AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES QUALITY AGENCY

Report of an Audit of
Raffles College of Design and Commerce

February 2009

CONTENTS

OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT

Background

In 2003 the Australian Government introduced the *Higher Education Support Act 2003* (HESA) to allow students in non self-accrediting higher education institutions to receive financial assistance for their students' tuition fees through the FEE-HELP program.

Non self-accrediting institutions (NSAIs) approved under the HESA for this purpose have become known as higher education providers, or HEPs. Although other institutions also provide higher education, the term 'HEP' is commonly used to denote only non self-accrediting higher education providers, and it is used in this sense in this Report. The HESA requires that HEPs in receipt of FEE-HELP funds must meet a range of quality and accountability requirements, including regular audit by a quality auditing body named in the Higher Education Provider Guidelines.

This Report of the audit by the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) of the Raffles College of Design and Commerce ('RCDC' or 'the College') provides an overview, and then briefly details the Audit Panel's main findings, and its commendations, affirmations and recommendations. A brief introduction to the College including its mission, vision and principles, is given in Appendix A; the mission, objectives, vision and values of AUQA in Appendix B; membership of the Audit Panel in Appendix C; and abbreviations and technical terms used in this Report in Appendix D.

The Audit Process

AUQA bases its audits of non self-accrediting HEPs on each organisation's own objectives, together with the MCEETYA *National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes* (National Protocols, available at: http://www.mceetya.edu.au/mceetya/), the DEST (now DEEWR) Handbook for Quality Audits of Higher Education Providers and other relevant legal requirements or codes to which the organisation is committed. The programs or courses of NSAIs are accredited by state and territory accrediting agencies, so quality audits of HEPs do not include a detailed examination of the academic quality assurance processes for programs of study.

HEP audits under the HESA consider institutional actions and performance in relation to, firstly, the institution's objectives; and, secondly, a group of criteria collectively known as 'Quality Audit Factors' (QAFs). The four QAFs are set out in the handbook referred to above (and in the AUQA Audit Manual). Their primary purpose is to provide the HEPs with a framework for the review of certain aspects of institutional performance. In the report of its self review (the 'Performance Portfolio' or 'Portfolio'), the Raffles College of Design and Commerce reported against each of the QAFs, in addition to carrying out an approach, deployment, results, improvement (ADRI) analysis under headings based on the Business Excellence Framework. The chapters in this Report use the four main topic headings provided by the QAFs. Within each chapter, all the criteria for individual QAF are addressed, but usually in a holistic way rather than criterion by criterion.

On 8 August 2008, the College presented its submission to AUQA, comprising a 59-page Portfolio report and Supporting Materials compiled in relation to the individual QAF criteria. NSAI HEP audit panels generally meet initially by teleconference and the Panel did this on 26 August 2008 to consider the materials and plan the audit visits.

The RCDC is based in North Sydney, but is providing programs in a number of offshore locations including: Singapore, Shanghai, Bangkok, Mumbai and Guangzhou. On 10 October, the Chair and Audit Director Panel undertook a preliminary visit to the College. From 20–25 October, the Chair and Audit Director visited two of the offshore sites: Raffles Design Institute, Singapore and Raffles Design Institute, Shanghai. The main Audit Visit to the College in Sydney took place from 18–19 November 2008.

The Audit Panel spoke with over 100 people during these Audit Visits, including the College directors, managers, staff, adjunct staff, students and external stakeholders. Sessions were also available for any member of the College community to meet the Audit Panel but no one took advantage of this opportunity.

This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the Audit Visit, which ended on 19 November 2008 and does not take account of any changes that may have occurred subsequently. It records the conclusions reached by the Audit Panel based on the documentation provided by the College as well as information gained through interviews, discussion and observation. While every attempt has been made to reach a comprehensive understanding of the RCDC's activities encompassed by the audit, the Report does not identify every aspect of quality assurance and its effectiveness or shortcomings.

The Report contains a summary of audit findings together with lists of commendations, affirmations and recommendations. A commendation refers to the achievement of a stated goal, or to some plan or activity that has led to, or appears likely to lead to, the achievement of a stated goal, and which in AUQA's view is particularly significant. A recommendation refers to an area in need of attention, whether in respect of approach, deployment or results, which in AUQA's view is particularly significant. Where such matters have already been identified by the College, with evidence, they are termed 'affirmations'. AUQA indicates that some recommendations and affirmations have a high priority. It is acknowledged that recommendations in this Audit Report may have resource implications.

Quotations taken from, and references to, the four core sections of the Portfolio and Supporting Materials are identified as (PF p) or (SM p).

CONCLUSIONS

This section summarises the main findings and lists the commendations, affirmations and recommendations. Other favourable comments and suggestions are mentioned throughout the text of the Report.

Introduction to Findings

The Raffles College of Design and Commerce ('RCDC' or 'the College') is a College within the Raffles Education Corporation (REC). The College was acquired by the Corporation in 2006. The College has utilised the AUQA audit to review activities and to endorse the strengths of the College and areas for improvement. The Audit Panel members and students were impressed by the quality of teaching staff and the skill, expertise and commitment the teaching staff contribute to the College, particularly in terms of connections with industry.

The College has undertaken a lot of policy development over the last year and must now ensure that policy and processes are implemented and staff are aware of these. The College began implementing a Strategic Plan in 2007/8 and all staff have been involved in the first strategic planning day, with another scheduled at the end of 2008. The College is also beginning to consider and work through the implications of developing a research agenda, and its aspirations towards achieving SAI status.

The Audit Panel recommends that the College undertake further work in the area of academic governance and how the governance and management structures intersect. The College has further challenges in scoping its relationship with Raffles University (RU). In particular, the College needs to review the involvement of RU in its quality assurance arrangements to ensure that the third party role RU is playing meets the needs of RCDC and enhances quality assurance activities.

The Audit Panel recognises that the College has limited resources to complete many of the growth and change management activities it is presently undertaking. Consequently, the College will need to consider its priorities to ensure that it can bring the required focus to high priority areas rather than undertaking a very large number of activities and being unable to follow through on implementation of initiatives. Finally, given the small number of staff, the College needs to look carefully at accountabilities of key members of staff and address how the corporate management of the College can encourage better communication and transparency in decision making.

Commendations

Affirmations

Recommendations

1   INSTITUTIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES AND INSTITUTIONAL GOVERNANCE

The Raffles College of Design and Commerce sets out its vision, mission and values in the Raffles College of Design and Commerce Strategic Plan 2008–2010. Its key objectives are also elaborated and can be found in Appendix A of this Report.

1.1   *Institutional and Educational Objectives*

Raffles College of Design and Commerce ('RCDC' or 'the College') was established as KvB Institute of Technology some 30 years ago and changed its name to Raffles KvB in 2006 when it was purchased by the Singapore-based Raffles Education Corporation (REC) in 2006 (PF p6). The present name was introduced in 2007.

RCDC has sustained many changes to operations over the last 18 months. This has included the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer, and the accreditation by New South Wales Department of Education and Training (NSWDET) of five higher degree programs in 2007. There has also been rapid growth in its transnational operations through the substantial reach of the REC network which includes some 15 design institutes and several universities in its scope of operations. The College has students in six countries at locations that are 100% owned by REC. These students represent one third of RCDC's student body.

REC is represented on the College Council and on the Academic Board. The Portfolio states that the 'Academic and Executive Management of RCDC is firmly in the hands of Australian residents as required by Australian legislation' (PF p6).

RCDC has an agreement with Raffles University (RU) which 'facilitates the development of programs and the quality of transnational sites' (PF p6). RU is 'a 100% owned company incorporated in Guernsey Channel Islands which was established by REC. As a self accrediting institution it is responsible in REC for Programme Development and Quality Assurance across the corporation" (PF p6) The RU offices are located in Singapore. Apart from the Singapore offices of RU there is no physical RU campus in the conventional sense. RU activities impinging on RCDC appear to be focused on administrative and advisory functions with an emphasis on quality assurance described as follows: 'RCDC has delegated responsibility for Quality Assurance (QA) of its programs to Raffles University (RU)' (SM 32 p2).

The Portfolio states that a number of committees and boards at RCDC have members from other parts of the REC group and that RCDC staff are members of RU management committees (PF p.13–14). For example, the CEO/Chair of RCDC is a Senior Vice President in the RU structure with other members of RCDC staff participating in RU committees and RU-led activities such as quality assurance activities. The formation of collaborative policies and processes between RCDC and RU are at an early stage of development.

The College has an aspiration as defined in the strategic plan:
> 'To be recognised as one of the top five Higher Education Providers in Australia within five years by becoming (in turn)
> - A Self Accrediting Institution
> - A University College
> - A campus of Raffles University' (RCDC Strategic Plan, p7)

The Panel believes that the College's state of transition towards its aspirations are important contextual considerations, and that the audit process was viewed by the College as a major developmental tool to achieve its defined purpose. The Panel acknowledges the foresight of the College in committing to a rigorous external audit and recognising the potential contribution of audit findings to raising the quality of all aspects of RCDC operations.

1.2   Institutional Governance

1.2.1   Board of Directors

The College has a Board of Directors which oversees the activities of the College. Membership of this Board includes the founder and Chair of REC; an independent director and a member of the RCDC Council. It was not clear to the Panel what responsibility this Board might have in establishing the academic directions of the College, nor how this Board communicates within the academic governance structures of the College other than through the CEO.

1.2.2   Council

The RCDC Council was established with a majority based of internal representatives. The CEO of the College is presently the Chair of Council. The Panel found differing opinions on the efficacy of this arrangement which, while legal, departs from widely-held principles of good governance.

It was found also that at least some Council members do not appear to fully comprehend their remit or responsibilities in respect of the governance of the College and many of the major decisions of RCDC are not discussed or monitored by Council. For example, while Council members are informed of the College's performance against the Strategic Plan there is no formalised and systematic reporting to Council on specific objectives. Council members advised that it was the responsibility of Council to seek and compile information on progress against the strategic objectives. It is not clear if Council has exercised this prerogative at any time.

The Council has not undertaken any skills audit or self assessment, nor have there been any planning days for Council as the key leadership body. Some Council members are also unsure of the specifics of roles and relationships between RU and RCDC. The Panel believes that the College needs to ensure members of Council are provided with appropriate professional development and all are aware of their responsibilities so they are able to responsibly govern the College through membership of the College Council.

> **Recommendation 1**
>
> **(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce ensures all members of Council receive the appropriate professional development to effectively discharge their governance responsibilities.**

1.2.3   Academic Board

The RCDC Academic Board has an external Chair and a number of external members including some who provide cross representation from REC and RU. The external Chair visits the College once every two months, generally attending to issues by email; the Chair described his dependence on the Provost to ensure things happen. Members of Academic Board are aware that quality and academic standards are the responsibility of Council, and are delegated to Academic Board. For example, the Academic Policy and Practice Committee (APPC) of Academic

Board 'monitors and reports on the academic standards of the College ensuring quality management in academia. The APPC also manages the Continuous Improvement Policy' (PF p16)

There are several quality issues which arise from the manner in which Academic Board is currently operating. Many HEPs have arrangements whereby external members are appointed to Academic Board to bring in external academic governance expertise and, in the absence of internal expertise, to broaden the skill base of Academic Board. To capitalise on this arrangement there are usually a number of reliable mechanisms in place to ensure that the discussions and decisions made at Academic Board and its committees are implemented and monitored thus creating quality assurance loops and accountability. At RCDC there is little evidence of systems to support the academic committees. RCDC provided a new overarching quality assurance policy that was developed prior to the audit (SM 4) but at this time it seems to exist only at a theoretical level in isolation from everyday life at RCDC. It is not clear how this situation might be improved while the Chair of Academic Board is at a remove from the operations of the College.

In addition while there is representation from RU on the Board is not clear to the Panel how this expertise is being transferred through the Board into quality improvements in the systems and academic processes at RCDC, or more generally that there is a transfer of knowledge and expertise occurring between the external members of Academic Board and RCDC staff.

> **Recommendation 2**
>
> **AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce consider whether it is advisable to have an internal chair of the Academic Board and how it might more generally take advantage of the other external representation on academic governance committees.**

The Audit Panel formed the view that the range of academic governance committees had been well conceived but that there are issues in how active they are (e.g. the Quality Committee), how they operate and the extent to which staff understand and use these committees for academic discussions. In addition, at present, the processes of communication and policy development seem largely dependent on the Provost with little evidence that there is follow-up and feedback between the key academic committees of the College.

The College needs to focus effort on implementing a robust set of processes which enable contributions by the various committees and structures and promotes communication and accountability for academic governance as well as implementation of policy. These also need to be in place to ensure academic quality in the College and to fulfil external regulatory requirements.

Academic Board is considered by some staff not to be an effective forum for academic discussion with something of a vacuum existing for academic discussions. The Academic Policy and Practice Committee of Academic Board is the committee where staff believe that they could discuss issues, but there is uncertainty in their minds regarding the future of this committee and its relationship to the Teaching and Learning Committee.

> **Recommendation 3**
>
> **AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce strengthen the role of Academic Board as the focus of academic discussion and responsibility for the assurance of academic quality and academic standards.**

1.2.4   Strategic Plan

RCDC has developed a 2008–2010 Strategic Plan, in consultation with staff and some external stakeholders. The College held its first planning day in December 2007, and was scheduling another planning day for all staff in December 2008. The College Strategic Plan has been endorsed by both Academic Board and Council. Staff awareness of the Strategic Plan is high.

The College could provide no strong evidence of how the plan is being monitored, or who is accountable if the targets and activities in the plan are not met. For example, the Information Technology plan was an activity in the Strategic Plan scheduled to have been developed by the middle of the year, but owing to staff turnover this had not occurred. Despite this change the Strategic Plan had not been adjusted. The Panel believes that, given the size of the College, the Strategic Plan should be further streamlined to ensure that the activities listed in the plan can be achieved. The College also needs to turn its attention to how the Strategic Plan and the associated plans are to be regularly monitored, how accountability is to be managed, and what kind of key performance indicators the College will use to monitor its progress against the plan.

> **Affirmation 1**
>
> **AUQA affirms Raffles College of Design and Commerce recognition of the need for a strategic planning process and the efforts being made to consult with staff and external stakeholders in this process.**

1.2.5   Teaching and Learning Plan

RCDC has a draft Teaching and Learning Plan which has yet to be endorsed. The Panel believes that the College needs to focus attention on finalising the plan and as with the Strategic Plan, attention needs to be given to ways the plan is monitored and reported on, and how accountability for the plan is developed.

In further developing the Teaching and Learning Plan and the associated issues around the quality of teaching and learning, the College needs to consider the precise role of RU in ensuring the quality of teaching and learning at RCDC and at transnational teaching sites where RCDC programs are offered. At present the contribution of RU in this regard is focused on checks of potential new sites, annual site visits to REC locations (apart from Sydney) and facilitation of external moderation of standards at the different sites (SM 32). The Panel acknowledges that the RCDC relationship with RU is developing and is a work in progress, but there was no strong impression formed by the Panel regarding the input of RU, as an effective facilitator of quality of teaching and learning at RCDC in Sydney.

1.2.6   Student Representation on College decision making bodies

The College has recently reconstituted a Student Representative Council (SRC) and there is provision for the membership of students on Council, Academic Board and other relevant Committees. Council meetings are being attended by a new student SRC representative, but it appears that there is no representation by students on Academic Board. The Panel advises the College to continue efforts to secure representation on Academic Board so that they have a voice in the academic governance of the College. While the Panel acknowledges that student representation is a challenge, it is important, in light of reported instances of past poor communications between the College and students. Students need to have a voice in the management and governance of the College, to ensure that decisions regarding students are made with input from students. The Panel suggests that an improved process for ensuring student representation be established between the SRC and the College so that students can

use the feedback processes provided through the SRC, with students represented by and through their elected representatives.

> **Affirmation 2**
>
> **AUQA affirms that there is a need for Raffles College of Design and Commerce to improve the participation of student representatives on Council, Academic Board and other relevant Committees.**

1.2.7   Chair and CEO dual roles

Following the change of ownership of the College and the movements of various senior personnel, RCDC is both managed and chaired by the same person. The College advised that this is a transition measure, and that moves are being made to de-couple the positions. While it is legally permissible for one member of staff to be both CEO and Chair, the Panel is concerned that investing two sets of different responsibilities in one person, even in a short term arrangement does not reflect good practice as demonstrated in the governance literature and international codes of practice. The Panel was not convinced that the CEO acting also as Chair of the College Council could undertake the necessary independent monitoring of the governance of the College. Concern about the lack of independence of the Chair and blurring of lines between the operations and governance of the College was also echoed by staff.

There are also some concerns about the role of Council in monitoring the performance of the CEO. The Constitution of the Raffles Council, states that the responsibilities of Council include:

> 'appointing the CEO of the Raffles College of Design and Commerce and monitoring his or her performance (SM 01, p7)'

Council members advised that these functions are undertaken by the Board of Directors. Council members need to be aware of and act on their responsibilities in regard to monitoring the performance of the CEO as set out in the Constitution of the Council.

> **Recommendation 4**
>
> **(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce implement measures to ensure that the roles of Chair of Council and Chief Executive Officer are separated and that Council undertake its role in appointing and monitoring the performance of the CEO.**

1.2.8   Governance relationships

As stated above the Panel observed that communication between different parts of the management and governance structures is heavily dependent on individuals, rather than system-wide processes even though a suite of committees has been formulated for operation of RCDC. The Panel encourages the College to refine academic governance relationships between these committees and also to consider how the corporate management of the College communicates within academic governance structures. For example, it was not clear to the Panel how the activities of the Board of Directors or the Senior Management Committee are reflected in the activities of the Academic Board and vice versa, nor how decisions made at a corporate level are communicated, discussed and implemented. The College also needs to consider and define the manner in which corporate decisions are made within the organisation, to ensure that these are not being made in isolation from the academic governance structures

where responsibility lies for decisions that impinge on the quality of teaching and learning and research activities.

Recommendation 5

(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce further define academic governance responsibilities of committees and between the corporate management of the College and ensure reliable communication processes between management and academic governance structures.

One of the aspects to be defined is the way in which individuals employed by RCDC also play a role in RU activities. While the Panel acknowledges the benefits, particularly for REC as a whole, of cross-representation between RCDC, RU and REC this has produced a degree of confusion at RCDC about the roles of some staff members and office-holders at RCDC. This needs to be teased out also to ensure that where individuals have more than one role in the REC system the accountabilities are clear and no perception of conflict of interest arises.

1.2.9   Risk Management

The College has a Risk Management policy (SM 59), but it was not clear to the Panel who had endorsed this policy or what status it has. Some Council members did not appear to be familiar with the policy. The College acknowledged that more work needs to be undertaken in this area. A number of senior managers believe that the approach to risk management within the organisation is ad hoc, and that there are no formal processes in place for managing risk. This is an area of concern and needs urgent attention.

Recommendation 6

(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce Council oversee the implementation, monitoring and management of the Risk Management policy of the College.

2   ACHIEVING EFFECTIVENESS IN TEACHING, LEARNING AND OTHER CORE FUNCTIONS

2.1   *Teaching and Learning*

2.1.1   Links between programs and industry

The combination of staff and the professional practice orientation of programs has resulted in an effective demonstration of strong linkages with industry. This is an area which the Panel judged is a key strength of the College. Staff members at all three College sites visited have strong links with industry, This was evident in the range of the internships students undertake, and the demand for RCDC graduates. Generally, students are impressed with the teaching staff particularly their industry experience. The sessional staff are admired by the students for the way they engage with students, discuss their professional work and inspire them. Students believe that, these staff give strong career advice and guidance on future directions. Further, students believe that this link between teaching and curriculum content provides them with a strong portfolio of skills once they commence work in their relevant design industry.

> **Commendation 1**
>
> **AUQA commends Raffles College of Design and Commerce on its strong links to industry and the resulting employability of students in their chosen fields.**

Industry representatives at all three sites were enthusiastic about the quality of the students the College is producing, and are keen to build further linkages including being involved in consultations in the development of the strategic plan and other key activities such as graduations, and as guest lecturers. This is an area in which the College could continue to capitalise on its links with industry.

2.1.2   Internships

RCDC has internships in all bachelor programs at the three sites visited. In Shanghai, students appreciate the on-the-job experience, particularly as this option comes at the end of their program of study and is seen as a valuable stepping stone into a job. In Singapore students also appreciate this study option, believing this form of study is a good experience and often a possible future source of employment.

Students in Sydney are less satisfied with the internship process, and do not necessarily see a direct link from the internship to future employment. This may be a function of local industry conditions and differing expectations but some students do not believe that the preparatory classes for internships provide them with the range of skills they need at the point when they are begin the internship. Students advised that no member of staff from RCDC visited them during their internship, nor was the progress of the intern discussed with the host by a member of the College. One employer described a process by which hosts fill out an internship form and sent it back to the College, but there is no dialogue between the College and the employer on the student's internship program and what could be improved in the future. The employers interviewed did not have the opportunity to convey views where students might be lacking in skills and or give feedback on the development of the curriculum. The Panel believes that the Internship Program at RCDC, has a strong foundation and further work should be undertaken to improve the experience of this program for students, particularly in the Sydney context.

Recommendation 7

AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce review the management of internships to ensure that students and employers are supported by the College and the College is able to use the feedback from employers and students to review and further improve the internship experience.

2.2   Postgraduate Education

The Panel spoke with a number of postgraduate students and concluded that RCDC needs to review the effectiveness of its support to students at this level particularly those based at transnational sites. The College is at an early stage with this level of study and needs to develop, through its Academic Board and consultation with postgraduates, an understanding of the needs of postgraduate students to ensure they have an enriching experience and an opportunity to stretch themselves academically to postgraduate levels of achievement.

2.3   Academic Standards

2.3.1   Assessment

The College is proud of its moderation processes and has been involved in recent times in working with RU to further develop processes with offshore sites. These processes include quarterly moderation meetings, generally held in Singapore, with the involvement of all offshore sites delivering RCDC programs.

The Panel explored the issue of assessment and found that, at the Sydney and transnational teaching sites it visited, the assessment tasks varied, although the learning outcomes were common. The Panel is concerned about the validity of the moderation of these assessments across sites in light of the differences in assessment tasks. It is acknowledged that the freedom to adapt the curriculum and assessment for local circumstances, relative to the learning outcomes, is an attractive feature of RCDC programs, but there are dangers in the lack of standardisation. The College needs to consider a greater degree of standardisation of academic assessment tasks between the sites so that moderation processes are comparing assessments of the same, or similar, type of exercise. It may be that RCDC can find a way of monitoring the assessment tasks set at the different sites to ensure comparability within a given set of parameters (rather than a full standardisation) but this needs to be explored and dealt with to ensure that the moderation processes are based on comparable inputs.

The Panel suggests that, in analysing its current approach to moderation, the College clarify the role of administrative staff in the process to ensure there is no perception that academic staff are playing a secondary role in making academic judgements.

Recommendation 8

AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce review the varied assessment tasks across teaching sites to ensure that similar assessment tasks are being moderated.

The College makes good use of external representatives from industry in assessment practices across all of its sites. RCDC has an Assessment Review Committee (ARC), with external representation, that meets throughout the year to consider assessment practices within the

College. The RCDC Transnational Education Guide (SM 32) provides a clear statement of procedures for delivery of programs including responsibilities for different aspects of assessment, but does not detail the role of the ARC.

Documentation provided to the Panel states that RU is responsible for many aspects of assessment (e.g. SM 32), but the Panel concluded that the impact of RU within RCDC is not substantial in the spectrum of assessment activities although RU activities in this regard are given a high profile within the organisation. Nor was the Panel convinced that the large moderation exercises in Singapore are supportive of developing internal assessment processes and external validation of programs at local RCDC teaching sites. The Panel believes that the ARC could take a stronger role in coordination and monitoring the quality of academic standards in programs across all RCDC sites. The ARC could be an effective source of advice to Academic Board in ensuring standards in teaching and assessment for RCDC including sites at which RCDC programs are delivered.

Recommendation 9

AUQA recommends that the Raffles College of Design and Commerce consider giving its Assessment Review Committee a more comprehensive leadership role than at present in the monitoring and review of assessment at transnational teaching sites.

2.3.2   Plagiarism

Staff and students at all sites visited are aware of the importance of implementing a strong and fair plagiarism policy. The RCDC Performance Portfolio advised that:

"The College's approach to quality assurance of academic programs that lead to an award, including their delivery methodology involves:

> minimising academic dishonesty by adopting anti-plagiarism software (Turnitin™), implemented in all campuses for identification of academic misconduct "(PF p23)

During the audit visits the Panel established that each RCDC teaching site has a different approach to the management of plagiarism. While students at each site were aware of the issues, each site has a different understanding of how plagiarism is managed and what type of software is used. The College in Sydney advised that Turnitin™ software had just been installed but not all staff were aware of its presence and how it was to be used.

The College also needs to monitor instances of plagiarism and report statistics to Academic Board so that trends and problem areas can be identified for remedial action.

Recommendation 10

AUQA recommends that the College develop and implement a consistent policy with regard to the management of plagiarism and that this policy be adopted across all teaching sites, and be supported with the appropriate software.

2.3.3   Changes to timetable

In July 2008 the College revised its timetable from providing two units of study over 16 weeks to two blocks of eight weeks, with two units covered in each block of time. The College advised that this change was to align with timetable structure at other REC sites, including Singapore and Shanghai.

The decision to make this change caused major upset at a number of levels of the College and the implementation of this decision and the ramifications to teaching and learning were still reverberating at the time of the Audit Visit to Sydney. There was no evidence that the decision was discussed at Council or at Academic Board.

Academic staff are implementing this system to the best of their ability but there are concerns raised by staff around the quality of teaching that they feel are being addressed 'on the run' as a consequence of the decision and poor implementation strategies. Students reported feeling enormous pressure to complete all of the work and assessment requirements in the new timetable, with many concerned that assessment tasks are being changed simply to meet the scheduling requirements. Further, a number of students perceive that there is a reduction in academic standards, with marking standards being reduced to smooth the changeover to the new scheduling. They believe it is easier for some students to get extensions to complete assignments which they see as unfair to the students as a whole. Staff and students are also concerned that this change in timetabling is resulting in a number of assessment tasks being reduced, particularly where there are physical items to be produced, such as a number of garments for fashion subjects. It was clear, however, that many of the issues around the new scheduling were being resolved at the time of the Audit Visits but there are some areas where more work needs to be done to ensure that assessment is appropriate and fair and that standards are not permanently eroded.

In future, all decisions affecting academic delivery should be discussed at Academic Board with appropriate planning to ensure effective implementation and management of the expectations of all stakeholders.

2.4   Scholarship and Creative Activity

Both within the Portfolio and in interviews at all three sites visited, there was evidence of the emerging research agenda of RCDC, RU and REC. At RCDC Sydney a Research Committee of Academic Board has been established. Staff members with research backgrounds or potential, are being recruited and supported. As RCDC is aspiring to become an SAI, there is acknowledgement that much work needs to be undertaken by the College to achieve an appropriate research output and a research culture. What was not evident to the Panel is the existence of any strategy or plan to enable the College to lift the volume of research activities including details such as what discipline areas the College will target for research, and how researchers will be supported by professional development activity. The Panel acknowledges that the College is at the beginning of this process, and that the Academic Titles, Duties and Workloads policy (SM 61) is one approach being used to address the workload issues of a research agenda.

3   ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURES, DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT TEACHING AND LEARNING AND OTHER CORE ACTIVITIES

3.1   Academic and Administrative Staff

The teaching staff are the major strength of the College. The Panel was impressed by the commitment of staff to their students. This was evident in the enthusiasm with which staff spoke of their teaching roles and interactions with students. Staff are also committed to ensuring the quality of the students teaching and learning experience. Students reinforced the commitment of staff to their education, and commented that staff are approachable, and generous in sharing their expertise and knowledge of the various professions within which they are involved. This included staff at head of school, program director and sessional level. The international backgrounds of teaching staff is very well appreciated at the transnational teaching delivery sites. Students consider the staff, with very few exceptions, to be helpful and operating above the necessary requirements when assisting students.

The Panel noted that the academic structure is based on heads of school and program directors. Front-line staff, particularly sessional staff, reported that this structure works well. The role of the Academic Directors at transnational teaching sites and the Transnational Manager are seen as pivotal in moderation processes and in maintaining standards across RCDC program locations.

Staff members reported that their induction processes established a sound basis for them to begin operating within RCDC. New teachers in Shanghai are also supported by a system of teacher observations, a student evaluation carried out in the middle of the teaching block and follow-up by the Academic Director. Staff mobility between transnational sites is also under consideration as a continuing professional development initiative of RU.

Commendation 2

AUQA commends Raffles College of Design and Commerce on the quality of academic teaching staff, including sessional staff, and on the strong commitment of staff to students.

The College is presently planning to appoint sessional staff to permanent part-time positions. The Panel encourages the College to use this form of appointment. Providing staff with permanency in their appointments to the College provides some confidence in further employment and allows them to take on further creative and research pursuits which are crucial if the College is to gain SAI status. This form of appointment also enables the College to recognise and support the key strengths of their part-time teaching staff.

Affirmation 3

AUQA affirms the Raffles College of Design and Commerce intention to appoint sessional staff to permanent part-time positions.

3.1.1   Staff Appraisal

A number of staff discussed with the Panel the fact that they had recently been through a staff appraisal process. Staff suggested that the staff appraisal instrument being used had not been customised or aligned with the strategic priorities of the College and believe that the appraisal instrument is not sensitive to the culture of the College or to the conditions of an Australian

workplace. Further, staff do not believe that the instrument provides strong feedback to them on their performance, nor is the appraisal linked to any financial incentives. Some academic staff reported that in some cases they are being appraised by administrative staff and consider this to be inappropriate.

Now that an appraisal process has been established the College needs to move to consider the appropriateness of the current appraisal tool to ensure staff are provided with regular valid feedback on performance. In addition, the College needs to consider how staff appraisals contribute to the development of individual staff performance planning, and relate to the proposed workload policy.

Affirmation 4

AUQA affirms that RCDC has begun to develop an approach to staff appraisal and further attention must be given to the development of relevant appraisal and supporting feedback instruments.

3.1.2   Staff Workload Policy

The College has recently begun discussions with staff about a workload policy to provide for greater support for research and continuing professional development. The Panel received conflicting reports on the status of this policy and of how it would be implemented within the College.

The implementation of this policy is important in the planning by the College to become a more research intensive institution. The Panel believes that this policy needs to be negotiated with staff as a matter of priority, so that staff can have some security and workloads can be constructed. Those staff interested in pursuing research opportunities should be allocated the time to do so and the appropriate human resource back-up and funding made available to allow professional development. It was commented at time of the audit visit that while staff may undertake professional development opportunities, it is often impossible for them to participate owing to their full workloads and lack of teaching back-up or resources to fund attendance at professional activities. Staff suggested that currently they are pursuing professional development opportunities to ensure standing in their own industry rather than as a result of any coordinated approach to professional development through the College. If the College is to be successful in the aims set out in its Strategic Plan to be an SAI; a university college; and ultimately a campus of Raffles University, it will need to give a great deal of attention to implementing career pathways for all staff and providing the support to the staff to be successful in advancing on the pathways.

Commendation 3

AUQA commends the current implementation of the Staff Workload policy that acknowledges the need for allocated time for continuing professional development and research by staff.

3.2   Communication

Issues of communication are common in all organisations including educational institutions. The Panel noted that RCDC also has a number of issues around communication. These need to be addressed, in particular how the senior management of the College both communicates with and provides feedback to staff and students. A number of staff described the culture of the College as '…directive rather than enabling'. Students also do not believe they are listened to at

the senior administrative levels of the organisation and there are some residual hostile feelings from the recent changes to semester scheduling.

It was, however, acknowledged that communication had recently improved, with reasonable attempts being made by the management of the College to ensure open communication with both staff and students. The College needs to build on these initiatives to ensure that they are communicating regularly with the College community and the Student Representative Council and vice versa.

> **Recommendation 11**
>
> **AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce continue to work actively on strengthening communication channels with both students and staff.**

3.3   Support for Student learning

3.3.1   Teaching and Evaluation (TEVAL) questionnaire

The College has implemented TEVAL questionnaires and recently moved to survey each teacher, rather than every subject, each semester to avoid questionnaire fatigue. Staff and students interviewed by the Panel were aware of this survey tool. Students were of the view that changes had occurred as a result of their input. From a student and staff perspective, the Panel could find no evidence of transparency in the management of the data from this survey. The data goes to the Provost who then initiates any necessary actions but there is no formal or consistent feedback to staff or students. Staff indicated that they are keen to receive feedback on their performance and not simply in cases where at present they are informed only if their performance is judged to be poor. At the moment the survey results do not feed into individual staff performance reviews. Consideration will need to be given to ensuring that the results of TEVAL and the other surveys of students such as the one carried out in mid 2008 are fed back to staff and students

The RCDC performance portfolio indicated that the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS) was to be conducted for the first time in 2008, but this had not yet occurred.

> **Recommendation 12**
>
> **AUQA recognises Raffles College of Design and Commerce's administration of the TEVAL survey to students, but recommends that the College needs to review the implementation of this process to ensure transparency in the management and feedback of the data to students and staff.**

3.3.2   Facilities

In considering facilities and equipment and the scheduling of classes and curriculum the Panel was advised by staff and students that there were a number of issues around the availability and quality of equipment during the course of the semester at RCDC in Sydney. There was a view that much of the equipment was out of date with inconsistencies in the information technology infrastructure that students felt needed to be addressed. There was, at the time of the Audit Visit, no overall plan for development of the information technology or equipment infrastructure although, as mentioned earlier, there had been an intention to develop an IT plan flagged in the Strategic Plan.

The College needs to ensure that in each teaching period the teaching staff and students have access to quality equipment and information technology resources to complete the requirements of their study. This includes adequate access to industry-standard equipment including specialist printing, dark-room facilities, studios for preparing large-scale products and software packages. It is also imperative, given the new shorter teaching blocks, that no teaching weeks are lost due to studio facilities (including computer terminals for CAD) being inoperable.

The issue of maintenance of teaching and learning infrastructure at Sydney is a major concern to both academic staff and students and there appears to be no schedule for the maintenance of facilities and equipment. It would be appropriate for a maintenance schedule to be developed for the facilities of the College to ensure classrooms and equipment are kept in good working order.

It was reported that staff rooms had been also reduced in number and common areas for students are increasingly limited. The Singapore and Shanghai locations were very limited in this regard with little or no opportunity for student interactions outside classrooms even though both locations, like the Sydney campus, have an attractive, clean and well presented appearance.

Students in Sydney reported delays in carrying out repairs in cases of classroom equipment failures that they considered had seriously impacted on their capacity to meet learning objectives particularly since the timetable structures had been changed. The Panel found differing views on the reasons for delays, or perceived delays, but one way or the other the College needs to attend to improving the way these matters are managed.

Library facilities at all offshore sites comprise very basic reference collections with no loan service. Students do not find arrangements helpful. This is an area that needs substantial attention if RCDC is to be a significant provider of postgraduate education or to be successful in its aspirations to be an SAI.

One of the factors impacting on the time taken for repairs and essential purchases is that any purchase over $100 AUD must be approved by REC Singapore, after it has been approved by senior staff in Sydney. Responsibilities for budgets and budget approvals need to be managed by staff at local level to minimise delays in carrying out repairs, and to empower staff in managing their areas of responsibility across the College including, for example, expenditure against already agreed budgets such as the Library budget.

> **Recommendation 13**
>
> **AUQA recommends that a systematic approach to the maintenance of all teaching equipment and facilities be adopted by the College.**

3.3.3   Handbook

RCDC provides every new student with a copy of the handbook, and thereafter the handbook is accessible electronically for students who seek to consult it. Updates are ratified by Academic Board and are also available electronically. In discussion with students the Panel was unable to confirm to its satisfaction that all students receive a copy of the handbook or that changes to the handbook were being systematically managed and students updated accordingly. The handbook is in effect the contract between the College and the student, and it is therefore

important that all changes to the handbook, as ratified by the Academic Board, are advised without fail, to the student body.

Recommendation 14

AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce ensure that all students receive a copy of the student handbook and that it be treated as a primary instrument of quality assurance.

3.3.4   Student Services

The Panel noted the variability of student services at the different RCDC teaching sites. Student support services in Shanghai appeared well managed with a number of course counsellors and good relationships with parents as key external stakeholders; English language support for students was also well represented. In Singapore, students were more critical of support services, particularly of the need for more common areas for students and equipment including library acquisitions. Further, students were interested in the provision of increased career development support services and counselling services. In Sydney, students have access to, and use a range of support services including a Student Counsellor and Learning and Development Unit.

4   MAINTAINING A COMMITMENT TO QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

4.1   *Quality Management*

The Provost takes a major role in preparing policy documents. Over 2008 the College has produced a number of documents and policies regarding the quality process, and this has also included the appointment of a Quality Manager. This effort, along with earlier work in developing quality measures represents a solid start to implementing an integrated QA system for RCDC. But much work is necessary to further develop and implement the system across RCDC and its transnational delivery sites.

> **Affirmation 5**
>
> **AUQA affirms the beginnings of a quality assurance system at Raffles College of Design and Commerce and advises the College to increase its efforts to ensure the implementation and regular monitoring of quality assurance policies and processes and their practical application at all levels of the College.**

The Panel received contradictory advice on where responsibility for quality lies at RCDC, or who has accountability if actions are not completed. The College needs to examine this issue and ensure all staff are aware of their responsibilities in achieving quality in teaching and learning, research and academic administration.

Apart from the information supplied on quality arrangements initiated by RCDC, the College advises in its documentation that it has entered into a 'third party' quality assurance arrangement with RU (SM 02, page26) as follows:

> 'Raffles University retains overall responsibility for the quality assurance of all Raffles University and designated Third Party programmes offered through the Approved Associate Colleges within the REC network. It is stressed however that the quality of provision is actually the responsibility of all managerial, academic, administrative and technical staff associated with RU and Third Party programmes throughout the REC network'.

Other statements suggesting that RCDC has 'delegated responsibility' for driving quality assurance appear in several RCDC and RU documents and websites. These statements, in the view of the Panel, are somewhat misleading as they apply to RCDC, as they seem to imply that leadership for quality assurance rests with RU. It is not disputed that RU plays a role in quality assurance within the REC group, but in relation to RCDC it appears to be an ancillary role as RCDC has been developing its own framework and approach to quality. The main contribution of RU to RCDC lies in the audits it conducts of REC sites (apart from Sydney) in terms of their adequacy for delivery of RCDC or other programs, and the advice and support provided to the group through a series of RU committees with international membership. The RU offices in Singapore also facilitate the moderation processes for the RCDC delivery sites, but a lot of this work is coordinated through Sydney, by the Registrar or, through the RCDC Transnational Manager who was seen by staff at off-shore sites as playing a pivotal role in quality assurance. It was the view of the Panel that RU plays a relatively minor role in assuring the quality of RCDC programs in Sydney and elsewhere. The quality assurance activities conducted by RCDC itself,

albeit at very early stages of development, provide the institution's main quality assurance mechanisms.

The Panel understands that within the REC group there is a desire to develop the role of RU as an overarching quality assurance and program development body. It does not believe, however, that at the present time in the case of RCDC there is the same amount of value-adding as there might be perhaps with some other colleges in the group. The Council and Academic Board of RCDC need to consider this matter. RCDC needs to review the effectiveness of RU quality assurance services in relation to its 'delegated responsibility' so that the Council of RCDC can be clear on the role RU plays and that it meets the needs and expectation of RCDC. Depending on the outcome of this review, the Council may need to refine the parameters of the contribution of RU to quality assurance in RCDC and the balance between RCDC and RU led initiatives. But regardless of the outcome, RCDC will need to ensure that RCDC personnel and committees fully understand the roles and responsibilities.

Recommendation 15

(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce review current arrangements for quality assurance and carefully define its position regarding the relative responsibilities of the College and Raffles University for the assurance of academic quality and academic standards.

4.2   *Benchmarking*

The College provided little information and evidence regarding benchmarking activity with other HEPs. The College has selected a number of policies and processes from other HEIs and adapted these good practices for its own use. Apart from some recently completed work in measuring the length of bachelor programs at different universities there is no evidence of a systematic approach to benchmarking. The Panel advises the College to begin a formal approach to benchmarking, particularly given the array of partnerships that the College is building, for example with staff from the University of Technology, Sydney and The University of Newcastle and with Associate Colleges in the REC network. While a number of site visits have been conducted by RU, there is no evidence that these facilitate any strategic benchmarking activities.

Recommendation 16

AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce begin to develop and implement an approach to benchmarking.

4.2.1   Policy implementation including feedback

It became apparent that much of the recent quality assurance work by the College has focused around policy development, so that the College has a foundation set of policy documents. But not many staff know about the range of policies or any processes to follow in terms of their implementation with the result that many RCDC policies have yet to have an impact across the operations of the College. This was the case with major strategic documents such as the continuous improvement policy. This aspect needs attention. In addition within the stated policies there are areas that need further development for example, how the strategic plan is to be monitored, and what happens if key strategic priorities are not met.

Recommendation 17

(urgent) AUQA recommends that Raffles College of Design and Commerce ensure that all policies are disseminated throughout the organisation, and are fully implemented and monitored.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: RAFFLES COLLEGE OF DESIGN AND COMMERCE

1.   Preamble

Raffles College of Design and Commerce (RCDC) is a wholly owned subsidiary of Raffles Education Corporation (REC), a publicly listed for-profit education provider in Singapore.

RCDC has adopted a rolling triennium approach to its strategic planning. Key Objectives and Action Plans apply for the whole of a triennium. The Senior Management Committee (SMC) will review action plans annually for progress, appropriateness of objectives and strategies and emergent needs of the market and/or challenges that require inclusion. They will send revised action plans, as well as proposed new plans, for the next year to the RCDC Council and Academic Board for their final meeting of each academic year.

2.   Vision

To be a leading private higher education provider in Australia and internationally in the areas of design, commerce and design/commerce education. We will achieve this through the excellence of our curricula and the fostering of a creative, supportive learning community within our campus/es.

RCDC will develop to become a Self Accrediting Institution (SAI), a University College and finally an Australian University functioning alongside the REC initiative; Raffles University (RU) as an innovator within REC providing academic leadership and innovative programs to the group.

3.   Mission

RCDC aims to deliver high quality teaching and learning through curricula that consistently emphasise:
*   Creativity and innovation
*   Enterprise and entrepreneurship
*   Industry relevance and employability
*   Professional excellence
*   Socially responsible, ethical professional practice.

RCDC will deliver its programs through its own campuses in Australia and internationally in partnership with REC and RU. Offering RCDC programs through RU into the REC network internationalises RCDC and provides our students and staff with a unique opportunity to live and work in a number of international environments and in the process gain a competitive edge in the global community.

4.   Key objectives and Action Plans

The key objectives for RCDC in the 2008-2010 triennium occur within the seven main areas of its operation:

4.1   Teaching and Learning
Graduate Attributes
Academic Program Structure
Academic Issues
Key Objectives:
–   To develop postgraduate and short courses sensitive to our core undergraduate programs
–   To enhance the quality of teaching delivery
–   To ensure an effective teaching and learning environment

4.2   Research / Scholarly / Creative Activities
Reasons for research
Promotion of research
Key Objectives:
–   To foster a collegial and collaborative environment which embraces research, scholarship, professional creative activity and professional credibility.
–   To encourage the capability and productivity of individual researchers.

4.3   Staff, Staff Development and Administration
Continuing Professional Development
Administrative support
Key Objectives:
–   To maintain a Continuing Professional Development plan for each staff member.
–   To ensure RCDC's governance and decision-making processes are clear, consistent and facilitate effective decision-making.
–   To ensure RCDC's administrative systems are efficient and effective.

4.4   Students / Student Support
Key Objectives:
–   To provide a vibrant college environment that optimises opportunities for social and intellectual interaction.
–   To ensure RCDC provides a student support service that enhances the student's campus experience and learning outcomes.

4.5   Alumni
Key Objectives:
–   To build an alumni association that offers mutual benefits to both alumni and students
–   To build relationships with the alumni such that the College and its student cohort are better able to interact with and benefit from closer ties with industry.

4.6   Community
Key Objectives:
–   To build a culture of connection with the external RCDC community.

4.7   Continuing Quality Improvement
AUQA requirements
Preparation of AUQA Audit Portfolio
Key Objectives:
–   *To acquire a recognisable and measurable reputation for quality higher education in deign,*
     commerce and education.

4.8   Future Directions & Growth
Becoming a Self Accrediting Institution (SAI)
Becoming a University College
Becoming a University
Key Objectives:
–   *To build and maintain the student population at optimum capacity.*
–   *To increase the course offerings to facilitate student growth and progress to SAI and UC*
     status.

(excerpt from Raffles College of Design and Commerce Strategic Plan 2008–2010)

Key Statistics 2008 (sites visited)

Indicator	Sydney	Singapore	Shanghai
Total Higher Education Student Enrolments EFTSL	435	195	101
Staff numbers FTE			
Academic	30	12	8
General	18	4	3
Total	48	16	11

APPENDIX B: AUQA'S MISSION, OBJECTIVES, VISION AND VALUES

Mission

AUQA is the principal national quality assurance agency in higher education with the responsibility of providing public assurance of the quality of Australia's universities and other institutions of higher education, and assisting in enhancing the academic quality of these institutions.

Objectives

AUQA is established to be the principal national quality assurance agency in higher education, with responsibility for quality audits of higher education institutions and accreditation authorities, reporting on performance and outcomes, assisting in quality enhancement, advising on quality assurance; and liaising internationally with quality agencies in other jurisdictions, for the benefit of Australian higher education.

Specifically, the objectives of AUQA are as follows:

1. Arrange and manage a system of periodic audits of:

    - the quality of the academic activities, including attainment of standards of performance and outcomes of Australian universities and other higher education institutions;

    - the quality assurance arrangements intended to maintain and elevate that quality;

    - compliance with criteria set out in the National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes;

    and monitor, review, analyse and provide public reports on the quality of outcomes in Australian universities and higher education institutions.

2. Arrange and manage a system of periodic audits of the quality assurance processes, procedures, and outcomes of State, Territory and Commonwealth higher education accreditation authorities including their impact on the quality of higher education programs; and monitor, review, analyse and report on the outcomes of those audits.

3. Publicly report periodically on matters relating to quality assurance, including the relative standards and outcomes of the Australian higher education system and its institutions, its processes and its international standing, and the impact of the National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes on Australian Higher Education, using information available to AUQA from its audits and other activities carried out under these Objectives, and from other sources.

4. Develop partnerships with other quality agencies in relation to matters directly relating to quality assurance and audit, to facilitate efficient cross-border quality assurance processes and the international transfer of knowledge about those processes.

Vision

To consolidate AUQA's position as the leading reference point for quality assurance in higher education in and for Australia. Specifically:

- AUQA's judgements will be widely recognised as objective, accurate and useful, based on its effective procedures, including auditor training and thorough investigation.

- AUQA's work will be recognised by institutions and accrediting agencies as adding value to their activities, through the emphasis on autonomy, diversity and self-review.

- Through AUQA's work, there will be an improvement in public knowledge of the relative academic standards of Australian higher education and an increase in public confidence in Australian higher education.

- Through AUQA's work with other quality assurance agencies, the international quality assurance requirements for Australian higher education institutions will be coherent and rigorous, avoiding duplication and inconsistency.

- AUQA's advice will be sought on quality assurance in higher education, through mechanisms including consulting, training and publications.

- AUQA will be recognised among its international peers as a leading quality assurance agency, collaborating with other agencies and providing leadership by example.

Values

In its external relations, AUQA will be:

- *Rigorous:* AUQA carries out all its audits as rigorously and thoroughly as possible.

- *Supportive:* AUQA recognises institutional autonomy in setting objectives and implementing processes to achieve them, and acts to facilitate and support this.

- *Flexible:* AUQA operates flexibly, in order to acknowledge and reinforce institutional diversity, and is responsive to institution and agency characteristics and needs.

- *Cooperative:* AUQA recognises that the achievement of quality in any organisation depends on a commitment to quality within the organisation itself, and so operates as unobtrusively as is consistent with effectiveness and rigour.

- *Collaborative:* as a quality assurance agency, AUQA works collaboratively with the accrediting agencies (in addition to its audit role with respect to these agencies).

- *Transparent:* AUQA's audit procedures, and its own quality assurance system, are open to public scrutiny.

- *Economical:* AUQA operates cost-effectively and keeps as low as possible the demands it places on institutions and agencies.

- *Open:* AUQA reports publicly and clearly on its findings in relation to institutions, agencies and the sector.

APPENDIX C: THE AUDIT PANEL

Professor Charles Bodman-Rae, Elder Professor of Music, Elder Conservatory of Music, University of Adelaide

Emeritus Professor Mairead Browne, Consultant (Chair)

Ms Karen Treloar, Audit Director, Australian Universities Quality Agency

APPENDIX D: ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The following abbreviations and definitions are used in this Report. As necessary, they are explained in context.

APPC	Academic Policy and Practice Committee
ARC	Assessment Review Committee
AUQA	Australian Universities Quality Agency
CEQ	Course Experience Questionnaire
DEEWR	Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, formerly DEST
DEST	former Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training
EFTSL	equivalent full-time student load
FEE-HELP	FEE-HELP is a loan given to eligible fee-paying students to help pay part or all of their tuition fees.
GDS	Graduate Destination Survey (http://www.graduatecareers.com.au/content/view/full/868)
HEP(s)	higher education provider(s)
HESA	Higher Education Support Act 2003
MCEETYA	Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs
NSAI(s)	non self-accrediting institution(s)
NSW DET	NSW Department of Education and Training
OADRI	Objective-Approach-Deployment-Results-Improvement
PF p	Performance Portfolio page reference
Portfolio	Performance Portfolio: Self-Review Report
QA	Quality Assurance
QAFs	Quality Audit Factors
RCDC	Raffles College of Design and Commerce
REC	Raffles Education Corporation
RU	Raffles University
SAI(s)	Self-Accrediting Institution(s)
SM P	Support Materials page reference
SRC	Student Representative Council
TEVAL	Teaching Evaluation questionnaire

Notes

....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....
....