Abstract Listing – AAIR Forum 2017

Current as at 17.10.17

Table of Contents

Does the Net Promoter Score measure up as a metric in a higher education?

Ms Andrea Jeffreys[1]

[1]*La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia*

1.1 - Does the Net Promoter Score measure up as a metric in a higher education??, MacDonnell Room A, November 1, 2017, 11:05 AM - 11:45 AM

Biography:

Andrea Jeffreys is a higher education professional with over seventeen years' experience. In her role as Senior Manager Planning and Governance in the College of Science Health and Engineering at La Trobe University she leads all aspects of planning, monitoring and improvement across the College and manages supporting governance processes and systems. Previously, Andrea held a number of senior positions at Deakin University in three Faculties managing portfolios including strategy, planning, curriculum, governance and research. Andrea holds a Bachelor of Science and Master of Marketing and has always chosen to work in positions with an analytical and strategic focus including Market Analyst, Business Analyst and Data Analyst roles in various sectors.

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) was developed by Frederick Reichheld and Satmetrix Systems as a metric to measure customer loyalty. Through an article published in the Harvard Business Review in 2003, The One Number You Need to Grow, Reichheld presented a strong case in support of customer loyalty, as measured by the NPS, being the single most influential factor correlated with revenue growth. The NPS is a simple calculation in response to a single survey question on an 11-point scale around 'likelihood to recommend' calculated by subtracting the percentage of detractors (unlikely / extremely unlikely to recommend) from the percentage of promoters (likely / extremely likely to recommend). Since its introduction, the NPS has been widely adopted and continues to be used, in particular by the corporate sector however the not for profit sector, including higher education have been much slower to come on board. There has also been criticism of the NPS, particularly from academics who have questioned the methodology that Reichheld used and have been unable to replicate through research his claims that the NPS is the best predictor of growth. This presentation will firstly introduce the NPS and through literature, briefly trace its history and evolution utilising selected case studies and empirical studies. Secondly, case studies and papers demonstrating the success of the NPS as a measure of satisfaction and loyalty in higher education and comparable not for profit sectors will be presented. Finally, the NPS will be considered and evaluated as a potential performance indicator in a modern day higher education performance management framework.

Review of QILT engagement and postgraduate experience scales

Dr Daniel Edwards[1], Mr Darren Matthews[1]

[1]Australian Council For Educational Research, Camberwell, Australia

1.2 - Review of QILT engagement and postgraduate experience scales, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 11:05 AM - 11:45 AM

Biography:
Dr Daniel Edwards

Dr Edwards is Research Director, Tertiary Education at ACER, leading a team of highly qualified researchers. He has led a range of high profile national and international research projects in higher education over the past decade, developing respect for his work through policy research, academic publications, media commentary and presentations. Dr Edwards is also a member of the ACER Board of Directors.

Darren Matthews

Darren is a Research Fellow in ACER's Tertiary Education Research Program. He has extensive knowledge of higher education, and is an experienced project manager. Before commencing employment at ACER he was employed as the Research Team Leader at Graduate Careers Australia. In that role he was Project Manager for the Australian Graduate Survey and the University Experience Survey, among other projects. Darren was the lead researcher on the Learner Engagement Scale redevelopment.

During 2017, two reviews of Quality Indicators in Learning and Teaching (QILT) surveys were commissioned by the Department of Education and Training, designed to address concerns relating to the relevance and validity of elements of the Student Experience Survey (SES) and the Postgraduate Research Experience Survey (PREQ). In this presentation, key member of the review team detail the approach taken in the reviews and provide insight into findings and recommendations.

The first review discussed involves the SES. This review was commissioned in response to concern that the Learner Engagement Scale (LES) of the SES may have an inherent bias against external study modes, and may not fully capture important aspects of online teaching practice. The project was commissioned to review and develop an alternate scale aimed at being more suitable for examining engagement of both internal and external mode students. Discussion of this review covers the steps taken in consultation, revision of the scale and piloting. It also details the findings of the pilot and implications for the future of the LES.

The second review in this presentation relates to a project aimed at exploring the contemporary relevance of the PREQ. This survey has remained relatively unchanged since its development in 1999. The review included extensive stakeholder and sector input, detailed literature reviews, the drafting of revised items, cognitive testing and large-scale piloting. This presentation outlines the process of the review and details the outcomes and recommendations for future implementation of the PREQ.

Avoiding being sucked into the data vortex

<u>Ms Wendy Marchment[1]</u>

[1]*Deakin University, Geelong, Australia*

2.1 - Avoiding being sucked into the data vortex, MacDonnell Room A, November 1, 2017, 11:50 AM - 12:30 PM

Biography:
Wendy has been a member of AAIR since its inception in 1988. In 2011 she was acknowledged for her many and varied contributions to the association with an AAIR Life Membership.

Wendy's career in the higher education sector spans nearly 30 years at seven universities across five states. Since 2011 she has worked at Deakin University's Geelong Waterfront campus in the Strategic Intelligence and Planning Unit. Currently her position is Manager, Institutional Research and Surveys.

There is ever increasing amounts of data and various technologies to manipulate and analyse it. In addition, many planning areas have for some years been being asked to do more and more with no extra resources.

I'll endeavour to share some tips and strategies on avoiding (as much as possible) 'feeding' the data vortex ie the provision of seemingly endless amounts of requested data which never seem to result in evidence-based decision making.

Come along with your tips as well for an interactive session!

Engaging staff and students in feedback surveys – Reviewing the past, modifying the current practices and planning for the future.

Associate Professor Elizabeth Santhanam[1], Ms Karen Randy[1], Dr. Bernardine Lynch[1]

[1]Australian Catholic University, Fitzroy Mdc , Australia

2.2 - Engaging staff and students in feedback surveys – reviewing the past, modifying the current practices and planning for the future, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 11:50 AM - 12:30 PM

Biography:
Elizabeth Santhanam is an Associate Professor at the Australian Catholic University and is responsible for coordinating the evaluation services provided through the Learning and Teaching Centre. Elizabeth has worked in the area of academic development at four Australian universities. She has published journal articles and presented at conferences on topics related to quality assurance and enhancement.

The higher education sector in Australia and elsewhere regularly faces the challenges associated with collecting reliable evidence for quality assurance (QA) processes. The student group is one of the appropriate sources for evidencing an educational provider's practices and outcomes. In addition to the data recorded in an institution's student management system, student views are commonly surveyed and reported by multiple agencies, be they internal units or external bodies. Within an institution, the purposes for conducting the surveys vary, from ascertaining satisfaction with the educational quality of a particular subject to identifying issue associated with the institution's physical and virtual environment. Therefore students in an institution could be invited to participate in four external surveys and 10 internal surveys during a year, just for QA purposes. Thus matters related to survey fatigue, and the consequences of low response rates on the reliability of survey findings, are periodically raised at many organisational levels of an institution and in public forum. The apparent effect of survey fatigue can be magnified for online surveys that lack 'captive audiences'.

This paper describes the experiences of an institution that transitioned from using paper-based questionnaires to an online evaluation system. It discusses the challenges faced by the institution in a five-year journey. The institution followed the path of many others, including the use of incentives suggested by staff and students. The paper shares the lessons learnt, and its current multi-pronged strategy that appears to be effective for engaging staff and students in the survey process.

Survey of Survey Managers

Ms Bo Liu[1], Mrs Annie Rose Smedley[1]
[1]The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

3.1 - Survey of Survey Managers, MacDonnell Room A, November 1, 2017, 1:35 PM - 2:15 PM

Biography:
Bo Liu is an Evaluation Analyst at the Australian National University. She has been with the Planning and Performance Measurement Division at ANU for over 6 years, working with university evaluation data from both internal and external evaluations. Bo is a member of the Evaluations Team that won the 2015 ANU Vice-Chancellor's Excellence in Education Award.

Annie Smedley is an Institutional Performance Cadet within the Planning and Performance Measurement at the Australian National University. She sits within the Evaluations Team that conducts the universities surveys and their analysis. She is currently studying a Bachelor of Economics and a Bachelor of Business Administration at the ANU and expects to complete her studies in 2018.

Recent years have seen a great increase in student survey activities within the Higher Education Sector, both from national and international benchmarking surveys and in-house quality assurance evaluations. This then raises questions about the range of functions and services university "evaluations units" are providing, and how they resource these activities and manage the large volume of surveys and analyses?

To better understand the profile of services and the organisational positioning (location) of "evaluation units" across Australian universities, a survey of Survey Managers, or their equivalent, was conducted to capture information on how universities manage their student evaluation activities (e.g. in-class course and teaching surveys, national government surveys), any other institutional survey support, including relevant policy implementation.

This presentation will summarise the quantitative and qualitative results from this survey, with a view to inform current practice and promote discussion and engagement among the "survey managers community" within the Australasian Higher Education Sector.

Continuous feedback from students, timely actions from teaching staff and service areas: Closing the loop with Bluepulse

Mr Tim Brennan[1], Jeff Anderson[1]

[1]eXplorance, Melbourne, Australia

3.2 - Continuous feedback from students, timely actions from teaching staff and service areas: Closing the loop with Bluepulse, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 1:35 PM - 2:15 PM

Biography:
Tim Brennan is the General Manager of eXplorance, Asia-Pacific. Based in Melbourne, Australia, Tim is leading the rapid growth of Blue users and the eXplorance office in that region.
Prior to joining eXplorance Tim was the Senior Manager of Survey Services Centre at RMIT University (Australia), Australia's largest tertiary institution where he was responsible for the administration and reporting of student feedback across all global locations.
Tim has experience in working in Government, Higher Education and the Vocational Education sectors, with a background in statistics and strategic planning.

In his 12 years at eXplorance, Jeff Anderson has assisted hundreds of clients with their course evaluation and institutional survey needs. Jeff's product and industry knowledge was built in his years forming and directing eXplorance's Quality Assurance and Customer Support organisations. Through that experience, he gained expertise which is now used to help inform and onboard new clients with eXplorance's Sales department.

In the competitive Higher Education landscape, institutions are striving to hear the student voice and to make rapid improvements to improve the learning experience, to increase student satisfaction, completions, retention rates and to maintain market share.

However, all too often institutions are struggling with demonstrating improvement and communicating in a timely manner the changes made as a result of the feedback obtained. In this session, you will hear examples of how Bluepulse is being leveraged by Students, Teachers and Institutions for their disparate needs.

Examples of the benefits for each will be provided:

For Students:
•   Make their voice heard from day one
•   Provide confidential feedback, anywhere, anytime
•   Witness the impact of your feedback on shaping the student experience
•   Gain the necessary help to succeed

For Teaching staff:
•   Act on feedback for an immediate impact on the student experience
•   Provide an open communication channel that is inclusive of all students
•   Engage students with a unique and diverse toolkit

- Track and evidence progress, demonstrate improvement

For Institutions:
- Data to complement the learning analytics strategy
- Improve student success by focussing on outcomes, retention and wellness during the term
- Compare student satisfaction, response rates and engagement of students with courses not using Bluepulse
- Leverage formative feedback to enhance instruction, shape course content, improve delivery mechanisms and inform strategic initiatives

Benchmarking student perceptions on teaching and learning at Non-University Higher Education Providers in Australia

Ms Helen Lawrance[1]

[1]Helen Lawrance Consulting, Kangaroo Point, Australia

4.1 - Benchmarking student perceptions on teaching and learning at Non-University Higher Education Providers in Australia, MacDonnell Room A, November 1, 2017, 2:20 PM - 3:00 PM

Biography:
Helen Lawrance is the Director of Helen Lawrance Consulting (HLC), an experienced higher education accreditation and quality assurance specialist. Helen is also the founder of the first benchmarking consortium to promote continuous improvement and report on student perceptions of teaching and learning at non-university higher education providers in Australia, established in 2013.

Helen started her higher education career at The University of Queensland administering university courses and preparing new courses for academic board and senate approval. Her experience of over 19 years extends to state government regulation of higher education accreditation for non self-accrediting institutions prior to TEQSA; representing Queensland in the development of the National Guidelines for Higher Education prior to the development of the Threshold Standards; audit preparation under the former Australian University Quality Agency (AUQA); developing quality assurance frameworks for higher education and disability services sectors.

Benchmarking between non-university higher education providers (NU-HEPs) can be problematic to undertake due to commercial sensitivities, yet is required under the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015.

This presentation discusses how a benchmarking consortium was formed to enhance inter-institutional cooperation amongst NU-HEPs, and how the mechanism for benchmarking teaching and learning outcomes effects continuous improvement whilst keeping commercial sensitivities intact. Analysis of the data reveals some interesting areas of strength and improvement and explores potential correlations according to fields of education and institutional size.

This presentation also discusses closing the quality loop via sharing of best practice amongst consortium participants based on strengths identified in the reports, together with workshopping identified areas of improvement. Mechanisms to inform institutional prioritisation, planning and decision-making are also explored.

What changes and influence have online course and teaching evaluations brought? - A brief review of SET configuration process

Dr Lizzie Li[1]
[1]*The University Of Auckland, City Auckland, New Zealand*

4.2 - What changes and influence have online course and teaching evaluations brought? A brief review of SET configuration process, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 2:20 PM - 3:00 PM

Biography:
Lizzie works as Evaluation Coordinator at the University of Auckland. In her current role in Academic Quality Office, Lizzie has become a trained Blue administrator and coordinates evaluation processes across the university. Prior to her current position, Lizziehas worked in research and research support roles in a number of Australian and New Zealand Research Institutes and Universities Lizzie is able to apply her skills and professional knowledge in quantitative and quantitative methodologies, associated data-collection methods and analysis techniques in various survey and evaluation projects and support senior management decision making. Lizzie's work contributed to the piloting "Research with Impact" at Griffith University in 2013. Since returning to New Zealand, Lizzie has focused on the development of knowledge and skills in project management and attained Project Management (Level I&II) certificate. Lizzie is interested in use her background in Management and Law to better support and develop quality assurance and Business Intelligence.

The University of Auckland has had a number of changes in the teaching and learning environment. One of major changes was to configure SET (Summative Evaluation Tool) to administrate course and teaching evaluations entirely online to replace mixed-mode operation supported by Cecil, an in-house learning management system. While adopting ADKAR approach to manage the configuration process, the shift from the Cecil to SET was not without challenges on all sides. One of challenges was the resistance to change in evaluation system which we anticipated, although not so strongly (Bareil, 2013; Piderit, 2000). The resistance through the evaluation system change reflected a transformational change in nature (Bridges, 2003; Griffith-Coper & Kang, 2007; LaMarsh, 1995).

The configuration and implementation of SET has influenced changes in in a research-intensive university in particular to the data integrity, quality assurance, as well as teaching and learning practice (Yanosky, 2009). By reviewing the project management process, we could understand that the change, managed as the technical one, but its influence has revealed in organisational culture at both organisational and individual levels (Morris et al., 2012). It is admitted that some of these impacts and potential influences from SET might have been in one way or another, underestimated or fully-considered in the project mode (Hornstein, 2015). We feel strongly to use SET as an example to address the necessity of an integrative approach in project management to identify and scope the influence of organisational changes and culture through institutional research initiatives and quality assurance practice.

CDU's Data and Analytics Journey

Ms Penny Szybiak[2], Mr James Mitchell[1]

[1]Altis Consulting, Sydney, Australia, [2]Charles Darwin University, Darwin, Australia

5.1 - CDU's Data and Analytics Journey, MacDonnell Room A, November 1, 2017, 3:35 PM - 4:15 PM

Biography:
Penny Szybiak is the Acting Director of Planning and Performance at Charles Darwin University. Penny has been with the University in a range of analytics and planning roles since 2007. During this time she has led the University's data and analytics strategy and in 2016 initiated a Business Intelligence and Data Warehouse strategy develop project, with Altis Consulting.

Charles Darwin University has embarked on a journey to build a new Data and Analytics capability and has engaged Altis Consulting as its partner. The first step was to create a Strategy and Roadmap to provide a unified vision for Data & Analytics and a clear path for how to get there. While securing funding to execute the roadmap, CDU and Altis have been busy delivering "quick wins" to provide tangible business benefits and keep Data & Analytics top-of-mind. This presentation will delve into the factors that made the Strategy and Roadmap successful, the path ahead, and touch on some of the quick wins and lessons learned.

Penny's bio:
Penny Szybiak is the Acting Director of Planning and Performance at Charles Darwin University. Penny has been with the University in a range of analytics and planning roles since 2007. During this time she has led the University's data and analytics strategy and in 2016 initiated a Business Intelligence and Data Warehouse strategy develop project, with Altis Consulting.

James' bio:
With 16 years of Data & Analytics experience at Altis, James has in-depth expertise in end-to-end solution delivery in all aspects of the development lifecycle. He provides technical thought leadership to his clients and is an advocate of implementing industry best practice approaches in a pragmatic and right-sized way. James is a Principal Consultant at Altis and he is passionate to work with clients to embrace new technology stacks.

James has been helping Charles Darwin University for over a year, initially on the DW/BI Strategy and Roadmap, and then working with the Office of Marketing and Planning to implement "quick win" solutions to build analytic capabilities across the university.

Engaging students and teachers as partners in eVALUating learning

Ms Tracey McHugh[1], Dr Cassandra Saunders[1], Dr Wendy Green[1], Mr Steven Collette[1], Dr Nazlee Siddiqui[1], Dr Jane Skalicky[1], Mrs CarolAnn Fletcher[1], Mr Calvin Jia Hau Hong[1], Miss Le Xi K'ng[1], Mr Costa Papas[1], Miss Melanie Ross[1], Ms Dongqin Ruan[1]

[1]University Of Tasmania, Launceston, Australia

5.2 - Engaging students and teachers as partners in eVALUating learning, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 3:35 PM - 4:15 PM

Biography:

Dr Cassandra Saunders [BBiomedSci(Hons), GradCertUniL&T, PhD] is a Lecturer in Learning and Teaching (Curriculum and Quality) at the University of Tasmania. Cassandra's role involves teaching into the Graduate Certificate in University Learning and Teaching, along with the coordination and management of all core internal and external University surveys, data analysis and reports. Her key research interest is in the area of student evaluation, which has led to a successful Teaching Development Grant to co-lead an institutional project that engages students as partners to investigate students' experiences with, and perceptions of, internal student surveys.

Tracey McHugh is a student studying a Bachelor of Laboratory Medicine at the University of Tasmania (UTAS), having already completed a Certificate III in Business Administration achieving First in Class. Tracey is a UTAS Student Learning Mentor and spent last summer working on a Deans Summer Research project. In 2016 she was placed on the Dean's Roll of Excellence for the Faculty of Health. Tracey is also active in the community, volunteering on the committee of Deloraine Little Athletics and helping out at her local running club. This year, she is contributing to a project on engaging students as partners in evaluation at UTAS.

Universities have a long history of collecting student feedback on learning and teaching to enhance the quality of the student experience. However, with the recently renewed focus on quality assurance across the higher education sector, student feedback is now considered a vital component of quality assurance processes, providing an opportunity to deepen student engagement and learning improvement.

In recent years, universities, both nationally and internationally, have achieved a functional proficiency with student feedback not previously possible by moving away from traditional paper-based surveys to online evaluations. While this has led to a number of benefits, including, inter alia, reduced operational costs, greater flexibility, improved analytical and reporting efficiencies and environmental sustainability, the move to online delivery of student surveys has led to a reduction in response rates across many Australian universities. The University of Tasmania is no exception to this, achieving an overall response rate of 33% to the institutional online surveys (eVALUate) in 2016. While reduced response rates continue to be recognised as a national challenge, to date, research has tended to focus on building the capacity of institutions and teaching staff to encourage student responses to student surveys. Anecdotal evidence suggests that low response rates are directly related to a perception that student feedback is not acted upon (or not visible to students), however, there is a paucity of formal research regarding student

perceptions of evaluation surveys, in particular, why their engagement with the surveys is generally low and what institutions can do to better engage students in the evaluation process.

Informed by the Students as Partners' Framework' (Healey et al., 2014), which positions students and academics as active collaborators, co-researchers and evidence-based change agents, this project engages students from a diverse range of backgrounds and disciplines as research partners to explore current student perceptions of, and motivations for, completing evaluation surveys, as well as the practices of teaching staff who consistently achieve high response rates. The study's mixed-methods sequential explanatory design involved collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data using a combination of staff and student focus groups and a student survey. A team of five staff and seven students collaborated at each stage of the research from conception to instrument design, collection and analysis of data. Informed by the findings, the student-staff team will co-develop resources, interventions and recommendations aimed at better engaging students in the evaluative process.

Does ATAR and Success Rate provide an insight to the performance of a student at university?

Mr Andrew Bradshaw[1], Banmali Pradhan[1]

[1]Macquarie University, North Ryde, Australia

6.1 - Does ATAR and Success Rate provide an insight to the performance of a student at university?,
November 1, 2017, 4:20 PM - 5:00 PM

Biography:
Andrew Bradshaw has been at Macquarie University for 28 years (30 years in total within higher education), is currently the Manager of Statutory Reporting in the Division of Strategic
Planning, Analytics and Rankings (SPAR). Andrew is responsible for all of the student and staff data collections on behalf of the university, and is also responsible for the submission of the Program Funding (CGS and various HELP submissions twice a year).

Ban Pradhan has been at Macquarie University for 8 years, and is currently the Data Scientist in SPAR. Ban has extensive experience in our Business Intelligence platform, Yellowfin, where many of our reports exist and drive our decision making within the university by senior executive. Ban is also involved with monitoring of Offers and student load for the university.

All Australian universities were recently asked to participate in the Improvement of Admissions Transparency of Higher Education Admissions. The participation in this exercise was related to our performance funding in the future from the Department of Education and Training.
As a result of this exercise, we were asked to produce student profile information for future students in 2018, including tables on student enrolments for commencing undergraduate students (domestic and international). This table also included information on our domestic students who recently completed secondary education and were admitted to their course based on an ATAR or whether they were admitted on a basis of other criteria and ATAR was not a factor.
Macquarie University's student profile showed many of our recent commencing domestic students are admitted on a basis of admission from other criteria, and this presentation will look at the success rates of commencing domestic students that were admitted from recent secondary education where ATAR was their main criteria, compared to commencing domestic students admitted on a criteria where ATAR was not a factor.
The presentation will also look at other universities data and see if similar conclusions can be drawn.

Streamlining data processes at CDU – tools and techniques used for our unit survey

Mr Wayne Franklin[1]

[1]Charles Darwin University, Casuarina, Australia

6.2 - Streamlining data processes at CDU – tools and techniques used for our unit survey, Ellery Room A, November 1, 2017, 4:20 PM - 5:00 PM

Biography:
Wayne began his employment at Charles Darwin University in late 2008 in Student Records. He began working in the Surveys Team as part of the Office of Teaching and Learning in 2011. Now as the Student Experience and Evaluation Officer in the Office of Planning and Performance he works in a team responsible for the data preparation, distribution, collection and reporting of CDU's suite of surveys.

Charles Darwin University has come a long way with our data preparation processes and this presentation will demonstrate where we were, what we have done and where we are today.

I will be discussing two main topics, Firstly, how we've streamlined the data preparation and input process; and secondly how we've customised the reporting output to provide efficient and valued custom reporting capability for academic staff.

Blue requires a number of data and relationship files to be uploaded for an evaluation to be run. Student data, unit data, lecturer data, unit coordinator data, student – unit relationship, lecturer – unit relationship, coordinator – unit relationship. In the early days, I was manually entering these data files in excel, filtering and checking, copying and pasting, as you can imagine it was quite time consuming for just one person, up to a week if I was also busy with other surveys.

We also had a very high volume of custom report request from academics, particularly around unit accreditation and academic promotion times. Academics were particularly interested in longitudinal views of their unit evaluations, something that couldn't be delivered out of the box from Blue. We have worked to bring the evaluation data into the data warehouse and build longitudinal reports to access this data, but have experienced some security issues on the way.

Through research and trial and error I was able to cut the work down to a few days but I knew there still had to be a better way. Early in 2016 I began to use Alteryx and it was through the use of this program that I have created an Alteryx app that is able to produce all the required data files within minutes.

In an environment where resources can be limited and survey schedules are time sensitive, being able to implement these efficiencies without reducing accuracy has been vital for CDU to improve its data processes.

Improving The Student Experience Through The Power Of BI

Ms Hiedi Wilkinson[1], Mrs Kerry Martin[1]
[1]USC, Sippy Downs, Australia

7.1 - Improving the student experience through the power of BI, MacDonnell Room A, November 2, 2017, 1:05 PM - 1:45 PM

Biography:
Kerry Martin is the Director, Strategic Information and Analysis Unit at USC and has worked in higher education for over 25 years. She is one of the university's founding staff members and has worked in a variety of roles, with a current focus on the implementation of the University's enterprise data warehouse and business intelligence solution.

Hiedi Wilkinson is an Information Analyst with the Strategic Information and Analysis Unit at USC. She has been with the Strategic Information and Analysis Unit at USC for eight years. Hiedi's particular areas of interest are data analytics and developing interactive visualisations that can be used to deliver powerful insights that support strategic decision making and improved student outcomes.

Enhanced business intelligence reporting at USC has been developed with the end user in mind. Fully interactive dashboards using Microsoft's PowerBI are being progressively rolled out, providing staff with the ability to answer in-depth questions about the University's students and performance.
An ongoing consultation process with key academic and non-academic staff has been essential to the success and uptake of the dashboards, ensuring that the needs of the University are being met, and in many cases, exceeded. The process has been driven by the University's priorities rather than by the data itself and this has been key to its success to date.
Enhancing the student experience is essential to the success of all higher education institutions, USC is no exception to this. Student Experience Survey dashboards were developed to explore the nuances of how USC student's experiences compared both within the University and against benchmark groups, providing the university with the opportunity to prioritise efforts in this area.
These new dashboards have been used by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Students) to formulate targeted improvement strategies and by her team in Student Services and Engagement to interact with the information needed to make evidence-based decisions that align with the University's strategic goals.
This presentation will demonstrate how USC consulted with key university stakeholders to develop fit for purpose dashboards, the engagement strategies used and how the information and analyses have been used to inform specific improvement strategies to further enhance the student experience.

New Students - Insights and Actions

Ms Wendy Marchment[1]

[1]*Deakin University, Geelong, Australia*

7.2 - New Students – Insights and Actions, Ellery Room A, November 2, 2017, 1:05 PM - 1:45 PM

Biography:
Wendy has been a member of AAIR since its inception in 1988. In 2011 she was acknowledged for her many and varied contributions to the association with an AAIR Life Membership.
Wendy's career in the higher education sector spans nearly 30 years at seven universities across five states. Since 2011 she has worked at Deakin University's Geelong Waterfront campus in the Strategic Intelligence and Planning Unit. Currently her position is Manager, Institutional Research and Surveys.

Deakin University conducts a biennial survey of new students in Week 7-9 of Trimester 1. The third iteration of the survey occurred in 2017, enabling some time series comparisons. In addition, student respondents were tracked to ascertain their enrolment status in Trimester 2, 2017.

Given the hot topic of retention, data was analysed to ascertain whether Deakin could improve its current targeting of 'at risk' students.

This presentation will reveal some of the key insights from the survey and actions that were taken, with a focus on relevance for other institutions.

From Paddock to Plate: serving up a delectable feast of data for the review and improvement of courses and units at CQUniversity.

Ms Sharon Liddell[1]
[1]*CQUniversity, Rockhampton, Australia*

8.1 - From Paddock to Plate serving up a delectable feast of data for the review and improvement of courses and units at CQUniversity, MacDonnell Room A, November 2, 2017, 1:50 PM - 2:30 PM

Biography:
Sharon has worked in various positions at CQUniversity and is based on the Rockhampton North Campus in Central Queensland. She has been in her current role as Surveys Coordinator and Analyst (Higher Education) for the past seven years. Sharon works within the Learning and Teaching Services team which is part of the University's Tertiary Education Division. Sharon enjoys the challenges of the surveys and data reporting space and hopes this work is helping to make a difference in improving the quality of learning and teaching at CQUniversity.

As a self-accrediting higher education institution, each qualification must have effective mechanisms to collect regular, valid and reliable feedback from various stakeholders. Annual reporting and enhancement of qualifications and courses are integral components of the academic quality assurance process aimed at improving students' experiences and graduate outcomes. AIMs is CQUniversity's Academic Information Management system - the one single source of truth relating to courses and units. This presentation will explore the inclusion of QILT survey and unit evaluation data in AIMS to create a smorgasbord of information to assist the academic decision making process.

Insights from the Graduate Outcome Survey (GOS) data: what have we learnt after one year?

Ms Chandrama Acharya[1]

[1]Macquarie University, North Ryde, Australia

8.2 - Insights from the Graduate Outcome Survey (GOS) data: what have we learnt after one year?, Ellery Room A, November 2, 2017, 1:50 PM - 2:30 PM

Biography:

Chandrama works as Manager, Surveys at Macquarie University, managing the operation of national surveys, like QILT, ISB and internal and other ad-hoc surveys. Chandrama worked in the higher education sector in Australia and overseas in the past 17 years. She has also the responsibilities to analysis and reporting of the student experience and graduate outcome data. She has background in marketing research, international business, statistics and research on higher education issues and published extensively in a number of international journals. Chandrama also provides expert advice to the University community regarding the best practices for the institutional surveys.   She is involved in the efficient use of survey data requirements for benchmarking and other business processes of the University.

Since 2016, the Graduate Outcome Survey (GOS) replaced the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS). One year on, it is time to explore what insights the GOS data might provide, which in term can feed into the planning processes of the universities. This presentation will review some of the possibilities of GOS data can offer to provide feedback to evaluation of programs and career advising. This presentation will also highlight some of the data requirements that institutions might have in light of redesigning the data file according to the needs of the institutions.

First Year Student Success and Retention – developing a model to inform strategy

Ms Tania Blanksby[1], Ms Andrea Jeffreys[1], Elizabeth Hemsley[1]

[1]La Trobe University, Bundoora, Australia

9.1 - First Year Student Success and Retention – developing a model to inform strategy, MacDonnell Room A, November 2, 2017, 2:35 PM - 3:15 PM

Biography:

Tania Blanksby is the Transition Coordinator in the College of Science, Health & Engineering (SHE) at La Trobe University. She has extensive experience in the higher education sector with 20+ years working at various levels: lecturer, subject and course coordinator. Tania has been recognised both at the institutional and national level for her outstanding contributions to student learning.

Andrea Jeffreys is a higher education professional with over seventeen years' experience managing a diverse range of portfolios. As Senior Manager Planning and Governance in the College of SHE at La Trobe University she leads all aspects of planning, monitoring and improvement across the College. Andrea holds a Bachelor of Science and Master of Marketing.

Elizabeth Hemsley is a data analyst co-supervised by Tania and Andrea as part of the Graduate Development Program at La Trobe University. She has a double degree in Finance and Accounting with Honours in Commerce.

With the broadening of participation in the Higher Education sector we are seeing an increased diversity in the student cohort. In particular around academic preparedness, academic collateral and student engagement. A "one-size-fits-all" strategy would not address the complexity of these issues, therefore it is essential to develop a localised model to inform success and retention strategies.

This presentation outlines the development of a methodology which brings together the literature, data, local context and knowledge. Using different lenses we analysed the data enabling a more robust coherent understanding of the factors contributing to first year success and retention. We focussed on five, large first year subjects in the College of Science, Health and Engineering at La Trobe University (LTU). These subjects represent three different disciplines with varying teaching modes, multi-campus complexities and distinct student cohorts. We will discuss the impetus for this pilot-project; describe the methodology; and, summarise our findings.

This project has provided an insight into localised differences, providing specific strategies that can be incorporated into the subject evaluation cycle to improve practice and support. As this is a pilot project, we plan to expand this to other first year subjects. The final report will inform broader retention and success strategies across the College.

Combined Institutional Research – What to do, when things are already being done

Dr. Rintaro Ohno[1]
[1]Tohoku University, Sendai, Japan

9.2 - Combined Institutional Research, Ellery Room A, November 2, 2017, 2:35 PM - 3:15 PM

Biography:
Rintaro Ohno has studied physics and mathematics at Würzburg University in Germany, received his Ph.D. in information sciences at Tohoku University in Japan, and is currently Senior Assistant Professor at the Office of Institutional Research at Tohoku University. Although he specializes in complex analysis and geometric function theory, he taught English and German for freshman classes and provides a wide, interdisciplinary perspective on institutional research and related projects.

Tohoku University is in the fortunate situation to accommodate several divisions tasked with objectives related to institutional research, each of which are under the supervision of different executives: (i) The Center for Institutional Research, dealing with student surveys and analyses regarding education, (ii) the University Research Administration Center, supporting the research activities within the university, (iii) the Evaluation-Analysis Office of University Activities, assessing the performance, and (iv) the Administration Bureau, dealing with financials and reports. The Office of Institutional Research was newly established in 2016 to assure the cooperation between these different activities, utilize the various data and analysis results for further improvements, and provide a combined presentation for the informed decision making of higher executives.

This presentation will introduce the somewhat unique situation of institutional research at a Japanese university as well as discuss the various aspects and difficulties when dealing with a larger, more complex bureaucratic structure. The focus will be on the combination of separate – and seemingly unrelated – data and analyses, which provides a more complete picture of the entire university, and new objectives and methods to improve the quality and agility of decision making on the executive level.

Reporting practices in an institution to inform and influence the learning and teaching experiences – From ad hoc to periodic updates, and from broad brush to nuanced views.

Associate Professor Elizabeth Santhanam[1], Ms Alexandra Sieniarski[1], Mr Jeffrey Jones[1]
[1]Australian Catholic University, Fitzroy Mdc , Australia

10.1 - Reporting practices in an institution to inform and influence the learning and teaching experiences – From ad hoc to periodic updates, and from broad rush to nuanced views., MacDonnell Room A, November 2, 2017, 3:50 PM - 4:30 PM

Biography:
Elizabeth Santhanam is an Associate Professor at the Australian Catholic University and is responsible for coordinating the evaluation services provided through the Learning and Teaching Centre. Elizabeth has worked in the area of academic development at four Australian universities. She has published journal articles and presented at conferences on topics related to quality assurance and enhancement.

Alex Sieniarski is the Manager of Statistical Analysis and Surveys, located in the Office of Planning and Strategic Management at the Australian Catholic University. Her responsibilities include validating and submitting University data as well as reconciling funding estimates to the Government, managing the administration of enrolment planning process and implementation of University institutional statistics and surveys. Alex's work experience in the University sector includes Business Intelligence, Analytics, Data Science on various projects including Rankings, Forecasting, Enrolment Planning, Uniforum, the establishment of the BI project and the creation of the University White Paper on Strategic Planning and Initiatives. She holds a double Master's degree in Commerce and IT and also has a background in Graphic and Web Design.

The paper describes the evolving nature of reporting on learning and teaching quality in an Australian university that underwent a rapid change in size and complexity, and it highlights the future direction for embedding evidence based practices.

Over a period of about ten years, the university changed from a small higher education institution to become one of the larger institutions in the country. This change resulted in an increase of academic staff employed by the university, as well as other significant changes to support both staff and students. The complexity of ensuing changes was compounded by the fact that the university consists of multiple campuses, which are separated by geographic distances and located under the influence of a number of governments and jurisdictions.

As the institution grew in size and complexity, there was a parallel growth in the types of reports to inform the allocation and management of resources, and to ultimately achieve its mission; the current mission includes 'transformative educational experiences'. The senior administrators frequently required relevant data presented in a report for many purposes. Many reports were initially requested on 'ad hoc' basis, and over time they became more standardised and periodic. There were also instances when a deep dive into specific situations was necessary to unpack a broad-brush overview and to target the use of limited resources. Thus the reports influenced the learning and teaching environments. Systematic reporting in the future, with the aid of dedicated applications for analysis, is expected to embed evidence based practice.