



Australian Government
**Department of Education,
 Science and Training**

| |
|------------------------|
| OFFICE USE ONLY |
| Date Received: |
| Acknowledged: |
| Entered on Database: |
| Organisation: |
| File number: |

**Higher Education Innovation Programme (HEIP)
 2004 Application for Funding**

For further information, please refer to the HEIP guidelines or contact the Programme Coordinator on 02 6240 5387 or heip@dest.gov.au.

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| This application has five parts: | |
| Part A: Applicant information | Part D: Attachments |
| Part B: Project information | Part E: Declaration |
| Part C: Project plan and budget | |

Instructions

Completing the form

You should read the HEIP guidelines before completing this application and use the guidelines as a reference for completing this form.

If the space provided in this form is insufficient for your response, please submit the information as a word document and attach it to this form.

Privacy Information

The information on this form is collected by the Department of Education, Science and Training and will be used only for the purpose of assessing the applications for the Higher Education Innovation Programme. In assessing your application, information may be shared with relevant Commonwealth, State and/or local government agencies, organisations and individuals, including those you identify in the application, to substantiate any claims or statements that you make, to verify the capacity of the applicant organisation to manage Commonwealth funds and for general comments on the viability of your proposed project. The Department will not otherwise disclose personal information on this form without consent, except where authorised or required by law.

Three paper copies should be sent to:

HEIP Programme Coordinator
 Quality, Equity and Collaboration Branch
 Higher Education Group (Loc 133)
 Department of Education, Science and
 Training
 GPO Box 9880
 Canberra ACT 2601

An electronic copy should be sent to heip@dest.gov.au.

Part A: Applicant Information

1 Title of Project

Accessing the Student Voice: using comments on the CEQ to improve the quality of learning programs in Australian universities

2 Name of Lead Organisation

University of Western Sydney

3 If an incorporated body

Legal/Registered Name

Trading Name (if different to legal/ registered name)

4 Name of Contact Person

Title Given Name

Professor Geoff

Surname

Scott

Position Held

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality)

5 Email

g.scott@uws.edu.au

6 Address for notices

Postal Address
Division of Corporate Services
University of Western Sydney
PO Box 1000

City/Town
St Marys

State NSW

Postcode 1790

7 Website

<http://www.uws.edu.au/>

8 Telephone numbers

02 9678 7814
0416 095310

9 Fax number

02 9678 7880

10 ABN or ACN

11 Amount of Funding Sought

| | |
|-------|-----------|
| 2004 | \$ 37,000 |
| 2005 | \$ 49,600 |
| | |
| Total | \$ 86,600 |

Part B: Project Information

12 Summary statement of no more than 8-10 lines describing the project, including programme, products, activities or services to be developed.

The project will analyse student comments in the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) from a representative sample of eleven universities using *CEQuery* software in order to identify the components of university experience that students identify as most engaging them in productive learning. From this analysis, it will develop recommendations on activities and processes to enhance the quality of learning design, delivery, student support and assessment in universities. The resulting research report will elaborate a tested set of quality assurance checkpoints derived from the analysis of *CEQuery* results, including by field of study; a set of proposals on how these QA checkpoints can be used in university accreditation, tracking and review processes; and make recommendations on how the results can be used to provide the Australian higher education sector a unique evidence-based and quality-focused marketing position in the international higher education market.

13 Background and context outlining the reasons and other factors behind the proposed project, including any consultations undertaken with relevant stakeholders.

Australia's universities operate in an increasingly competitive and scrutinised environment, both nationally and internationally. It is an environment in which the effective and consistent management of quality assurance has become critically important. As the higher education learning market has been opened up, as student expectations and demands for service grow and as universities become more entrepreneurial, governments and universities are increasingly concerned with assuring the quality of higher education outcomes.

To meet the challenges of this changed operating environment, it is critical that the design, delivery and review of higher education learning programs directly address what students themselves identify as most engaging them in productive learning. And it is here that Australian universities now have a unique and powerful tool at their disposal. In 2003 *CEQuery* was designed and delivered through a collaboration between UTS and QUT in partnership with other Australian universities. *CEQuery* is an IT-enabled qualitative data analysis system specifically calibrated to automatically code and analyse national Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) comments. It has been made available, with training coordinated by the GCCA, to every Australian University free of charge during 2004. *CEQuery* is particularly flexible. Users can undertake a wide range of customised analyses against any of the variables gathered in the CEQ (for example, field of study, mode of attendance, type of attendance, level of study, fee type, gender, age, residency, ATSI status and CEQ quantitative results). This project will use *CEQuery* to analyse digitised CEQ comments from a broad sample of eleven universities to improve our understanding of what engages students in productive learning and to make recommendations to improve learning design, student support and assessment.

14 Objectives of the project described in a concise statement

To analyse 2001-3 CEQ comments from a range of Australian universities using *CEQuery* in order to:

1. Identify those components of their university experience that students identify as most engaging them in productive learning overall and in different areas of tertiary study.
2. Produce a system for using these findings to improve the quality of learning design, student support and assessment in university learning programs and their associated support services, administrative systems and infrastructure.

15 How will this proposal maintain and enhance innovation in, or the quality of, higher education?

To our knowledge no higher education system in the world has yet undertaken a detailed qualitative analysis of open-ended comments written by graduates about their university experience. This project will undertake such an analysis. It will identify key quality assurance checkpoints to assist university learning programs and their support systems to directly take into account feedback from graduates on what they see as being necessary for productive learning.

Nor does any higher education system in the world have available such a large, nationally developed data base of digitised comments sorted into what graduates say were the best aspects of their university experience and what most needs improvement, pre-coded for a wide range of educational and demographic variables. It is only Australia, through the recent development of the *CEQuery* software, which now has the capacity to systematically analyse this large repository of 'the student voice'. The project will undertake this analysis and use the results to develop recommendations concerning improving learning design and delivery, assessment and student support. In this way, it will make a direct contribution to improving the quality of Australian higher education.

16 Please describe the capability of the project staff and the institution or incorporated body (including experience of the organisations and individuals to be involved).

Project Team

Project Director: Professor Geoff Scott, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality) at UWS has extensive experience in the field of quality management in higher education. He was project director of the consortium that developed *CEQuery*

Professor Scott will work with a team drawn from the following institutions:

Professor Graham Webb, Director, Centre for Higher Education Quality, Monash University
Mr Kerry Trembath, Deputy Director Planning, UNSW
Ms Robyn Peutherer, Manager Strategic Intelligence, UTS
Mr Richard Clifford, Director Planning & Quality, Griffith University
Ms Robyn Adams, Chief Consultant Quality, RMIT University
Assoc Prof Peter Jamieson, Teaching and Educational Development Institute, University of Queensland
Dr Annie Burrett, Office of the PVC (Academic & Quality), Southern Cross University (with N. Doncaster)
Professor John Rosenberg, DVC (Academic), Deakin University
Professor Robyn Quin, PVC (Teaching and Learning), Edith Cowan University
Professor Sue Johnston, PVC (Teaching and Learning) University of Tasmania
Mr Steve Butcher, Manager Information & Analysis, UWS

(Discussions are also underway with QUT, University of South Australia and Curtin, who may also join the project)

A **National Steering Committee** for the project will be established. The following have agreed to participate on the Steering Committee:

Professor Dennis Gibson, Chair, Graduate Careers Council of Australia (GCCA) and Chancellor RMIT
Professor Richard Johnstone PVC (Teaching and Learning) UTS and Deputy Chair, AUTC
Ms Cindy Tilbrook Executive Director, GCCA
Dr Carol Nicoll, Head, Funding Branch, Higher Education Division DEST
Dr Claire Atkinson, Assistant Director Quality, Higher Education Division, DEST

17 State your claims against the following questions:

- Is the proposal for a pilot or introductory phase of a project?
- How will the proposal benefit the higher education system as a whole?
- Will the proposal foster collaboration? Detail the nature of this collaboration.

The proposal is for a new project which commences a systematic analysis of student comments in the CEQ, evaluating their university experience. In this first stage, eleven universities are involved. Later stages will involve a larger number of universities. The project will not be comparing universities and their data will be de-identified for purposes of analysis and reporting.

By evaluating qualitative data on the student experience across multiple institutions by area of study and by drawing on the results to make recommendations to improve learning design, support, tracking and assessment, the project will make a significant contribution to the Australian higher education sector.

The project can be used to provide the Australian higher education sector with a unique evidence-based and quality-focused marketing position in the international higher education market.

The project involves collaboration among eleven universities and has the potential to expand beyond those universities. These universities will share their CEQ data, especially the digitised qualitative student comments in the CEQ and collaborate on the analysis of that pooled data.

18 Provide details of other partners. (If no partners leave blank)

| Other Partners Involved | Name & contact details <i>To be confirmed</i> | Financial or non – financial contribution |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| Higher Education Institutions | <p>Monash University - Professor Graham Webb, Director, Centre for HE Quality</p> <p>UNSW- Kerry Trembath, Deputy Director Planning,</p> <p>UTS - Robyn Peutherer, Manager Strategic Intelligence,</p> <p>Griffith University - Richard Clifford, Director Planning & Quality,</p> <p>U Queensland – Assoc Prof Peter Jamieson TEDI, UQld</p> <p>RMIT - Robyn Adams, Chief Consultant Quality,</p> <p>Southern Cross University – Dr Anne Burrell, Office of PVC Academic and Quality</p> <p>Deakin University, Professor John Rosenberg, DVC (Academic),</p> <p>Edith Cowan University, Professor Robyn Quin, PVC (Teaching and Learning)</p> <p>University of Tasmania, Professor Sue Johnston, PVC (Teaching and Learning)</p> <p>UWS - Steve Butcher, Manager Information & Analysis,</p> | |
| Commonwealth Government Agencies | | |
| State Government Agencies | | |
| Community Organisations | | |
| Private Sector | | |
| Other | | |

20 Project Costs and Revenue. Detail for each stage outlined in the Project Plan at question 19.

(Note: Example layout only included below)

| Stage | Item | Cost for Item (\$) | Total costs for each stage (\$) | HEIP Grant sought (\$) | GST If Appropriate | Other Sources Cash (\$) | Other Sources In-kind (\$) | Total Cost (\$) |
|---|---|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|
| 2004 Oct - Dec | | | 2004 | | | | | |
| Ethics approval | Salaries & wages* | \$21,600 | | | | | | |
| Collation of digitised CEQ comments | Equipment | \$5,000 | | | 500 | | | |
| Commence data analysis | Software support | \$4,000 | | | 400 | | | |
| Convene national steering committee | Meetings, travel, communications, and related admin costs | \$5,000 | | | 500 | | | |
| | | | \$35,600 | | \$1,400 | | \$8,800 | 45,800 |
| 2005 | | | 2005 | | | | | |
| Complete data analysis | Meetings, travel, communications, and related admin costs | \$10,000 | | | 1,000 | | | |
| Consultations, Analysis of results, Recommendations | Salaries & wages** | \$32,000 | | | | | | |
| Report writing | Printing and distribution | \$6,000 | | | 600 | | | |
| | | | \$48,000 | | \$1,600 | | \$16,500 | 66,100 |
| TOTAL | | \$83,600 | | | \$3,000 | | \$25,300 | \$111,900 |

*Senior research officer: 12 weeks x 20 hours x \$60 incl on-costs = \$14,400

*Research assistant: 12 weeks x 15 x \$40 incl on-costs = \$7,200

**Senior research officer: 16 weeks x 20 hours x \$60 incl on-costs = \$19,200

**Research assistant: 16 weeks x 20 x \$40 incl on-costs = \$12,800

21 Provide details of assistance from other sources (confirmed and unconfirmed). Identify all funding including existing or intended applications to other funding sources and resources committed to the project from your own or other organisations.

| Description Name of funding source | For which stage of the project has funding been sought? | Cash \$ | Value of in-kind \$ | Confirmed Yes/No (Date) |
|---------------------------------------|--|------------|--|-------------------------------|
| 11 participating universities | Extraction and collation of digitised CEQ comment data; analysis of results; development of recommendations and usage guidelines | | Total of approx. \$25,300 for staff resources and facilities from each university to (i) provide coded CEQ data files de-identified by university (20 hours x \$40 x 11 = \$8,800); and (ii) provide Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) or equivalent position to analyse how the results can be used to enhance quality for course accreditation, tracking, review and improvement (15 hours x \$100 x 11 = \$16,500) | YES 28 June 2004 |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

22 Detail the key performance indicators and how achievement will be measured.

1. Completed database of digitised (and de-identified) CEQ comments from collaborating institutions
2. Analysis of CEQ comments: rank order by overall count in 'best aspects' and 'needs improvement' categories, through *CEQuery* software
3. Completed report with analysis of findings concerning student experience indicating what engages them in productive learning
4. Recommendations on how to improve quality of learning design, student support and assessment, based on the analysis of qualitative student responses and how partner institutions will use the results
5. Establishment of benchmark data for institutional comparison of student experience

23 Evaluation plan. Outline your plans for an evaluation of the project. Note that an independent evaluation may be required for projects over \$100,000. Grant funds can be used to pay for this evaluation.

Review of project process and outcomes by National Steering Committee for project. The steering committee will establish performance indicators, tracking processes, targets and sign-offs by phase of project

The results will be reviewed by relevant course accreditation committees of participating institutions and

relevant national and international bodies, such as Australian Education International (AEI) and other networks. International groups such as the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), Academy for Institutional Assessment in Higher Education (AIAHI) and the Canadian Quality Network of Universities will also be invited to review the results.

Findings will be published in refereed journals in Australia and internationally.

24 Where will subsequent funding be obtained? Detail what is required to sustain the project financially at the end of the funding period and where ongoing financial support will come from. Will the project be self-sufficient/viable on an ongoing basis?

It is expected that subsequent funding and ongoing financial support will be provided by Australian higher education institutions wishing to participate and contribute to an expanded CEQuery database and benchmarking exercise

25 If you have indicated in your application that you have funding from other sources, does such funding depend on the approval of this application? Please provide details of the following:

- Other funding and conditions of that funding; and
- If there is no funding, why there is no funding from other sources.

The support for this project from collaborating universities is *in-kind* provision of staff resources, facilities and data.

26 Does your institution or incorporated body have any overdue acquittals for funding from DEST involving staff who will work on this proposed project? If yes, please complete the table below. **N/A**

| Name of programme under which funding was provided | Funding received to date | Unacquitted Funds | Reason for overdue acquittal |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

27 Financial Viability (Incorporated bodies only) In some circumstances it may be necessary to assess your incorporated body's financial viability. If your proposal request is over \$100,000 please provide the following information. Provide details of all relevant people directly involved with the project and organisation. Relevant people are people with the potential to exert significant influence over the management /operation of the project and the use and recording of funds. Eg: directors, partners, project managers. **Please Note:** All of the requested information is required to ensure that the Department obtains accurate information about the correct individual from the databases that it accesses. Missing, incomplete, inaccurate or illegible details that do not allow the Department to accurately identify an individual may delay assessment of your application.

Full Name (No abbreviations or initials)

Date of Birth

Residential address (must have Street Name)

Position in Organisation

Number of years in position of influence in Organisation

Full Name (No abbreviations or initials)

Date of Birth

Residential address (must have Street Name)

Position in Organisation

Number of years in position of influence in Organisation

Full Name (No abbreviations or initials)

Date of Birth

Residential address (must have Street Name)

Position in Organisation

Number of years in position of influence in Organisation

Note for incorporated bodies (only):

The onus is on you to provide DEST with satisfactory evidence of your financial viability. However we require financial statements, preferably audited, for the most recent complete financial year to be attached. If the most recent of these statements are more than six months old, interim financial statements should also be attached. The statements should be accrual based accounts and include profit and loss, balance sheet, statement of cash flows and notes to the accounts. Where statements are audited, include the auditor's statement and the name, qualifications and address of the Auditor.

Please note: If the applicant is a trust, please provide the above financial information for both the trust and trustee. If the entity is a wholly owned subsidiary reliant upon a parent entity for financial support please provide the above financial information for both the subsidiary and parent company along with evidence that financial support by the parent is guaranteed.

Part D: Attachments

28 The following documents, **where applicable**, must accompany this application form:

- Letters of support from collaborating partners *including details of financial and non-financial contributions*
- Business plans
- Certificate of Incorporation
- Financial statements

Please identify below other attachments.

Part E: Declaration

29 I declare that:

- I am authorised by the applicant to sign this form on behalf of this applicant organisation.
- To the best of my knowledge, the information that I have provided in this application is true, correct and accurate in all material particulars.
- I have read the guidelines and information provided on the application form and understand that the information contained in, and attached to, this application may be disclosed to others as outlined in the privacy information section.
- I will immediately inform the Commonwealth of any changes in the circumstances of the project.

I understand that:

- The provision of false or misleading information or the making of false or misleading statements to the Commonwealth in an application is an offence under the *Criminal Code Act 1995*.
- Where applicable, any funding provided by the Commonwealth will be taxed under the A New Tax System (Goods and Services Tax) Act 1999.
- If any actual or potential conflict of interest arises, I must notify the Commonwealth immediately in writing of the facts giving rise to the actual or potential conflict of interest and to such steps as the Commonwealth may require to resolve or otherwise deal with any conflict of interest that may arise.
- I understand that the Higher Education Innovation Programme Guidelines apply to my project funding application and, if successful, the project grant itself. I have read and noted the programme guidelines.

Signature of the CEO of the lead institution or incorporated body.¹

| Title | Given Name |
|-----------------|------------|
| Vice-Chancellor | Janice |

| Surname |
|---------|
| Reid |

| Signature |
|-----------|
| |

| Date |
|--------------|
| 28 June 2004 |

¹ Please note that for collaborative proposals, letters of support from collaborating partners are required detailing the nature of their financial or non-financial contribution. Please detail such attachments at Part D.