?

- Growth of student population
- Shrinking public funding
- University reliance on external sources of income
- Growth of private higher education (21% in 2008)
- Increased use of technology in learning
- Increased diversity of student population
- Changing pattern of student participation
- Nelson reforms e.g. LTPF
- AUQA audits of universities and private providers
- Review of national protocols, national code and ESOS act
- Change in government
- Global recession
- Review of AQF
- Bradley review and TEQSA
Success of the current framework

- Reputation of Australian higher education e.g. growth of International education
- International ranking (2008 THE ranking 8 unis in top 200)
- Internal quality management
- Emergency of quality framework (ADRI, PIRI, PDCA)
- Commonwealth monitoring
- Performance based funding
- Compliance to laws and guidelines
- External quality audits
- Course accreditation
Success of the current framework cont..

- Recognition of university qualification
- Research assessment
- Student surveys
- The QA framework has been enjoyed by the sector with University autonomy
- Improvement led culture e.g. AUQA audit
Deficiencies of the current framework

- Quantifiable results
- The student experience
- Rewarding quality
- University complacency
- AUQA’s role and its effectiveness
- Comparable academic standards
- Compliance to national protocols and AQF
- Inconsistent State/Territory policies
- Promoting quality
- Student engagement in quality
- Understanding of quality in higher education
Bradley review

- The current arrangements are complex, fragmented and inefficient

- The quality assurance framework is too focused on inputs and processes

- Different and overlapping frameworks regulate the quality and accreditation of higher education institutions

- Responsibility is divided between the Commonwealth and the states and territories
Bradley review cont.

**Recommendation 19**
That the Australian Government adopt a framework for higher education accreditation, quality assurance and regulation featuring:
- accreditation of all providers based on their capacity to deliver on core requirements … (etc)
- an independent national regulatory body responsible for regulating all types of tertiary education … (etc)

**Recommendation 23**
That the Australian Government commission and appropriately fund work on the development of new quality assurance arrangements for higher education as part of the new framework set out in Recommendation 19. This would involve:
- a set of indicators and instruments to directly assess and compare learning outcomes; and
- a set of formal statements of academic standards by discipline along with processes for applying those standards.
Commonwealth response

- Undertook to establish a new Tertiary Education Quality & Standards Agency (TEQSA) from 2012

- Awarded the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) $2 million to facilitate and coordinate discipline communities’ definition of academic standards

- Review of AQF


- Discussion Paper: Mission based compacts in 2009
Progress made post Bradley review

- Near finalisation of the indicator framework after some glitch
- ALTC project: uncertainty on where the project will go
- DEEWR released Draft Provider Registration Standards in Higher Education in early 2010, which were broadly decried
- Mission-based compacts funding is postponed until Feb 2011
- Appointment of TESQA Chair and CEO
- AQF review: unsure of its endorsement in late 2010
- Some clarity on performance based funding using equity, CEQ, new University Experience Survey (UES) and the new Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
Setting scenario post 2012/13

- Growth of private higher education with huge investment
- Increased competition
- Collaboration between institutions (universities, TAFEs, private providers, schools)
- More demand for flexible and online learning, fact track courses
- Growth of students enrolments in universities
- New campuses and huge expansion of University Colleges
- Increased expansion of TAFE in HE
- myUni website and Australian ranking
- Equity and market will be key drivers of change
- Performance based funding: unsure how it will work (equitable funding) to acknowledge university diversity and mission
- Using survey data could be controversy (depending on who collects and codes them)
- Scrutiny by TEQSA on all providers (e.g., accreditation of unis)
Setting scenario post 2012 /13

- Sanctions and penalty on institutions
- Some private providers may be booted out: TEQSA if good for them
- Possibility of more private universities e.g. SEEK Learning
- ALTC standards project and its uptake by TEQSA will result in an expensive and possible bureaucratic quality regime
- Rise in the use of teacher/unit survey data in PDR process
- Academic autonomy
- Rewarding for universities with high proportion of LSES and other equity groups e.g. UWS, La Trobe, Deakin and other post 1987 unis
- Internationalisation: depending on immigration policies
- Offshore: decline
- Innovative and creative universities will succeed
- Careful strategy development and implementation will be key to success
What's Next??

- Has the current QA system provided a helpful mirror for the next phase of QA in Australia? Or has it been a monster?
- Can social inclusion policies lower academic standards?
- Can equity and increased student participation compromise quality outcomes?
- Do we need brand new kinds of institutions of higher education to cater growth and provide opportunity for students to participate in HE?
- TEQSA: what kind of watchdog is it: sniffer dog, police dog or guide dog?
- The renewal of planning and quality units in universities in the new environment
Way forward

- Universities must set and maintain their own standards
- Institutions should be encouraged to pursue their diverse mission
- Use of qualitative measures such as external assessment moderation and use of external examiners
- Need for relook at the structure of higher education – do we need new public institutions?
‘Quality is not an accident; it is always a result of intelligent effort’

John Ruskin

‘It is also a moral purpose of higher education institutions’
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