

AUSTRALIAN  
UNIVERSITIES  
QUALITY AGENCY

Report of an Audit of  
Monash University

December 2006

AUQA Audit Report Number 48

ISBN 1 877090 64 6

© Australian Universities Quality Agency 2006

Level 10, 123 Lonsdale Street  
Melbourne, VIC 3000  
Ph 03 9664 1000  
Fax 03 9639 7377

[admin@auqa.edu.au](mailto:admin@auqa.edu.au)

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

The Australian Universities Quality Agency receives financial support from the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments of Australia.

## CONTENTS

<b>OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Background .....	1
The Audit Process .....	1
<b>CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
Introduction to Findings.....	3
Commendations.....	4
Affirmations .....	6
Recommendations .....	6
<b>1 INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT.....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Strategic Planning .....	8
1.1.1 Monash University’s Aims.....	9
1.1.2 University Key Performance Indicators .....	10
1.1.3 Benchmarking.....	11
1.2 Governance and Management.....	12
1.2.1 University Council.....	12
1.2.2 Council Audit Committee.....	13
1.2.3 Senior Management.....	13
1.2.4 Academic Board .....	14
1.2.5 Campus Integration .....	14
<b>2 QUALITY .....</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Quality at Monash.....	17
2.2 Evaluation Instruments .....	17
2.3 Review Schedule.....	18
<b>3 PEOPLE.....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Human Resources Policies.....	20
3.1.1 Recruitment of Staff .....	20
3.1.2 Probation and Promotion .....	20
3.1.3 Staff Equity.....	21
3.1.4 Cultural and Language Training.....	22
3.2 Staff Satisfaction .....	22
3.3 Performance Management Scheme.....	23
3.3.1 Academic Staff .....	23
3.3.2 General Staff.....	24
3.4 Early Career Researchers .....	24
3.5 Students.....	25
3.5.1 Student Profile .....	25
3.5.2 Equity Targets .....	25
3.5.3 Entry Requirements .....	26
<b>4 EDUCATION .....</b>	<b>28</b>
4.1 Educational Management.....	28
4.1.1 Teaching Values .....	28
4.1.2 Graduate Attributes .....	29
4.1.3 Management Structure.....	29
4.1.4 Education Policy.....	30

4.1.5	Education Planning .....	30
4.2	Quality of Teaching .....	31
4.2.1	Teaching Evaluation .....	31
4.2.2	Graduate Certificate in Higher Education .....	33
4.2.3	Teaching and Learning Support.....	33
4.3	Quality Assurance .....	34
4.3.1	Course and Unit Development and Approval.....	34
4.3.2	Course and Academic Reviews .....	35
4.4	Course Equivalence.....	35
4.5	Education Performance .....	36
<b>5</b>	<b>RESEARCH TRAINING .....</b>	<b>38</b>
5.1	Research Training Policy .....	38
5.2	Supervision.....	39
5.3	Support.....	39
5.4	Research Training Performance .....	40
5.5	Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire .....	41
<b>6</b>	<b>RESEARCH.....</b>	<b>42</b>
6.1	Research Planning.....	42
6.1.1	Research Activity .....	42
6.1.2	Scholarship .....	43
6.1.3	Research Collaboration.....	43
6.2	Research Organisation .....	44
6.2.1	Organisational Structures.....	44
6.2.2	Research Infrastructure .....	45
6.3	Research Performance.....	45
<b>7</b>	<b>ENGAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>47</b>
7.1	Community Engagement Framework .....	47
7.2	Engagement Activities .....	48
<b>8</b>	<b>INTERNATIONAL.....</b>	<b>49</b>
8.1	Strategy .....	49
8.2	Management.....	50
8.3	Transnational Collaborations .....	50
8.3.1	Approval .....	50
8.3.2	Recruitment Agents .....	51
8.3.3	Collaborative Teaching Arrangements .....	51
8.3.4	Review of Operations .....	52
8.3.5	Staffing .....	52
8.4	Staff and Student Mobility .....	53
8.5	Monash College .....	54
<b>9</b>	<b>MONASH UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA AND MONASH SOUTH AFRICA .....</b>	<b>55</b>
9.1	Monash University Malaysia .....	55
9.1.1	Governance.....	55
9.1.2	Campus Characteristics .....	55
9.1.3	Stakeholder Engagement .....	56
9.1.4	Facilities.....	56
9.1.5	Student Support .....	56

9.1.6	Performance Management.....	56
9.1.7	The Quality Portfolio.....	57
9.2	Monash South Africa .....	57
9.2.1	Governance.....	57
9.2.2	Campus Characteristics .....	58
9.2.3	Stakeholder Relations .....	58
9.2.4	Staff Development.....	58
9.2.5	The Quality Portfolio.....	59
<b>10</b>	<b>SUPPORT SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>60</b>
10.1	Financial Management.....	60
10.2	Risk Management .....	61
10.3	Support services .....	61
10.3.1	Management .....	61
10.3.2	Information Technology Services .....	62
10.3.3	Library .....	62
10.3.4	Student Administrative Services .....	63
10.3.5	Grievance Procedures .....	64
10.3.6	Occupational Health Safety and Environment .....	64
	<b>APPENDIX A: MONASH UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>67</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B: AUQA’S MISSION, OBJECTIVES, VALUES AND VISION .....</b>	<b>69</b>
	<b>APPENDIX C: THE AUDIT PANEL .....</b>	<b>71</b>
	<b>APPENDIX D: ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>72</b>



## OVERVIEW OF THE AUDIT

### *Background*

In 2006 the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) appointed an Audit Panel to undertake a quality audit of Monash University.

This Report of the audit provides an overview, and then details the Audit Panel's findings, recommendations, affirmations and commendations. A brief introduction to Monash University (hereinafter referred to as Monash University, the University or Monash) is given in Appendix A; the mission, objectives, values and vision of AUQA are shown in Appendix B; membership of the Audit Panel is provided in Appendix C. Appendix D defines abbreviations and technical terms used in this Report.

### *The Audit Process*

AUQA bases its audits on each organisation's own objectives, together with the MCEETYA *National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes* <http://www.mceetya.edu.au/mceetya/>, and other relevant legal requirements or codes to which the organisation is committed. The major aim of the audit is to consider and review the procedures an organisation has in place to monitor and achieve its objectives. Full details of the AUQA audit process are available in the AUQA Audit Manual <<http://www.auqa.edu.au/qualityaudit/auditmanuals/index.shtml>>.

Monash presented its submission (Quality Audit Portfolio, hereinafter Performance Portfolio) to AUQA on 15 May 2006 along with a number of printed supporting materials. The Performance Portfolio consisted of three volumes, a volume covering Monash University, and volumes for Monash University Malaysia (MUM) and for Monash South Africa (MSA). The Portfolios included reference to policies and other key documents on the Monash website and intranet. The Audit Panel met on 7 June 2006 to consider these materials.

The Audit Panel Chair and Audit Director undertook a Preparatory Visit to Monash University on 26 June 2006. This visit allowed the Panel Chair and the Audit Director to discuss the Panel's requests for additional documentation, to clarify a number of issues, and to make arrangements for the Panel's visits. The University handled the requests for additional documentation readily and efficiently in the course of the Audit, and the highly professional support provided by the University's internal audit project team greatly aided the Panel in its work.

The Audit Panel Chairperson and the Audit Director undertook two Audit Visits outside Australia. During the week of 31 July the delegation visited MUM and one of Monash's collaborative teaching partners in Singapore, TMC, with a particular focus on the Bachelor of Information Technology course. During the visit to MUM the Panel interviewed representatives of the MUM Board of Directors, senior management, academic and general staff, students, staff and student associations and representatives of MUM's main external stakeholders. The visit also included a guided tour to the new MUM campus. At TMC the Panel met the senior management, local tutors, administrative staff and students. On 24 August the delegation interviewed by tele-conference senior academic staff, administrative staff, local tutors and students of the Master of Practising Accounting course at the School of Professional and Continuing Education, the University of Hong Kong. At the Audit Visits in Australia the Audit Panel had the opportunity to interview Australian academic and general staff involved in the teaching of the two collaborative programs interviewed by the Panel delegation.

An audit of MSA was conducted (29 August to 1 September) in cooperation with the South African Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC). According to South African legislation, all private

providers operating in South Africa have to undergo external audit by HEQC every fifth year. AUQA and HEQC have a Memorandum of Cooperation and in 2005, after discussion with senior staff at Monash who were positive towards the idea, it was agreed that the audit of MSA would be conducted jointly by HEQC and AUQA. This meant that Monash submitted the same Performance Portfolio for MSA to HEQC and AUQA and a joint Audit Panel was established. The joint Panel consisted of the AUQA Audit Panel Chair who was also chair of the joint Panel, the AUQA Audit Director, a manager of institutional audits from HEQC and two South African panel members appointed by the HEQC. The joint Panel coordinated its request for additional documentation and prepared and conducted all the interviews during the Audit Visit in South Africa together. Due to the differences in focus of AUQA audit (MSA is part of the whole-of-institution audit) and HEQC audit (audit of MSA as an independent private provider in South Africa), the HEQC panel delivered its oral feedback to MSA at the closure of the Audit Visit, and HEQC and AUQA prepared two separate audit reports.

A written report of all visits undertaken outside Australia was prepared and circulated to the full Audit Panel for its consideration prior to the main Audit Visit. In all, the delegation spoke with over 250 people during these Audit Visits.

A delegation of the Audit Panel visited the Gippsland campus on 5 September 2006. The main Audit Visit took place from 11 to 15 September at the Clayton campus. In all, the Audit Panel spoke with approximately 500 people during these Audit Visits, including the Chancellor and members of Council, the Vice-Chancellor and members of senior management, academic staff, general and sessional staff, staff associations, domestic and international undergraduate and postgraduate students including representatives of the student unions, and members of the external community. All sessions included staff from all the Australian Monash campuses except Gippsland. Sessions were also available at the Gippsland and Clayton Campuses for any member of the Monash community to meet the Audit Panel. Ten people took advantage of this opportunity.

This Report relates to the situation current at the time of the Audit Visit, which ended on 15 September 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 Monash University as well as information gained through interviews, discussion and observation. While every attempt has been made to reach a comprehensive understanding of Monash's activities encompassed by the audit, the Report does not identify every aspect of quality assurance and its effectiveness or shortcomings.

This Report contains a summary of 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 Monash with evidence, they are termed 'affirmations'. It is acknowledged that recommendations in this Audit Report may have resource implications, and that this can pose difficulties for the University. Accordingly, AUQA does not prioritise these recommendations, and recognises that it is the responsibility of Monash to respond in a manner consistent with its local context.

The Audit Panel has structured this Audit Report using the same chapter headings as in the University's Performance Portfolio, adding a chapter on Monash University Malaysia and Monash South Africa.

Monash University's strategic directions are laid out in 'Monash Directions 2025' which establishes the long-term vision of the University and in 'Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008' (section 1.1). The Audit Panel's judgements of the University's achievements of its objectives will be made against the objectives presented in these two documents and in accordance with the references made to them in the Performance Portfolio.

## 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*

Monash Directions 2025 lays out the future vision for the University to be one of the best universities in the world distinctive because of its research-intensive, international focus. Monash is well under way in achieving this vision with the establishment of campuses in Malaysia and South Africa, centres in Europe, metropolitan and regional campuses in Australia, an extensive array of international research collaborations and an internationalised student and staff profile. AUQA commends Monash for this vision which is greatly supported by the university community, and builds on its strengths, in particular the University's longstanding tradition of offering education to international students and its current position as the Australian university with the highest number of international students.

The University's international profile could be further strengthened, however. AUQA recommends that Monash explore the possibility of adding international members to the Council. Monash also needs to continue to ensure that the campuses are at an appropriate level of development to contribute to the University's performance objectives, particularly with regard to research. The commitment of Monash to the development of its Malaysian and South African campuses was noted by the Panel.

Assuring academic equivalence of units taught across campuses is important to Monash and a common set of principles applies for this purpose. AUQA endorses the strengthening of these principles with the introduction of the Academic Programs taught from Multiple Campuses Policy which will apply from January 2007. Given the focus accorded to internationalisation of the University's activities the Audit Panel noted that the term 'internationalisation' was not well understood and consistently interpreted amongst staff and it would be of value to develop a 'Monash University Statement of Purpose' to help embed the concept.

Monash's quality cycle is conceptualised in 'Quality at Monash: Values and Principles' and encourages staff to apply quality values and principles. The importance of the quality cycle is emphasised through the existence of the Centre for Higher Education Quality. AUQA commends Monash for the systematic implementation of quality cycle within the University's work processes.

It is an important part of Monash's approach to quality to consistently evaluate its results and performance. The University has developed an elaborate set of key performance indicators that covers the performance at University, faculty and campus level. Monash is commended for this initiative which is an important means of monitoring the University's performance systematically against the strategic directions of the University.

Monash University has as two of its main objectives the achievement of excellence in education and research. The University refers to these two objectives as the 'twin peaks' and emphasises that research and education are equally important. Monash has initiated a process aimed at improving its research performance, and AUQA commends the University for putting in place an integrated set of strategies to improve its research performance and obtaining commitment from staff to contribute to the achievement of the research objectives. It is a target for Monash that at least 80% of academic staff be research active by 2008.

As part of this strategy, Monash has set stretch targets for its research performance against the performance of the Group of Eight (Go8) universities of which it is a member. Monash has set a target to be among the top three in the Go8 with respect to research income and share of weighted and unweighted

publications. Monash's performance in the latter category has improved both compared to the sector and the Go8 while its share of research income has fluctuated and has to be improved for the University to reach its targets against Go8 measures in 2008.

The priorities in education are primarily set in the Education Plan 2006–2010 which is supported by a range of documents, such as the Values of High-Quality Teaching and Learning Policy and the Code of Practice for Teaching and Learning and the Code of Practice for Graduate/Postgraduate Teaching and Learning. Efforts are needed to embed the teaching and learning values and plans more thoroughly among staff. If the objectives of excellence in education are to be achieved it is necessary to introduce measures that support the value of high quality teaching. AUQA recommends that the role of the Associate Deans (Teaching) be reformulated to provide greater leadership in teaching and learning and affirms Monash's intention to use a variety of means to encourage improvements in teaching performance.

Monash effectively monitors student satisfaction with the study experience and the quality of teaching through a number of student survey instruments, such as the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), Monash Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) and unit evaluations. They provide Monash with critical data which is effectively and consistently used to inform discussions of and planning of initiatives to improve the quality of teaching. AUQA commends the University for the systematic implementation of its considerable suite of evaluations which are supported by training activities which are administered and reported systematically.

An important element of Monash's strategy to strengthen its research performance is to increase its share of national HDR completions and per capita national HDR completions, share of national HDR student load and share of international HDR students. Monash aims at being among the top three in the G08 on these measures. The Research and Research Training Plan 2006-2010 lays out a number of strategies which Monash is currently pursuing to reach these targets. AUQA commends the University for its support mechanisms for Higher Degree Research students, such as the exPERT research training program aimed at providing a high quality research training experience.

Financial management at Monash has focused on raising the awareness of costs for a number of years and builds on the principle that all revenue earned by a faculty is attributed to the faculty and the faculty covers all direct expenses of staff salary and non-staff related expenses. This process has been effectively facilitated through the implementation of service level agreement where service level statements have been negotiated between all major support service areas and the faculties. AUQA commends Monash for the development and implementation of service level agreement.

A summary of commendations, affirmations, and recommendations follows. These are not prioritised by the Audit Panel. They are listed below in the order in which they appear in the Report.

### ***Commendations***

1. AUQA commends the Vice-Chancellor and senior management for having developed a vision for the University that builds on Monash University's particular strengths and emphasises its profile as a research-intensive international university, and for having embedded an understanding of and support for the vision within the University.....10
2. AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of the University key performance indicators as a means of monitoring its performance systematically against the strategic directions throughout the University. ....11
3. AUQA commends Monash University for the effective implementation of the quality cycle as described in 'Quality at Monash' that permeates the University's work processes.....17

4. AUQA commends Monash University for the systematic implementation of its considerable suite of evaluation instruments, which are supported by the Centre for Higher Education Quality's training activities, and administered and reported systematically.....18
5. AUQA commends Monash University for its consistent implementation of the Performance Management Scheme for academic staff which is providing an effective framework for the assessment of staff performance and for setting the future direction for the development of staff. ....24
6. AUQA commends Monash University for its pathway programs which effectively prepare the students for further study and facilitate the transfer of students to the University in particular Monash College and the Academic Development Program at Monash South Africa. ....27
7. AUQA commends Monash University for its rigorous evaluations of student satisfaction with the study experience, through the Monash Experience Questionnaire and unit evaluations, that have contributed to the improvement of satisfaction with the experience. ....32
8. AUQA commends Monash University for the introduction of completion of the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education as a requirement for probation for academic staff. ....33
9. AUQA commends Monash University for its supervisor accreditation program which incorporates mechanisms for addressing poor supervision practice. ....39
10. AUQA commends Monash University for its support mechanisms for Higher Degree Research students, such as the exPERT program, which are aimed at providing a high quality research training experience.....40
11. AUQA commends Monash University for putting in place an integrated set of strategies to improve research performance and its success in raising the profile of research and obtaining a commitment from staff in all campuses to contribute to achievement of the ambitious stretch research targets set for the university.....46
12. AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of service level agreement as a means of increasing transparency of services and awareness of costs as well as being a vehicle of collaboration which can ensure an increased alignment between internal services and faculty needs.....60
13. AUQA commends Monash University for its comprehensive risk management framework and crisis management and recovery planning. ....61
14. AUQA commends the Monash University Library for its educational support services, such as Monash University Lectures Online and its information literacy activities, that support the achievement of the University's objectives in teaching and learning. ....63
15. AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of the Caulfield Service Centre model which has simplified student access to services through the establishment of a single point of contact. ....63
16. AUQA commends Monash University for its environmental programs, the implementation of which is supported by effective organisational structures. ....65

***Affirmations***

1. AUQA affirms Monash University’s recognition of the need to focus on embedding planning at school and department level and that the introduction of the Conference for Academic Heads as a recurrent annual event is an important means of achieving this goal.....9

2. AUQA affirms the need identified by Monash University to take steps that assure the effective implementation of the five-year cycle of academic and service area reviews. ....19

3. AUQA affirms Monash University’s intention to ensure that the level of English language competency of some staff is improved and that support is offered to assist staff in improving their level of cultural awareness and their English language skills through initiatives such as the CLEAR program. ....22

4. AUQA affirms Monash University’s intention to use a variety of means to encourage improvements in performance including the provision of incentives and rewards for high performance in teaching in order to strengthen the objective to achieve excellence in education. ....29

5. AUQA affirms Monash University’s decision to develop a university-wide definition of the term ‘research active’, which is essential in determining the attainment and sustainability of its goals for research performance. ....43

6. AUQA affirms Monash University’s intention to establish structures that will support the development of research activities at the Gippsland campus, Monash University Malaysia and Monash South Africa and will integrate their research strengths into the University’s main areas of research. ....44

7. AUQA affirms Monash University’s initiative to develop a Community Engagement Framework that more effectively identifies new directions and coordinates activities, monitors predefined targets, and allows the university to better share experiences across campuses. ....47

***Recommendations***

1. AUQA recommends that Monash University take measures to simplify the organisation’s operation and rationalise the decision-making processes in order to reduce the sense of bureaucratic overload.....10

2. AUQA recommends that Monash University explore the possibilities for adding to the University Council international members in order to strengthen the University’s international profile.....13

3. AUQA recommends that the Monash University Council Audit Committee membership be revised so the Audit Committee includes no members of the Council Executive Committee and be expanded to include appropriately qualified external members. ....13

4. AUQA recommends that Monash University include targets for research activity in the probation requirements to equally reflect the importance of research and teaching in the probation process. ....21

5. AUQA recommends that Monash University ensure that staff supervisors are adequately trained in order for the Performance Management Scheme for general staff to be consistently applied and to strengthen supervisors' abilities to discuss with staff equitable development opportunities that enable them to pursue appropriate career advancement opportunities.....24
6. AUQA recommends that Monash University reformulate the role of the Associate Deans (Teaching) to ensure greater opportunity and accountability for leadership in learning and teaching in their faculties and the University as a whole.....30
7. AUQA recommends that Monash University develop a strategy to better support sessional teaching staff and monitor the effectiveness of this strategy in order to improve the overall student learning experience.....33
8. AUQA recommends that Monash University introduce a formal reaccreditation requirement in its course review policy to ensure systematic consideration of the currency of the University's education program.....35
9. AUQA recommends that Monash University develop a 'Statement of International Purpose' to support and integrate the understanding of internationalisation more effectively into the activities of the university.....50
10. AUQA recommends that Monash University develop procedures to introduce local staff involved in courses taught as part of collaborative teaching arrangements offshore to the University values, such as student-centred and flexible learning, to ensure that the study experience is equivalent. ....52

## 1 INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Monash Directions 2025 establishes the current long-term vision of the University and includes the following statement of purpose:

*Monash University seeks to improve the human condition by advancing knowledge and fostering creativity. It does so through research and education and a commitment to social justice, human rights and a sustainable environment. It values:*

- *excellence in research and scholarship*
- *excellence in education*
- *excellence in management*
- *international focus*
- *innovation and creativity*
- *diversity*
- *fairness*
- *engagement*
- *integrity, and*
- *self-reliance.*

Monash Directions 2025 also includes the University's aim:

*By 2025 we will be one of the best universities in the world, distinctive because our research-intensive, international focus enables us to address important theoretical and practical challenges, and develop graduates who will wish to do the same.*

The Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008 presents Monash's strategic directions and includes the following value with respect to management:

*Excellent education and research need to be supported by excellent management. Monash's complexity, size and diversity provide significant management challenges. A fundamental component of excellence in management is to value staff and to be an exemplary employer.*

### 1.1 Strategic Planning

Planning at Monash is led by the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor (SDVC) and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Planning). Monash has developed a planning pyramid which illustrates the planning framework of the University. Monash Directions 2025, which was approved by Council in 2005, sits at the apex of the pyramid and all other plans are derived from its strategic directions. The strategic directions are underpinned by an Academic Plan, which incorporates the Education Plan 2006–2010, Research and Research Training Plan 2006–2010 International Plan 2007–2010 and a Discipline Profile. Plans for campuses, centres, faculties and divisions form other layers of the pyramid. Supporting and facilitating plans are developed to reinforce the strategic plans and provide detailed actions and targets in academic, finance, human resources, facilities and service areas.

Not all faculties at Monash have constituent schools/departments and the planning pyramid does not include plans at these levels. It is left to the faculties with schools/departments to identify how planning will occur at these levels and how links with the faculty operational plan will be established. Some of these faculty operational plans explicitly incorporate a school dimension. The faculty operational plans are developed on a common template which requires the faculty to report on progress since the previous year. The objectives and targets are linked to the strategic

planning documents, and the University key performance indicators (KPIs) are broken down to faculty level. The Still Learning self-review identified the need for stronger campus planning and since 2005 operational plans are required to include campus statements. Campus Directions Statements, which are prepared by each campus, were introduced to provide the vision for each campus, in the context of the overall vision set by Monash Directions 2025. It is too soon to judge the impact of this link between campuses and faculties. The development of faculty plans is monitored and approved by the Vice-Chancellor's Group.

The University has made good progress in terms of embedding planning at university and faculty and divisional levels where there is already a thorough understanding of the link between the different levels of planning. Monash has recognised that planning at department and school level is uneven and is focusing on embedding planning at these levels.

A conference for academic heads was organised for the first time in 2005 – the first such meeting for some time. The feedback from the participants showed that there was a strong need on the part of the academic heads to clarify their relationship with the rest of the University and for them to regularly meet colleagues and share experiences. Due to the feedback from the 2005 conference an annual conference for academic heads has been introduced. The second conference was held in 2006 and the feedback showed that the opportunity for the participants to re-meet was appreciated. The annual conference will be an important step in embedding the planning framework at school and department level.

#### **Affirmation 1**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's recognition of the need to focus on embedding planning at school and department level and that the introduction of the Conference for Academic Heads as a recurrent annual event is an important means of achieving this goal.**

#### 1.1.1 Monash University's Aims

Monash Directions 2025 lays out the future vision for Monash University. Monash Directions 2025 is based on Monash's strengths and special characteristics as a university. Monash aims to be one of the best universities in the world, distinctive because of its research-intensive, international focus. This aim is being achieved through a range of initiatives such as the existence of campuses in countries other than Australia, metropolitan and regional campuses in Australia, centres in Europe, an extensive array of international research collaborations and an internationalised student and staff profile.

Monash consists of a network of eight campuses, two centres and ten faculties that relate to each other within a matrix structure. Senior management, of whom a majority is situated at the Clayton campus, is the core of the matrix. Teaching and research activities are undertaken by faculties across the campus and centre network. Faculty Boards have responsibility for the management and control of all matters relating to studies within the faculty's academic fields of interest. Faculty Boards report to Academic Board.

Staff at the Malaysian and South African campuses are located within academic schools of faculties. They report operationally to the head of school and work collaboratively with colleagues across the faculty and thus across locations in unit and course management and delivery. Course coordinators and unit leaders are often their main point of contact. At each of these campuses, committees have been established which oversee the academic activities of the campus and report to Education Committee. Campus-based Research Committees have also been established.

Monash's two centres in Europe are used to develop and expand its links with European institutions and provide better opportunities for staff and students to spend time in Europe. Senior management, with the support of Council, has developed the ambitious vision for the University. It reflects and builds on the current strengths of Monash, including its long standing commitment to the education of international students, and provides Monash with a profile which is distinct from other Australian universities. The panel notes the University's development from being an entrepreneurial institution to its strong commitment to be a research-intensive international university committed to the public good. Furthermore senior management has been successful in embedding the vision in the planning processes of the University and getting the support from the majority of staff on its future direction.

### **Commendation 1**

**AUQA commends the Vice-Chancellor and senior management for having developed a vision for the University that builds on Monash University's particular strengths and emphasises its profile as a research-intensive international university, and for having embedded an understanding of and support for the vision within the University.**

Monash's leaders acknowledge that the University's complexity, size and dispersion provide management with a range of challenges. Monash currently conceives of itself as a networked institution distributed across a number of locations and seeking to establish an appropriate balance between local needs and central control. The Panel wondered whether this approach will be sustainable in the longer term, given the increasing size, diversity and dispersion of the university, or whether Monash will eventually need to consider moving to a 'system-style' organisational framework where the campuses are independent units working under devolved authority.

The Audit Panel recognises that at the moment there is a need for central direction to manage the change agenda. At the same time there is a pressing need for simplifying the organisational structure. The strong message from all the interviews during the Audit Visits is that the multi-layer decision-making processes deriving from the current organisational structure. The involvement of Clayton as well as the other campuses slow down the pace of decision-making and increase the layers of red tape. The complexity risks stifling the strategic intentions and impeding the concentration of resources around the core businesses. It is important that Monash consolidate its vision and the achievements to date before embarking on further expansion and consider the need and appropriate strategies for benefiting in full from the devolved organisational structure by passing authority downwards in the organisation.

### **Recommendation 1**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University take measures to simplify the organisation's operation and rationalise the decision-making processes in order to reduce the sense of bureaucratic overload.**

It is essential that this process takes into account how information is collected and used to inform the decision-making processes and if the collection and use of information can be organised more effectively. Monash has recognised this issue and the development of an Information Management Strategy has been a university-wide priority for 2006.

#### 1.1.2 University Key Performance Indicators

Monash has developed a set of KPIs to monitor its performance against the objectives set out in its strategic planning documents. There are 20 university-wide KPIs. These core indicators cover reputation, research, education, equity, international and financial. In addition to these, Monash has formulated an additional 52 indicators which constitute the University-Wide Full Performance Indicators Report that is provided at institutional, faculty and campus level. The

indicators cover resources and infrastructure performance in addition to the areas mentioned above.

The 20 high-level KPIs were presented with targets for the first time in 2005. For most measures, a stretch target has been set to be in the top three of the Go8 by 2008. 'Traffic-light' reporting against the targets has also been introduced using green, amber and red to signify areas meeting aspirations, needing improvement and needing critical attention. Actual performance in the measures is discussed in relevant chapters in this Report.

The use of the KPI reports to monitor and guide direction is well embedded within the University. The KPIs are reflected in the faculty operational plans. The reports are presented annually to Council and Academic Board and keep members up to date with progress on the KPIs. The Panel found evidence that the targets are well understood by the university community and function as a clear stimulus for staff to improve their performance. The KPIs are an important lever for the University to successfully meet its objectives.

## **Commendation 2**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of the University key performance indicators as a means of monitoring its performance systematically against the strategic directions throughout the University.**

### 1.1.3 Benchmarking

Monash aspires to be one of the best universities in the world by 2025 and therefore its placement in some of the global university ranking schemes is part of Monash's performance measures. Monash's goal is to be among the top 150 in the Shanghai Jiao Tong Index by 2008 and among the top 25 in the THES World University Rankings by 2008. Monash's position in the former has deteriorated since 2003 from the 150–200 band to the 200–300 band in 2005. Monash was 33 in the THES rankings in 2004 and 2005.

Monash has furthermore elected to benchmark itself, through the university-wide KPIs, against the Go8 universities and the stretch targets are a clear stimulus for staff to improve their performance (section 6.3). While recognising the reasons behind this choice, the Panel was not entirely convinced that restricting itself to peer-groups, competitive benchmarks will provide sufficient information to enable the University to measure its progress towards its objective to be 'one of the best universities in the world'. It could therefore be valuable for Monash to also identify indicators of excellence other than against Go8 universities that will emphasise Monash's brand and objectives more specifically.

The Audit Panel's discussions with students, especially international students studying in Australia and international students enrolled at MUM and MSA and the collaborative teaching partners visited by the Panel showed that they are very aware of Monash's reputation. Furthermore in most cases it had been the deciding factor in the students' choice of Monash as their place of study, and many quoted Monash's exact place in the rankings. There could be a danger of too much emphasis on the international league tables in a situation where the University can lose places in such league tables in a short period of time without any tangible evidence that anything has really changed. While the Panel acknowledges the current effective use of the KPIs and the general awareness of these measures across the University, it is important that the University does not allow the KPIs to become a means in themselves rather than an indication of the effectiveness of other measures and initiatives.

At the operational level, Monash uses benchmarking actively as a measure of its performance and to identify good practice. The University benchmarks a range of its activities, both academic and

administrative, on a needs basis against several Australian universities, such as student experience information with the University of Sydney and University of Queensland, teaching research nexus with the University of Sydney and doctoral programs with universities in Australia, New Zealand and the United Kingdom. The last couple of years have seen an increase in benchmarking projects with international partners, an area which according to the university will be increased in the future in line with the University's international profile.

## 1.2 *Governance and Management*

### 1.2.1 University Council

The University Council is the governing body of the University and consists of 22 members. The responsibilities and membership of the Council are laid out in the *Monash University Act 1958*. The main responsibility of Council is to approve the University's strategic direction and policies and oversee its management and performance. Furthermore Council is specifically responsible for approving and overseeing systems of control and accountability of the University, including controlled entities and the assessment of management and risk. Council has eight standing committees, of which one is an Executive Committee.

Council members receive a thorough induction to their responsibilities which is tailor-made to the level of experience and knowledge of the individual members. In regard to Council's governance responsibilities, eg the National Governance Protocols and the *National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes*, it was clear that members rely on the information and interpretation provided by the university, especially the secretary to Council due to the complexities of the information.

As a consequence of the latest evaluation of Council, it has been decided to limit membership of Council to two terms (a maximum of six years). This is a change from the current situation where several members have been on Council for numerous terms and therefore are well-informed about the governance of the University. With more frequent changes in membership it is important that Monash continues to ensure that the information and induction provided to Council is adequate, for example in regard to Council's legal responsibilities.

Since the current senior management took over in 2003, the focus on quality, quality assurance and reporting on performance has according to Council increased considerably. This has improved Council's level of knowledge of the performance of the University. Council members characterised the level of reporting and Council's involvement in the governance of the University in regard to their areas of responsibilities as appropriate. The evidence suggests that Council works well with senior management and clearly supports Monash's vision.

In the Panel's view, the governance structure of Monash University does not sufficiently reflect the University's international focus as there are currently no international members on Council.

As separately constituted companies, Monash University Malaysia (MUM) and Monash South Africa (MSA) have their own Boards of Directors. The Deputy Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor are members of both Boards and report regularly to Council on the developments at each campus. Other members of VCG also serve on the Boards. The Board of Directors of MSA is chaired by the Deputy Chancellor.

Given that Monash aspires to be an international university, not least achieved through the inclusion of campuses outside Australia in the university network, it would strengthen the University's international profile if there were international members on Council with an international outlook and expertise relevant to Monash's activities in other countries. The *Monash University Act 1958* sets the criteria for the appointment of the various categories of members and

specifies that not more than three members of the University Council appointed by the Governor in Council or by Council may normally reside outside Australia. The Panel believes that Monash should explore the possibilities of adding international members to Council within the parameters laid out in the Act. This could for example be introduced as a requirement in the profile for members appointed by Council.

### **Recommendation 2**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University explore the possibilities for adding to the University Council international members in order to strengthen the University's international profile.**

Council administers two internal review processes. Members are regularly required to complete a questionnaire on the performance of Council. The results of the survey are discussed at an annual Council conference. In addition, the Chancellor conducts individual interviews with Council members to discuss their individual performance and to seek their views on the performance of the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor. The main observations from these discussions are reported to Council. The review processes seem fit for purpose.

#### 1.2.2 Council Audit Committee

In accordance with Council's responsibilities, one of its standing committees is the Audit Committee. Reports from the Audit Committee are a standing item on the agenda of Council meetings. The Audit Committee comprises an external member of Council with experience in business and financial management (as Chairperson); the Chancellor; one external Council member with experience in business and/or law; and a Monash University Professor from an appropriate discipline (currently held by the professorial head of the Department of Accounting and Finance). The Committee may co-opt an external person with appropriate expertise and experience. Staff in attendance at meetings include the Vice-Chancellor, the Vice-President (Finance) and the Director, Audit and Risk Management (as Executive Officer and Secretary).

According to the material requested by the Audit Panel and the discussions during the Audit Visit, the Audit Committee appears to work satisfactorily and has been appropriately rigorous in regard to its risk assessment (section 10.2). Due to the small size of the Audit Committee and the dominance of Council members, the University is overly dependent, however, on having members on Council with appropriate audit expertise, and the Audit Committee and Council are not protected by viewpoints external to the University's governance bodies in exercising their audit and risk management responsibilities. The Audit Panel is of the view that the Audit Committee would be strengthened and the Council better served to carry out its governance duties if the Committee membership included no one who is a member of the Council Executive Committee and was extended to include appropriately qualified external members.

### **Recommendation 3**

**AUQA recommends that the Monash University Council Audit Committee membership be revised so the Audit Committee includes no members of the Council Executive Committee and be expanded to include appropriately qualified external members.**

#### 1.2.3 Senior Management

The 'Still Learning' self-review in 2002 surfaced the need for greater emphasis to be placed on the campus nature of the university management in order to widen faculty-based management (PF vol 1, p 15)

The senior management consists of the Vice-Chancellor's Group (VCG) which is the primary management group. With the Vice-Chancellor as Chair it consists of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) Vice-President (Administration), Vice-President (Advancement), Vice-President (Finance), the President of the Academic Board and a dean elected by the group of deans (PF vol 1, p15). The Senior Management Committee (SMC) is the high-level forum for considering issues and proposals of major significance to the University. Members of the SMC are the VCG and their direct reports. In addition, the Committee of Deans, consisting of VCG and the Deans, acts as a high-level advisory board, primarily responsible for considering current or future strategic or policy issues.

The organisational changes have most directly affected the deans. When the Deans Discussion Group was discontinued, the Committee of Deans began meeting in the discussion group's timeslot. The Panel formed the view that the structure allows the senior management to work effectively at the strategic and operational levels and ensures the involvement of the necessary members of senior management. The inclusion of a dean on VCG is a relatively recent initiative (2005) and it would appear that there is a need to clarify the role of this position.

#### 1.2.4 Academic Board

The Academic Board (AB) is regulated by the University Statute 2.2. AB's main responsibilities to Council are supervision and direction of the academic affairs of the university, including the maintenance of high standards in teaching and research, and liaison with the faculties. AB membership consists of ex-officio members, elected members, professorial and non-professorial members, elected student members including undergraduate and postgraduate, and members appointed to the Board on the nomination of the Chair and the relevant campus directors. AB has approximately 150 members. The President and Vice-President are elected for two-year terms. The introduction of elected Presidents of AB was made with the arrival of the current VC in 2003.

AB members saw the Board's main role as serving as a conduit for communication between the academic community and management and as a disseminator of information through the deans. AB's position in regard to its responsibilities for academic affairs is not articulated to the same extent and was not reflected in the Audit Panel's discussions with AB members. This may partly be a reflection of the size of AB.

As part of its continuous improvement AB will need to reaffirm its role in regard to its main responsibility for the supervision of the academic direction of the University and maintaining high standards of excellence in teaching and research. This will involve a clarification of its role in regard to the Education Committee and its two sub-committees and the SMC and the deans. The AB has the support of the VC who has expressed his commitment to strengthening AB's role in academic governance. This process could be facilitated through a review of AB.

#### 1.2.5 Campus Integration

Monash University has six campuses in Victoria, of which the Gippsland campus is a regional campus, campuses in Malaysia and South Africa and centres in Italy and the United Kingdom.

It is an important part of Monash's profile to be a research-intensive, international university with campuses and centres and collaborative arrangements both in research and teaching in a range of countries. According to the Portfolio (vol 1, p15), the organisation comes together in a matrix management model that has been developed to ensure sufficient local autonomy in order to take advantage of local opportunities and respond to needs while retaining faculty participation and institutional alignment.

One mechanism through which campuses are integrated is membership of the campus PVC's on SMC and Academic Board. The Academic Advisory Board at MUM and the Board of Studies at MSA report to Education Committee and there are two representatives from these two bodies on Academic Board. Faculty boards have representation from all campuses on which the faculty operates. Campus impact statements are developed by Campus Academic Directors, based on information from faculties (in operational plans) about their operations and Campus Direction Statements provide a vision for each campus.

During its visits to MUM, MSA and the Gippsland campus, the Audit Panel formed the impression that there is a feeling at these campuses, and to some extent other campuses than Clayton, that the University is too Clayton-centric and that there is not sufficient recognition of the other campuses' special characteristics and achievements, especially their particular strengths and contributions to the University. This is not consistent with Monash's stated vision. This observation and the view that there is need for the direction of MUM and MSA and their integration with other Monash campuses to be strengthened, for example in terms of research cooperation, were also expressed at the Academic Heads Conference in 2005.

The University recognises the need to continue to develop its matrix management and communication channels to accommodate the complexity of the multi-campus network and make the necessary adjustments as the needs arise.

The Audit Panel identified several examples of good practice at individual campuses, but found no evidence that there is a strong culture to regularly share experiences across campuses, especially initiatives that originate from MUM and MSA. An obvious example, where the latter would be useful, is the initiatives which have been taken to strengthen the research performance at MUM and which could inspire MSA activities.

Given that Monash is strengthening its international position, there is a need to actively make use of the strengths of all the campuses and involve staff in ways that inform the whole university of strengths and achievements of each campus.

Because of the geographical spread of the organisational units, the University is highly dependent on technology for its communication and it makes considerable use of email, teleconferencing and where available videoconferencing as a means of communication. A 'Monash Memo' is circulated weekly and the University makes extensive use of global emails. The evidence suggests that the electronic communication works well, and also from the point of view of staff at MUM and MSA. Nonetheless, it has not discharged the need for staff to meet in person. Staff in Australia attend many meetings in person held at different locations which requires a considerable amount of travelling. Management representatives from MUM and MSA come to Australia at least twice a year and senior management in Australia also visit these campuses regularly. Academic and general staff also have to travel around the campus network but less frequently than management. The Monash Mobility Framework and Monash Abroad are important initiatives to increasing the mobility across the Monash network (section 8.4).

It is a challenge for any organisation to work across numerous locations and not least across continents. It appears to the Panel, however, that Monash has developed a communication system and a culture that generally facilitates communication across multiple locations and time zones to the satisfaction of most staff. This does not mean that there are no practical difficulties and there is still a need for staff at different levels of the organisation to meet physically which is a drain on time and financial resources. The time difference across the three continents on which Monash operates its campuses is an issue that needs to be constantly borne in mind, especially when planning meetings. Monash's Academic Board and many other committees take the time difference into consideration as much as possible when planning their meetings to allow for teleconference participation from members across the Australian, Malaysian and South African campuses. It was apparent from the Panel's discussion with staff that the timing of meetings

prevented staff from MSA to participate in meetings more often than staff at other campuses. It is important that Monash continuously monitors the effectiveness of the communication channels as communication is the backbone of the multi-campus network.

## 2 QUALITY

### 2.1 *Quality at Monash*

Monash's approach to quality is conceptualised in *Quality at Monash: Values and Principles*. The quality cycle was introduced in its current form in 2001. It is based on a 'fitness for purpose' definition of quality and is intended to inform the thinking of all staff and to encourage them to apply the principles of the quality cycle - Plan, Act, Evaluate (Monitor, Review) and Improve - in their work.

Responsibility for the management of quality is vested in the VC, SDVC and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality). Furthermore the Still Learning self-review introduced the Vice-Chancellor's Group (Quality) (formerly the Quality Development Committee) to lead, monitor and develop the quality of the University's activities.

CHEQ has a broad range of responsibilities in regard to quality assurance policy and practice, such as supporting senior-level decision-making and overseeing and supporting academic and support service review activity and providing a broad array of evaluation services, for example the Course Experience Questionnaire, the Monash Experience Questionnaire and unit evaluations (section 4.2.1). Another measure in place to support the discussion and sharing of good practice about quality is the university-wide Monash Quality Network and quality groups at faculty and divisional level which are organised to fit the organisational structure of the faculty or division. In Malaysia, all the schools, except the School of Engineering, have introduced quality circles to facilitate the discussion of quality.

The University KPIs (section 1.1.2) and the evaluation instruments (section 2.2) are used to inform the quality thinking and assure that the necessary data is available for management and staff to judge their performance and take the necessary steps to improve.

The Audit Panel found that the quality approach is well embedded in most parts of the organisation. Most staff the Panel interviewed referred explicitly to the philosophy and how it applies to their work situation. The priority and attention given to quality by senior management, not least translated into action through the establishment of CHEQ, and the services provided by CHEQ staff as well as the quality networks, have been instrumental in implementing the quality thinking within the University.

#### **Commendation 3**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the effective implementation of the quality cycle as described in 'Quality at Monash' that permeates the University's work processes.**

### 2.2 *Evaluation Instruments*

A central part of the University's quality cycle is the development and administration by CHEQ of a substantial suite of evaluation instruments in different areas and at different levels, ie national surveys, university-wide surveys and at school, department, centre or unit level. Monash institutional evaluation instruments are:

- Monash Experience Questionnaire (Biennial)
- Monash Support Experience Questionnaire (Biennial from 2006)
- Unit Evaluation (Each unit evaluated at least once in the academic year)

- MonQueST - evaluation of teaching (used at the discretion of academic staff)
- Brief Feedback Unit and Teaching (used at the discretion of academic staff)
- Postgraduate Research Supervision Survey (Every three years)
- Staff Attitude Survey (Every two years)
- Learning and Growth Survey (As scheduled by unit, but not more than two year intervals)
- Employer Survey (Every five years since 2003)
- Head of School/Department Survey (When required)

CHEQ has developed a survey standard – the CHEQ standard – to ensure that all aspects of questionnaire development are covered and appropriately considered. CHEQ provides support in implementing and interpreting the surveys.

Since the Still Learning self-review 2002, it has been a priority for the University to collect and monitor data systematically. The procedures specify who is responsible for the follow-up and how the information is to be used for improvement.

The Panel was presented with evidence that there is a high level of knowledge of the instruments and results of the surveys. However, the level of ownership of the instruments and use of the results also differ across organisational units and discipline areas.

Nevertheless, it is a strength that Monash's key activities are regularly evaluated and that there are processes in place to collect and analyse the data, and to use the results actively for improvement purposes. The continuous implementation of and reporting on results facilitates the monitoring of the areas that need attention.

#### **Commendation 4**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the systematic implementation of its considerable suite of evaluation instruments, which are supported by the Centre for Higher Education Quality's training activities, and administered and reported systematically.**

### **2.3 Review Schedule**

In addition to the evaluation activities the University administers a series of reviews. Thematic reviews such as the Still Learning self-review, the Review of Research and Research Training, the International Self-Review are carried out as needed. Review recommendations are addressed in action plans and evidence was presented to the Panel of the various improvements that have been made as a consequence of the completed reviews.

Academic and service area reviews occur at five-year intervals. These two types of reviews cover the operational units, such as faculty, school, department or division. The Monash Review Policy also requires faculties to carry out course reviews of particular courses or programs (section 4.3.2). According to the Portfolio (vol 1, p34), full compliance with the five-year rolling reviews of academic and service areas still has to be achieved. CHEQ administers a database which reports on the planned reviews and their implementation. Currently approximately two thirds of the planned reviews have been implemented and greater levels of compliance will be pursued. The guidelines for review are also being revised.

Campus reviews have recently been introduced, but they are not compulsory. Both MUM and MSA have conducted campus self-reviews.

**Affirmation 2**

**AUQA affirms the need identified by Monash University to take steps that assure the effective implementation of the five-year cycle of academic and service area reviews.**

Monash is a review and evaluation intensive organisation. Review and evaluation happen within organisational units and across the institution, and the activities involve management, decision-making bodies and individual staff at varying degrees. There is no doubt that the University has achieved a high degree of acceptance of the need for systematic quality thinking (section 2.1). The University should continue to consider, however, as to how the momentum created through the implementation of the current review policies and activities can be maintained and an even higher level of ownership be created, while at the same time avoiding the possibility of overload.

### 3 PEOPLE

As part of Monash's aspiration to be one of the best universities in the world, Monash Directions 2025 emphasises the need for the University to be recognised as the employer of choice by the best researchers, teachers and general staff, and to attract the most talented students and post-doctoral students.

The Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008 includes the following value with respect to management which includes a reflection on Monash University as an employer:

*Excellent education and research need to be supported by excellent management. Monash's complexity, size and diversity provide significant management challenges. A fundamental component of excellence in management is to value staff and to be an exemplary employer.*

#### 3.1 Human Resources Policies

In 2005 Monash's full-time equivalent staff (all campuses) totalled 5541, excluding casual staff. 2657 are academic staff and 2884 general staff. The total number of casual staff in 2004 was 1015 (Institutional Assessment Framework (IAF) 2005).

##### 3.1.1 Recruitment of Staff

It is a priority for Monash to attract high quality staff, not least senior staff, as a means of raising its research profile and achieving excellence in both education and research. This is a particular challenge in Malaysia and South Africa. According to staff and stakeholders lack of knowledge about Monash and what the University has to offer in the two countries seems to be an obstacle to attracting the right people. At the same time it is particularly important for the MUM and MSA to be able to attract staff with the desired profile as these staff are needed to make a decisive contribution to the required increase in research productivity.

Monash recognises the need for a more coordinated and strategic approach to its human resources management (PF vol 1, p36). That has led to the establishment of a separate Human Resources Division which is responsible for assisting the development and implementation of recruitment and retention strategies with an increased focus on ensuring that only research-active academic staff who can contribute to the strengthening of Monash's research profile and performance are appointed. In selection committees for academic vacancies, it is a requirement that in each panel at least the chair of the committee and one other panel member must be trained in selection procedures.

##### 3.1.2 Probation and Promotion

A review of academic promotion and probation was initiated in late 2005 with a second phase continuing into 2006. The first phase of the review has led to new guidelines for promotion in order to better align them with Monash Directions 2025.

The conditions for probation are laid out in the Monash Workplace Policies and Procedures. The conditions for probation include the requirement that new staff members complete the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education in order to enhance staff's teaching skills. Other conditions may be formulated as a condition for probation in which case the staff member has to be notified in writing.

Academic staff probation requirements include research activity as a requirement, although no fixed target is mandated. The target for research productivity is agreed between the staff member

and his/her supervisor in the 'Engagement Profile' developed as part of the Performance Management Scheme. Given that the University aims at having 80% "research-active" academic staff by 2008, it would support the achievement of the University's research performance objectives if targets for research activity were included in the probation requirements.

#### **Recommendation 4**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University include targets for research activity in the probation requirements to equally reflect the importance of research and teaching in the probation process.**

The revised Academic Promotion Guidelines have introduced representation on promotion committees from the Malaysian, South African or Gippsland campuses when a candidate from one of these campuses seeks promotion. This is considered to be a significant improvement by MUM and Gippsland staff as this procedure will to a larger extent ensure that the special conditions of the particular campus are taken into consideration in the promotion process. If an application is received from a candidate from the Berwick or the Peninsula campus, it is the dean's decision whether or not to appoint a local representative on the promotion committee.

As discussed in section 1.2.5, the multi-campus profile of the University can be further strengthened by an increased integration of MUM and MSA with the other Monash campuses. The decision to include members from MUM, MSA and the Gippsland campus on the promotion committees is a step in that direction. The Audit Panel is of the view, however, that it would be appropriate for Monash to consider according membership on the promotion committees for academics from these campuses irrespective of whether candidates from the campuses are applying for promotion. This would emphasise the international profile of the University and demonstrate equity of treatment and acknowledge the maturity of the overseas campuses.

MSA seems to be faced with an additional challenge in terms of promotion (section 3.1.1). As an effect of Monash being less well-known in South Africa, among other things, it is more difficult for MSA to attract high quality staff. An alternative to attracting senior staff would be to concentrate on recruiting young high quality staff and offer them development and promotion opportunities that allow them to grow within the University. The Panel was presented with evidence that the threshold for promotion at South African public universities is lower than at Monash which may encourage some young staff to move from MSA to a public institution. There is therefore a risk that the less favourable promotion possibilities could result in an undesirable turnover of younger academic staff. Monash needs to address this issue in order to find a suitable solution in terms of keeping academic staff via other incentives, without compromising Monash standards.

#### 3.1.3 Staff Equity

Monash's KPIs in regard to staff equity are focused on the number of female staff, general as well as academic, in senior positions. The target is to be among the top three Go8 universities in 2008. Monash already meets this target, except for female general staff.

Through the Equity and Diversity Centre the University offers a range of information about equal opportunities and runs various programs to reach its targets. Two such programs that have contributed to the achievement of the KPIs are the 'Women's Leadership and Advancement Scheme' and 'The Vice-Chancellor's Taskforce for the Advancement of Women'. The Women's Leadership and Advancement Scheme is designed to advance the status of women within the University and includes a mentoring scheme pilot program, the Women's Leadership Shadowing Program. The Vice-Chancellor's Taskforce for the Advancement of Women considers organisational and cultural change aimed at improving the employment status of women. These

schemes are important elements in the University's strategy to address equity issues and they were generally appreciated by staff.

### 3.1.4 Cultural and Language Training

Monash has a Language Policy that recognises that the University accepts the responsibility of encouraging effective and efficient communication in all its operations. Objective 3 of the Education Plan emphasises the importance of staff being able to communicate with culturally diverse student groups.

The International Self-review in 2005 and subsequent documents such as the Discussion Paper as Background to the International Plan 2007–2010 issued in 2006, concluded that the University would benefit from improving the language and communication skills of some staff members. The discussion paper recommended that an effective communication standard be introduced and made suggestions for an improved integration of language standards into human resource management. There is a growing understanding within the University that it is also important to improve cross-cultural training in respect to the large numbers of international students studying at Monash and the increasing numbers of international staff.

The Audit Visit confirmed that staff language competency and cultural understanding is an area that needs acute attention. A significant issue identified through the student interviews at all campuses was difficulties in understanding some lecturers or tutors. Given the importance of the global perspective to Monash's advancement, staff involved in teaching and student services require excellent intercultural understanding, and an ability to speak English fluently and comprehensibly.

Some staff, such as frontline staff dealing with international students, have been trained in intercultural competencies. Furthermore, the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching is planning to address the language standards through the CLEAR program (Communicating in the Language of English for Academics and Researchers) and is responsible for taking action on the direction set in the Education Plan 2006–2010 in terms of intercultural training.

#### **Affirmation 3**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's intention to ensure that the level of English language competency of some staff is improved and that support is offered to assist staff in improving their level of cultural awareness and their English language skills through initiatives such as the CLEAR program.**

### 3.2 *Staff Satisfaction*

It is central to the achievement of Monash's objectives to value its staff and to be considered an exemplary employer. A university-wide staff attitude survey was carried out for the first time in 2005. It will be undertaken biennially in the future. Previously staff satisfaction has been surveyed through the Learning and Growth Survey at faculty or divisional level at the discretion of the relevant organisational unit.

The 2005 Staff Attitude Survey was disseminated online to all staff at all campuses. The overall measure of satisfaction was 64% ranging from 80.8% in the Financial Resources Management Division to 59.6% in the Faculty of Business and Economics. The response rate was only 33.6% which Monash does not consider satisfactory. This is primarily explained by the timing of the survey, in November 2005, and it will be undertaken at a less busy time of the year in 2007.

Staff generally enjoy working at Monash and feel that they have the skills required and know what is expected of them. The area that indicated the lowest satisfaction was the feeling that the

University did not sufficiently value its employees. Another area of concern identified in the survey is the level of attention to workload. This result resonated with concerns raised by academic staff during the Audit Visits, not least at MUM and the Gippsland campus which traditionally have mainly been teaching intensive campuses. As a consequence of the objective to both increase research productivity (section 6.3) as well as to achieve excellence in teaching, there is a danger that these pressures will affect staff workloads further, resulting in higher stress levels.

The survey has been followed up by focus group interviews to address the areas which were rated less satisfactory, and faculties and divisions have been required to address the issues related to their area and prepare an action plan. The action plans are monitored by the VCG.

The general level of satisfaction expressed by staff was confirmed in the interviews with staff including senior management, permanent general and academic staff and sessional staff at all campuses. The great majority of staff are clearly proud to be a part of the institution. A number commented how they felt well supported in their work and in striking a balance between their work and private life.

The Audit Panel endorses Monash's decision to conduct staff attitude surveys biennially as a means of actively monitoring the progress in addressing the issues raised by staff.

### **3.3 *Performance Management Scheme***

#### **3.3.1 Academic Staff**

A university-wide performance management scheme applies to all continuing and fixed-term academic staff. The scheme consists of an annual portfolio submitted by each staff member and approved by that staff member's supervisor. The staff member and the supervisor meet annually to review the portfolio, discuss the plan and priorities for the forthcoming year. Following the review the staff member is required to submit a revised portfolio.

Monash has monitored compliance with the Performance Management Scheme since 2000 and in 2004, 90% of the planned performance interviews for academic as well as general staff were undertaken. The Staff Development Unit also evaluates satisfaction with the Performance Management Scheme. Satisfaction among academic and general staff has increased over the last three years and the mean score was 4.3 (out of 5) in 2005.

Academic staff characterised the annual performance review as a useful occasion to assess the achievements of the previous year, discuss the formulation of priorities for the following year and identify development needs.

Several staff emphasised that the recently introduced requirement to align the individual staff plan with the faculty operational plans was an improvement. According to the Portfolio (vol 1, p34), it is a priority to develop this area further and ensure a stronger alignment between the strategic and operational plans and the individual staff plans developed as a result of the performance management scheme.

The Audit Panel formed the view that the Performance Management Scheme aligns well with the two key drivers of the University: its culture and its people and that the University is committed to the continuous development of academic staff.

### Commendation 5

**AUQA commends Monash University for its consistent implementation of the Performance Management Scheme for academic staff which is providing an effective framework for the assessment of staff performance and for setting the future direction for the development of staff.**

The requirement that the review performance process leads to the formulation of specific performance targets allows the supervisor and the staff member to focus on special areas of attention and suggest activities aimed at successfully achieving the performance targets.

With an increased focus on research productivity, it is important that Monash still be able to achieve excellence in teaching. The commitment to research-led teaching and to the teaching-research nexus is considered to be an important element in achieving equal excellence in education. In the light of that priority, the performance management manual in particular the 'Key Documents for Performance Management' could more effectively articulate and reinforce research-led teaching.

#### 3.3.2 General Staff

The performance management scheme is applicable to all full-time or part-time general staff, excluding casual staff, but inclusive of those at the top of the incremental scale. The review is based on the staff member's position description, an Annual Work Plan, which comprises work goals, targets against goals and a program of achievements to date, and an Annual Development and Career Plan. General staff at MUM, due to the division of administrative and academic responsibility between the Sunway Group and Monash, have not been included in the Monash University Performance Management Scheme until 2006.

The Audit Panel formed the impression that the Performance Management Scheme for general staff is not as well embedded as for academic staff. Although all supervisors undertake a compulsory one-day training program, the value of the process seems to depend considerably on the supervisor. Career and development opportunities are discussed as part of the Performance Management Scheme, but the scheme does not seem to adequately incorporate ways of rewarding staff or discussing career development possibilities. The value seemed to decrease when the staff members have reached a ceiling in their career progression.

The structure of general staff positions in Australian universities is such that general staff at the top of the scale have no opportunity for further promotion. This situation could be addressed through the identification of development paths for general staff that compensate for the shorter career paths and the exploration of ways of effectively using incentives for performance improvement other than financial rewards.

### Recommendation 5

**AUQA recommends that Monash University ensure that staff supervisors are adequately trained in order for the Performance Management Scheme for general staff to be consistently applied and to strengthen supervisors' abilities to discuss with staff equitable development opportunities that enable them to pursue appropriate career advancement opportunities.**

#### 3.4 *Early Career Researchers*

The importance of Early Career Researchers (ECRs) is mentioned in Monash Directions 2025 which states that: "Monash will develop funding strategies that allow a balance between areas of research strength and the encouragement and support of early career researchers and scholars".

The Research and Research Management Review (2004) emphasised the need for enhancing support, development, and recognition for ECRs. These needs are addressed in the Research and Research Training Plan 2006–2010 which includes strategies to strengthen recruitment, development, mentoring and reward of ECRs.

The review also presented feedback from some of the ECRs in some schools that the allocation of teaching load makes no allowance to enable junior staff to establish themselves as researchers, but is allocated equally irrespective of grants held and higher degree student load. The Review Committee noted that workloads need to take account of the requirements of each discipline, but that it would be valuable to establish consistent models at faculty level to provide Associate Deans (Research) with the capacity to monitor and review workloads and so ensure that research and research training are considered.

Workload models for ECRs are not specifically addressed in the review action plan. However, the plan suggests that in the future workload for all staff should address both research and research training and be uniform at faculty level.

The Review has undoubtedly been important for defining the priorities needed to enhance the experience of ECRs at Monash. The Research and Research Training Plan requires faculties to develop staffing plans to support the achievement of research excellence. The Audit Panel endorses these initiatives but finds it particularly important that the need to give probationers lighter teaching loads to enable them to develop their research profiles is addressed. It seems to the Panel that the ECRs have a number of needs in common across faculties rather than different needs related to their research areas. Some of the issues related to the work situation of ECRs could therefore be more effectively solved through university-wide initiatives such as seminars for grant writing and provision of seed grants.

### 3.5 *Students*

#### 3.5.1 Student Profile

According to the Portfolio (vol 1, appendix 2), the total number of students enrolled at Monash in 2005 was 52,400. 2450 of them were enrolled at MUM (2763 by March 2006), 23% of whom are international students. 524 students were enrolled at MSA (819 by June 2006), 60% of whom are international students. 8500 students study off-campus.

Monash has since its establishment had a considerable number of international students enrolled. It continues to be the lead institution in recruiting international students and has the largest number of international students of any Australian university. One of Monash's KPIs is to be among the top three in the Go8 in terms of 'share of international student load' and 'share of international coursework student load'. Monash is currently number one in these two categories, and the University ranks above the national average in terms of access and participation by students with a non-English speaking background (IAF 2005).

Monash's student population profile complies fully with its aspirations to be an international university attracting international students for all its campuses.

#### 3.5.2 Equity Targets

Monash's university-wide KPIs cover equity access and participation measures which are all benchmarked against the Go8. The aim is to be among the top three in the Go8 by 2008. Monash already meets this target in many areas and is fourth in a number of areas.

Monash's results, in terms of equity measures, are below national averages, however, except for students from a non-English speaking background and students with disabilities.

The areas that Monash has identified to be in particular need of attention are access and participation by Indigenous students. For both measures Monash was 8<sup>th</sup> in the Go8 rankings in 2004 and has not improved in the period from 2000 to 2004. DEST noted, however, in the IAF 2005, that Monash's success indicator is significantly higher than that of Victorian universities and Australia as a whole.

Monash offers two admission schemes (the Monash Indigenous Access Scheme and the Indigenous Non-Award Pathway) to support access of Indigenous students. The University is encouraging all faculties to adopt these schemes. The Monash University Scholarship for Excellence is available to provide financial assistance. The Indigenous Student Support Unit, which is a part of the Centre for Australian Indigenous Studies, offers a broad range of services to support Indigenous students and this is supplemented by support functions in some faculties.

Monash's relatively high entry requirements are a barrier for access for Indigenous students. In favouring access for the most talented Indigenous students, good outcomes are reflected in high retention and success rates.

The University shows a strong commitment to increase the number of Indigenous students. Given that the University has not improved its performance over the last four years, it needs to identify strategies to more effectively improve its outcomes on these indicators.

### 3.5.3 Entry Requirements

Undergraduate degree applicants must be 17 years of age and have gained a Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) or equivalent. From 2007, applicants must also have a VCE score of 25 in English or equivalent.

Monash is committed to recruiting the best students regardless of their means and circumstances. The University has a quality floor for undergraduate admissions of an Equivalent National Tertiary Entrance Rank (ENTER) of 70 for Commonwealth Supported Places, 65 for full-fee places, 65 for associate degrees and 50 for the Diploma of Foundation Studies.

The Access Monash program provides a range of pathways for applicants to establish entry to the University, together with access and equity scholarships and other forms of financial support. MSA offers the Academic Development Program which has been very successful in bringing students, often from disadvantaged backgrounds, at par with University entry requirements. There has been a high transfer rate from the Academic Development Program, 96 % in July 2004 and 83% in March 2005. Monash College is the major provider of pathway courses for students studying in Australia or offshore. The performance of students who have entered the University through a Monash College program is monitored continuously and they perform similarly or slightly better than other students. The Gippsland campus also administers its own foundation year which is considered imperative to increase the access of local students to the University.

There is a concern among parts of the university community that the University's objective to attract high performing students and the sole use of ENTER scores for admission will have an impact on enrolment at Gippsland, MUM and MSA where the reliance on the ability to attract local students is high.

Monash has recognised that use of selection processes other than relying on ENTER may be beneficial and is currently trialling the General Achievement Test and uniTEST, an aptitude test, as alternative selection processes. Further flexibility in the entry requirements could include the exploration of more innovative student selection processes.

Monash's commitment to MUM, MSA and Gippsland necessitates efforts being put into the exploration of alternative pathways to Monash other than solely by a straight ENTER score including use of alternative selection processes. Monash College and the foundation program at Gippsland and the Academic Development Program at MSA are good examples of effective pathway programs.

#### **Commendation 6**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its pathway programs which effectively prepare the students for further study and facilitate the transfer of students to the University in particular Monash College and the Academic Development Program at Monash South Africa.**

A significant indicator of the quality of the Monash educational experience is the students' capabilities when they complete their degree and their achievement in the workforce rather than their ENTER score on entry. This is being measured via the Employer Survey and the Graduate Destination Survey.

## 4 EDUCATION

The Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008 notes that excellence in education is a main objective for Monash University. The strategic framework further states that:

*Recognising the fundamental significance of high quality education to the future of Australia and the world, Monash will strive for the highest possible quality in teaching and learning.*

After the Still Learning self-review identified the need for more detailed values to underpin teaching and learning the 'Values for High-Quality Teaching and Learning Policy' was developed. These values inform the Education Plan 2006–2010 which was approved by Council at the end of 2005.

### 4.1 Educational Management

#### 4.1.1 Teaching Values

The University's objective to achieve excellence in education cannot be seen in isolation. The related objective is 'excellence in research' (section 6). The University refers to the two objectives, education and research, as the 'twin peaks' and senior management consistently emphasised that the 'twin peaks' are equally important.

Staff interviewed by the Audit Panel at all locations were familiar with the twin-peak values of education and research. On the other hand, as stated in the Portfolio (vol 1, p61), the Values for High-Quality Teaching and Learning Policy needs to be communicated more widely to staff.

A critical element in the strategy to achieve excellence in both education and research is the objective in the Education Plan to promote research-led teaching and learning. Inspired by a recommendation in the Still Learning self-review, Monash initiated a debate on a 'Monash view of research-led teaching' in order to underpin this concept.

The Audit Panel recognises that a number of initiatives have been launched recently to further develop the common understanding of research-led teaching. Despite it not being a recent priority for the University, there is significant variety in the interpretation of the concept of research-led teaching. It needs to remain a priority to embed this concept broadly within the academic staff.

There are no direct mechanisms under the current structure for research staff in research institutes to contribute actively to the development of the concept of research-led teaching. It may be possible to enhance the concept of research-led teaching through greater involvement of this group of research staff in teaching. The Audit Panel gained the impression that research staff were receptive to this approach. They emphasised the value of having more opportunities to teach, not solely to contribute to the teaching-research nexus, but also to have an increased exposure to graduate students.

Concerns were raised by staff interviewed by the Panel that there is an obvious risk that the quality of teaching may suffer as a consequence of the increased expectations for the research performance of individual staff members, although both teaching and research loads are in principle taken into account in workload formulas. There was generally very little reference to teaching activities per se made in the Panel's conversations with teaching staff, but rather to administration, quality assurance and research. Some Council members are of the view that the University has not yet developed a system that allows the University to determine that it is

achieving excellence in teaching, but emphasised that the introduction of University KPIs is a step in the right direction.

It is necessary if the objective of the 'twin peaks' is to be achieved and the quality of teaching to be raised across the board (section 4.2.1) to introduce measures that rigorously support the value of high quality teaching, for example linkage of performance in learning and teaching to broader incentives such as a component of budgetary allocation. This has been identified as a priority by Monash and one of the strategies included in the Education Plan 2006-2010 is to use a variety of means to encourage improvements in performance including the provision of incentives and rewards for high performance in teaching.

#### **Affirmation 4**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's intention to use a variety of means to encourage improvements in performance including the provision of incentives and rewards for high performance in teaching in order to strengthen the objective to achieve excellence in education.**

#### 4.1.2 Graduate Attributes

The graduate attributes are another set of teaching values. The University has a long tradition for formulating and reformulating graduate attributes statements and believes that the graduate attributes, especially in professional courses are well embedded. The graduate attributes are currently being revised to be better aligned with the Education Plan. Following this process the revised attributes will be incorporated in all Monash courses. The Monash Experience Questionnaire includes a section on the evaluation of graduate attributes which shows that student satisfaction in regard to the achievement of Monash graduate attributes in their course has been improving in recent years (a mean score of 3.68 in 2003 to 3.75 in 2005).

Nonetheless, staff and students could not easily, if at all, refer to the graduate attributes. Student awareness related rather to the intended outcomes of their particular courses and to the importance of Monash's reputation. Despite the University's longstanding experience with graduate attributes it appears that a serious effort is still needed to thoroughly embed the concept within the staff and the student population. An increased focus on the importance of teaching could have a positive effect on the awareness of the graduate attributes or it could for example be built around the promotion of the graduate attributes. Given the currently minimal impact of the attributes Monash may even want to reconsider the value of having a university-level statement of graduate attributes.

#### 4.1.3 Management Structure

The education portfolio is the responsibility of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor (SDVC). The SDVC is supported by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Planning) and the PVC (Quality). The PVC (Quality) also has oversight over teaching and learning. Associate Deans (Teaching) or equivalent have oversight at faculty level of coursework policy and development. Many faculties have divided the responsibility for undergraduate and postgraduate education between two distinct associate deans. Faculty Boards manage, control and advise Academic Board on all matters relating to studies within the faculty's academic fields of interest and responsibility. As discussed in section 1.2.4, Academic Board has responsibility for the supervision and direction of the academic affairs of the university, including the maintenance of high standards in teaching and research, and liaison with the faculties.

There is a well-functioning division of labour of the responsibilities for the education portfolio at senior management level. However, the main responsibility of the Associate Deans (Teaching) appeared to the Panel to have become the administration of plans and policies rather than provision of leadership in the achievement of the education objectives. The role of associate

deans could be strengthened if time could be freed of administration to allow them to concentrate on exercising leadership in teaching and learning and celebrate good practice of teaching. Most of the Associate Deans (Teaching) are based at the Clayton campus and the Panel formed the opinion it would facilitate their work if their awareness of the needs of other campuses was increased. If the leadership responsibilities of the Associate Deans (Teaching) were strengthened this could help emphasise the value of teaching.

### **Recommendation 6**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University reformulate the role of the Associate Deans (Teaching) to ensure greater opportunity and accountability for leadership in learning and teaching in their faculties and the University as a whole.**

#### 4.1.4 Education Policy

Monash has a comprehensive policy framework. All education policies are made available online in the Education Policy Bank. In 2005 the University initiated a review to identify the level of awareness and compliance with university education policy and alignment between it and faculty-level policies. The review identified areas of non-compliance and ensuring compliance with academic policy is a targeted area for improvement. The Education Policies and Procedures were for example distributed across the University in hard copy in 2006. A follow-up check is planned and policies are reviewed in three-year cycles to ensure that they are up-to-date and consistent with University directions.

Alignment with the University policy framework is a special area of attention at MUM and MSA. The added challenge in regard to these campuses is that some policies need to be adapted to local circumstances, for example in South Africa due to the requirements of the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC). The two campuses are making good progress on developing their policies to match the University policy framework.

Discussions with staff during the Audit Visit showed that staff are generally familiar with policies at faculty and school level, but to a lesser extent at university level. This emphasises the need for the University to continue to raise awareness of its academic policies and reassert some level of central oversight of alignment of faculty policies with central policies to assure compliance and avoid duplication of policies.

An example of a policy which the Audit Panel found to be thoroughly embedded among students and permanent staff is the Policy on Plagiarism. There is a high level of awareness of plagiarism and the processes in place to continuously manage plagiarism. In the period from 2002 to 2005 the highest number of detected cases of student misconduct logged was 18 (2003) and the lowest was 11 (2005). There were no detected cases of misconduct at MUM and MSA in 2005. Nevertheless, students interviewed at all campuses reported that plagiarism still occurs. Procedures for handling plagiarism permit faculties to use electronic plagiarism detection software and other methods to compare work submitted for assessment against various databases. The use of such software must be published in handbooks and websites. Monash acknowledges that the initiatives to avoid plagiarism need to be ongoing.

#### 4.1.5 Education Planning

Monash has developed successive Education Plans since the beginning of the 1990s, and it is a requirement that the achievements of previous plans be documented. The last Learning and Teaching Plan 2003–2005 was reported in the brief ‘Achievements against Learning and Teaching Plan 2003–2005’ which was available to the Panel. The current Education Plan came into effect at the beginning of 2006. The plan was developed with input from senior management, the Committee of Associate Deans (Teaching), and several iterations of discussion in the

Education Committee. Faculty operational plans reflect the objectives of the Education Plan and contain strategies for their implementation.

Despite the extensive process for the preparation of the Education Plan, the Audit Panel found that the degree to which it is known by teaching staff is limited and in general less well known to teaching staff than were the University's quality assurance plans and practices, although many are familiar with some of its seven objectives. The same was true for the Code of Practice for Teaching and Learning and the Codes of Practice for Graduate/Postgraduate Teaching and Learning which are not widely known by students.

These documents are central to achieving the University's aspiration in education on the one hand and the need to highlight the importance of teaching within the university on the other. It is therefore necessary to adopt strategies to raise the awareness of the Education Plan and the Codes of Practices for Teaching and Learning.

## 4.2 *Quality of Teaching*

### 4.2.1 Teaching Evaluation

Monash administers an impressive range of evaluations to monitor and continuously improve the quality of teaching and in particular the teaching experience.

The Monash Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) was introduced in 2003 to complement the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) and the internal Monash unit evaluations. It was developed to measure the current student satisfaction with the study experience and it includes some CEQ scales (Good Teaching, Generic Skills, Learning Community, Overall Satisfaction) to allow direct comparison. The MEQ is administered every second year at all Monash campuses and at partner institutions offering Monash courses offshore. From 2006, the Monash Support Experience Questionnaire covering Monash's support functions will be administered in the year when the MEQ is not run.

The results of the MEQ are reported at university, campus and faculty level and distributed by the Centre for Higher Education Quality (CHEQ). Faculties and divisions discuss the results and report back to the Vice-Chancellor's Group (VCG) and are required to integrate follow-up actions into their plans. This is discussed at the VCGs annual meeting with faculties and divisions. The rigor of the integration of the results into the operational plans seems to differ from faculty to faculty.

Broad satisfaction with the Monash study experience increased from 91% in 2003 to 93% in 2005. MEQ05 showed improvement of mean scores for each scale. Except for MSA, which performed significantly better, there is very little difference in the results between the Australian campuses or between domestic and international students studying in Australia.

The MEQ is based on a five-point Likert scale that includes a 'neutral' category. An answer in the 'neutral' category is reported as a satisfactory response. An analysis of the MEQ05 results shows that only very few respondents 'agree or strongly agree' with some of the statements in the survey and there is a large neutral category. An example of this are results from the MEQ05 at MUM in relation to the 'Good Teaching Scale' where 'neutral' responses vary from 43–50% while 'strongly agree' responses vary between 2.5–4.1%. Monash's use of the neutral category could distort the interpretation of the results toward the more positive and negate the very positive use of the MEQ as a major screening tool on which it bases its continuous improvement in learning and teaching. Monash should therefore reconsider its use of the neutral category.

Student evaluation of units was introduced at Monash in 1993. In 2005, a new evaluation instrument was introduced together with policy that requires all units to be evaluated by students on a common set of items. One of the reasons for the revision was to ensure a higher level of faculty compliance with the policy. All units are now evaluated at least annually. Results are posted on CHEQ's public website and results are reported at university, campus and faculty level, and by individual unit. Deans, Associate Deans (Teaching) and heads of department/school are required to take action where units are performing relatively poorly. Targets vary and are being adjusted upwards as improvement occurs incrementally. Centrally, the SDVC receives reports of the top and bottom 25% of units. For those performing relatively poorly, investigations and improvement actions are initiated. Staff in the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching (section 4.2.3) provide support and advice to teaching staff.

The Audit Panel formed the impression that staff are generally satisfied with unit evaluations as a development tool. The introduction of the new unit evaluation policy is fairly recent and it is necessary to concentrate on identifying the improvements which happen as an effect of the evaluations and advertise these broadly within the University, not least to students. Most students are generally not aware that the results of the unit evaluations are accessible on the Monash website. They wish to be better informed of actions taken as an effect of the evaluations. This is a situation which Monash shares with many other universities, but which nonetheless requires attention in the form of increased information.

The quality of teaching is evaluated via the Monash Questionnaire Series on Teaching (MonQueST) which is a suite of 11 questionnaires each of which can provide feedback on different teaching activities. It is voluntary for staff to use MonQueST but staff are encouraged to conduct MonQueST every two to four years. Approximately one third of the staff make use of MonQueST. Participation is highest at MUM and MSA where 84% and 56% have used the tool in the period from 2002–2004. Other approaches to teaching evaluation, such as peer review and mentoring, are used at the discretion of the schools/departments. Given the importance accorded by the University key performance indicators (KPIs) to student satisfaction with the study experience and the importance of the quality of teaching in general, the introduction of MonQueST as a compulsory measure would more effectively support Monash's teaching goals.

The evidence shows that the evaluations are implemented systematically and that, there are structures in place to ensure the analysis, the distribution and the interpretation of the results.

### **Commendation 7**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its rigorous evaluations of student satisfaction with the study experience, through the Monash Experience Questionnaire and unit evaluations, that have contributed to the improvement of satisfaction with the experience.**

Inspection of unit evaluation data and examples of unit outlines also revealed considerable variation in the quality of teaching on all the campuses visited. In a sample of unit outlines randomly selected by the Audit Panel, a number of unit outlines were clearly unsatisfactory and gave students very little information on what was expected from them. The view of variable teaching was echoed by the many students interviewed. Students highlighted the exposure to many inspiring academics as one of Monash's strengths, but there were also strong comments of dissatisfaction of the teaching skills of some staff. This comment was in many cases related to sessional teaching staff. The students at MUM and MSA in particular found that the teaching is not always sufficiently student-centred and could to a greater extent actively involve the students.

While the Panel was convinced that the strategy to establish CALT will help improve teaching quality, there is an urgent need for Monash to concentrate on identifying the gaps in the satisfaction with the quality of teaching in order to diminish as much as possible the variability in

the quality of teaching. Monash's unit evaluations will assist in reducing the level of variability and the introduction of the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education is addressing the issue of teaching skills (section 4.2.2). Students are generally unaware of this initiative and the Audit Panel would encourage the University to inform students more widely about it. Monash's acknowledgement of the staff's language difficulties is also of critical importance in regard to the quality of teaching (section 3.1.4).

Arrangements for the supervision of sessional staff and also their working conditions vary considerably across faculties and departments/schools. Their level of integration within their faculty as well as their school/department varied equally, for example in terms of induction and introduction to policies and plans and whether they get feedback on their teaching. Given the proportion of teaching delivered by sessional staff in some faculties, such as the Faculty of Business and Economics and the Faculty of Science, the needs of sessional staff will have to be incorporated better into the planning of teaching and the initiatives offered to support staff in improving their teaching.

#### **Recommendation 7**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University develop a strategy to better support sessional teaching staff and monitor the effectiveness of this strategy in order to improve the overall student learning experience.**

#### 4.2.2 Graduate Certificate in Higher Education

The University introduced the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education (GCHE) in 1999 and has since 2001 required new academic staff (levels A-D) who do not already have a teaching qualification to gain formal qualification in university teaching during their probationary period. In the light of Monash's teaching objectives this was a positive initiative. The real test of the adequacy of the requirement will be whether it will consistently improve teaching effectiveness.

The Portfolio mentions (vol 1, p94) that there is an ongoing debate about the place of the GCHE within the University. Some staff feel that it deters appointment and hampers the research productivity of new staff while others support its role in enhancing standards of teaching. The Panel predominantly heard a positive assessment of the GCHE in terms of its positive impact on teaching skills. The concern raised by some staff was mostly related to participation in the GCHE not always being appropriately reflected in the negotiated workload. The Panel endorses Monash's decision to review the GCHE's place in the career of new staff and would encourage the University to pay attention to workload aspects of participation in the GCHE in the review and to consider the possible introduction of staff development activities relating to research in the program.

#### **Commendation 8**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the introduction of completion of the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education as a requirement for probation for academic staff.**

#### 4.2.3 Teaching and Learning Support

The Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CALT) replaced the Centre for Learning and Teaching Support (CeLTS) in early 2006. CALT is placed within the SDVC's portfolio with the director reporting to the PVC (Quality) as CALT works closely with CHEQ. The focus of CALT differs from CeLTS in the sense that it will lead and coordinate strategic improvement of teaching and learning to faculties and schools/departments as identified via the University's reviewing and monitoring processes such as MEQ and unit evaluations, as well as the planned new Course and Unit Profiling. Profiling will consolidate data on an agreed set of

indicators with three year-time series on variables such as enrolment, attrition, progression, unit evaluation, Graduate Destination Survey and CEQ. The Panel found this a very positive initiative which is likely to improve the availability of data and the use of data to support the improvement of teaching.

Although recently established CALT already seems to be able to play an important role in facilitating the translation of evaluation results into improvement of the effectiveness of the teaching. CALT is also likely to be able to play a decisive role in the achievement of the Education Plan.

One of the 'actions' in the Education Plan is to enhance support for appropriate use of education technology and e-learning to increase flexibility. Monash has had a learning management system, Monash University Studies Online System (MUSO) in place since 2001. It covers all the Monash campuses and has 45,000 unique students registered. The Flexible Learning and Teaching Program provides support for staff in the use of MUSO but the number of staff allocated to this task is very limited.

Most students and staff consider MUSO to be a valuable tool that supports the teaching and learning process. The need signalled in the Education Plan to enhance support for the use of educational technology was confirmed in the Panel's interviews with staff and students. It is important that enhanced support includes initiatives and appropriate resources to allow for an upgrade of staff development in online teaching for those staff who are not comfortable with the technology.

In some units, particularly those that are offered across several campuses, it was clear that discussion boards and fora within MUSO were actively used and were appreciated by students. Given that in many units students are enrolled at Monash campuses in different countries, it would seem that greater use of online discussion could contribute to students sharing their cultural perspectives and thus contribute significantly to internationalisation of curricula and the learning experience.

### 4.3 *Quality Assurance*

#### 4.3.1 Course and Unit Development and Approval

Responsibility for development and approval of coursework offerings and units has been devolved to faculties since 2001. New unit and course proposals are developed within the faculties and have to be approved by a range of senior academic, administrative staff and Faculty Boards. Faculties provide biannual reports to the Education Committee about new courses/units and major amendments. The recommended course and unit development and approval process builds on a central course proposal template to establish the course rationale and a costing model to establish the resource needs of the course.

All new courses and course amendments that fall within one of Monash's six categories of strategic importance require the additional approval of the SDVC. AUQA concurs with the decision to have a mechanism for central oversight of courses of significant strategic importance for the University. An audit of new course and unit approvals and course amendments in 2005 showed a high level of compliance with the process but it also identified a need to provide further explanations about reporting responsibilities in terms of the areas of significant strategic importance. The review also revealed that four faculties relied on the adequacy of the course approval process. They did not formally sign off course approval documents relying instead on Faculty Board approval as de facto sign-off. There is always a risk of non-compliance in a devolved system. The University is aware of these risks and the need to provide regular information about the policies and the need to review the adequacy of the policies systematically.

The Portfolio notes (vol 1, p62) that Monash qualifications categories are consistent with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) which is a requirement for self-accrediting institutions. The course and unit approval document does not include a process through which the development of courses is checked against the qualifications on the AQF. The course approval process would be strengthened if such a step be added to it.

#### 4.3.2 Course and Academic Reviews

Monash requires that each area of the University's operations is reviewed normally every five years, although a shorter cycle is discretionary. The Policy for Academic Review notes that the integrated nature of academic work means that all aspects of academic work are best considered at the same time. Academic review has the operational unit of the faculty, school or department as its focus. The purpose of Academic review is to assist the University to assure itself of the quality of its academic endeavour and to utilise learning from this essentially developmental process in order to effect improvement. The scope of academic review is courses, including teaching, learning and assessment, research and research training, professional and community activities and internal organisation, management, quality assurance and improvement.

Specific course reviews also occur frequently. Course review is a more limited activity having as its focus a particular course or program. According to the Guiding Principles for Course Review the purpose is to assist faculties and the University to assure the quality of academic courses and to learn from this essentially developmental process in order to effect improvement. It includes the entire academic program (degree, diploma or certificate) in the context of its regulations, overall structure and management, the units, major and minor sequences and clinical experiences, practicums, projects and work experience that make up the course. The major focus of a course review is the manner in which the range of units, sequences and other activities offered contribute to the course.

Some faculties have initiated a separate process to disestablish courses. An example is the Faculty of Business and Economic which disestablishes courses with less than 20 first year students.

The Audit Visit confirmed that the University is of the view that the current course review process sufficiently covers the areas that need to be considered and that on the other hand reaccreditation is assured through the formal external accreditation required for professional degrees, which is pursued wherever possible. However, professional accreditation only covers a minor part of the University's courses and the Panel found evidence that the course review policy is not being systematically implemented. The Audit Panel is of the view that the University's review process would be improved if it included procedures that regularly and formally confirm that its courses are of appropriate quality or whether it would be advisable to discontinue some of its courses.

#### **Recommendation 8**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University introduce a formal reaccreditation requirement in its course review policy to ensure systematic consideration of the currency of the University's education program.**

#### 4.4 *Course Equivalence*

Assuring the academic equivalency of courses and units across multiple locations is important to Monash. Considerable efforts and effective measures are put into ensuring the equivalence of courses and units taught in different locations. In general terms, units offered across more than one mode or location are required to have equivalent curriculum and assessment standards. It is possible for a campus to adapt 20% of a unit to their circumstances, but the modified unit must be submitted for approval through the normal approval processes. Faculties have effective policies

and procedures for moderation of results and for monitoring of student academic performance across locations. Primarily this occurs through chief examiners and boards of examiners. In South Africa it is a formal requirement that examinations are marked by external examiners and MSA has introduced formal assessor training for staff to prepare them for this task. This is a very positive initiative which is likely to strengthen the assessment process.

A new Policy for 'Academic Programs offered from Multiple Campuses' was approved by AB in July 2006 and will take effect from the 2007 academic year. The policy is a reaction to objective 7 in the Education Plan regarding the multi-campus nature of the University. The policy introduces strengthened requirements for naming of courses, course structure, conduct, entry, assessment and course management groups with representation from all campuses offering a particular course to be responsible for oversight of the development and operation of a course across all campuses as well as any specific campus variations.

The Panel found many positive examples of good practice in terms of assuring academic equivalence but also identified variety in the processes across faculties. The policy is likely to address this variety. It may also have the beneficial effect of encouraging more cross-campus collaboration in teaching, something which many staff indicated to the Panel would be desirable.

The Audit Panel endorses the development of the Monash University Policy for Academic Programs Offered from Multiple Campuses and its intention to set minimum standards for the assurance of course equivalency across campuses.

There seems to be a historic differentiation of courses in some fields of study, with variant courses in the same field offered at different campuses, rather than a single multi-campus course. This contributes to a perception expressed by academic staff and stakeholders of Clayton degrees being of a higher standard, which is clearly not the University's intent. Therefore AUQA supports the harmonisation of Monash degrees such that units become equivalent and transferable across campuses.

Moderation of assessment is a critical element in the process for achieving unit and course equivalence. Moderation of assessment is not a compulsory element of the Monash Policy for Assessment of Coursework. AUQA encourages Monash to consider the value of introducing moderation of assessment as a standard component of its university-level assessment policy to further strengthen the level of equivalence. The approach adopted by MSA could serve as a model for the whole University.

#### **4.5 Education Performance**

Monash's education-related sector-wide performance indicators include CEQ results (Good Teaching, Generic Skills and Overall Satisfaction), the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS) (Employability of graduates), the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) and share of national graduate and postgraduate coursework students (PF vol 1, p81).

Monash's results improved within the three CEQ measures from 2000 to 2004 although they have been below Go8 averages. The target is to be within the top three of Go8 by 2008 on these measures. MEQ, which includes some CEQ scales for comparison purposes (section 4.2.1), has demonstrated an improvement in results in most areas from 2003 to 2005 and Monash expects this to be positively reflected in the future CEQ results. Furthermore, the deliberate use of the MEQ and the future role of CALT in troubleshooting and providing staff support in courses with unsatisfactory results is a positive strategy which is likely to have a positive impact on these survey results. The University was successful in the first round of the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund being allocated \$4.6 million which was a significant achievement, although it is below its own target compared to the Go8. Monash has already met its 2008 target in terms of

share of national graduate/postgraduate coursework students where it is currently ranked second in the Go8.

The full-time employment rate, which is one of the Graduate Destination Survey measures, has decreased for Monash graduates since 2000 and the gap between Monash graduates' employment rate and the Go8 average has widened. The lack of progress has recently prompted Monash to focus on future strategies to address the issue, through the new Education Plan and a review of the centrally funded careers and employment service. These initiatives are not likely to have an immediate effect and it is necessary for Monash to also launch initiatives which are likely to have a short term effect in order to reach the desired target.

## 5 RESEARCH TRAINING

Monash Directions 2025 signals the desire to achieve excellence in all areas of activity, including research training. According to the Portfolio (vol 1, p95) Monash also aspires to be the 'university of choice' for the most talented research students.

In Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008 Monash recognises the need to strengthen its research training programs in order to achieve the University's goals of excellence in research. The main strategies to strengthen research training activities are to increase Higher Degree by Research (HDR) student numbers, additional support and professional development of HDR students, and to ensure training of supervisors at all campuses.

### 5.1 *Research Training Policy*

In 2005 a total of 8248 postgraduate students were enrolled at Monash University of whom 2217 were HDR students. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Research Training) has oversight of research training programs and is the Director of the Monash Research Graduate School (MRGS). Higher degrees by research, except masters by research degrees, are administered by the MRGS. Masters by research degrees are administered by the faculties. The MRGS is also responsible for coordinating postgraduate research training activities.

Monash has a comprehensive framework of policies and regulatory procedures in place for research training. Two of the key documents in the framework are the Handbook for Doctoral and Master of Philosophy Degrees 2006 and the Code of Practice for the Supervision of Doctoral and Research Masters Candidates. Faculty policies for masters by research students are mostly based on MRGS policy and it is a requirement that they comply with the Code of Practice for Supervision of Doctoral and Research Masters Candidates. Information on faculty policies is available on faculty websites and published annually in the Student Resource Guide. All the information provided to HDR students comes together in the HDR Quality Platform which is administered online by the MRGS.

Monash monitors the progress of HDR students in a number of ways. Probationary candidature is used to monitor doctoral and Master of Philosophy (MPhil) student progress at an early stage of their candidature. The candidate is required to present written evidence of sufficient progress as well as give an oral presentation of their research project. This submission is assessed by a panel and discussed with the candidate. A recommendation is then made to the Research Graduate School Committee, a standing committee of Academic Board, which has final authority for approving admission to the PhD, professional doctorate, higher doctorate and MPhil. Furthermore doctoral candidates, MPhil and those masters by research candidates in receipt of a centrally funded scholarship submit annual progress reports. The MRGS administers the system for progress reports, and continuation of candidature is conditional upon the receipt of a satisfactory progress report.

The probationary candidature and the progress reports are very valuable tools in the guidance of students, but the value of these mechanisms is dependent on the University's consistent ability to provide timely feedback to the students on their submissions. The Audit Panel was presented with several examples of delays in feedback on progress reports and confirmation of candidature. For the University to make the maximum benefit of the monitoring tools, the Audit Panel would encourage the MRGS to review its processes for ensuring that feedback on confirmation of candidature and progress reports is provided within appropriate time frames.

## 5.2 *Supervision*

The Code of Practice for the Supervision of Doctoral and Research Masters Candidates regulates the supervision practice at the University and is the joint source of reference for students and supervisors.

The appointment of supervisors of HDR students is overseen by the Research Graduate School Committee (RGSC) – a standing committee under Academic Board responsible for administering PhD, professional doctorate, higher doctorate, and MPhil regulations – and the code sets the requirements for supervisor qualifications for both internal and external supervisors. Monash has had a supervisor training program in place since 2002. The program is divided into a level one (primary training) and six master classes (advanced training) and successful completion of level one allows the academic staff member to supervise four full-time equivalent candidates (or up to six individual students) of HDR students. Only after completion of five of the six master classes is the supervisor permitted to supervise up to an equivalent of eight full-time candidates (or 12 students in total). The Audit Panel learned at the Audit Visit that the latter is often the case in faculties without spare capacity, such as the Faculty of Business and Economics. Monash staff who have already supervised HDR students to successful completion as an associate supervisor under the guidance of a mentor main supervisor are exempt from attending the training program. Staff new to Monash who have successfully supervised masters and PhD candidates at another institution and who wish to become a main supervisor at Monash may apply for an exemption to the training requirements.

Discussions at the Audit Visit confirmed the value seen by both staff and students in the supervisor training scheme. Despite the training program and other measures such as the annual progress reports, the evidence presented to the panel also highlights the need to continuously track students and supervisors in an effort to reduce examples of poor supervision practice. The Research and Research Management Review identified a number of areas for improvement in regard to supervision, such as a need for a greater emphasis on supervision of individual supervisors. The code of practice enables the RGSC to place limits on the supervision level (down to zero) of an academic staff member showing poor supervision performance or serious violation of the code, but there is no formal system of deaccreditation in place.

### **Commendation 9**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its supervisor accreditation program which incorporates mechanisms for addressing poor supervision practice.**

Despite the systems in place the MRGS and RGSC will need to continue to actively monitor and report on the effectiveness of the program; not least with respect to initiatives to improve supervision to signal to students that accreditation is taken seriously.

Monash recognises that it is important to ensure that supervisors are themselves research active. Mechanisms to monitor the proportion of HDR supervisors who are research active are included in the project to introduce a university-wide definition of ‘research activity’ (section 6.1.1).

## 5.3 *Support*

Monash offers a range of training activities for HDR students. One of them is exPERT which consists of a range of programs offered in the form of workshops and seminars covering a range of research training issues. exPERT activities are offered as face-to-face workshops, video-conferences and on DVD and are accessible to all campuses and to students based at The Alfred hospital. The number of programs has grown from 90 in 2004 to 180 in 2005. Monash has recently developed a feedback tool in order to be able to continuously monitor the level of student satisfaction with exPERT.

Monash regularly evaluates the general level of satisfaction with the services provided to HDR students through the Postgraduate Research Supervision Survey (PRSS), which is conducted every third year, and an annual exit survey. PRSS results have been generally positive and have shown improving trends since 1998. The 2005 survey shows that particular areas in need of further attention include provision of 'a stimulating/supportive research environment' and 'access to induction'. The latter area, however, still needs attention.

The Audit Panel is of the view that the support structures in place are important elements in the process to successfully achieve the performance targets set for research training. Monash's ambition to increase the load of HDR students will increase the pressure on the support systems which will be a test of the quality support services in place for HDR students.

### **Commendation 10**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its support mechanisms for Higher Degree Research students, such as the exPERT program, which are aimed at providing a high quality research training experience.**

#### **5.4 Research Training Performance**

Monash University KPIs related to HDR activities include share of national HDR completions and per capita national HDR completions, share of national HDR student load and share of international HDR students (PF vol 1, p 104). Monash's target is to be among the top three of the Go8 universities by 2008.

Monash was number four in terms of share of national HDR completions in 2003 and 7<sup>th</sup> (2003) in per capita national HDR completions. The University was 5<sup>th</sup> in 2004 in share of national HDR student load and 6<sup>th</sup> (2004) in share of international HDR students.

The Research and Research Training Plan identified a number of strategies to pursue in order to reach these goals, such as an increase in external funding to support HDR scholarships, an increase in scholarships so that the ratio of scholarships to student load does not fall and an increase in the number of trained and accredited supervisors to accommodate the student targets. These strategies are currently being pursued. This includes MUM where four honours scholarships were offered in 2005 and six were available to masters/PhDs. Monash is currently establishing a database with information about HDR students intended to improve the University's ability to track HDR students in order to maintain regular contact with them as a means to reduce attrition and offer additional support.

Since the Research and Research Management Review, achievement of a higher degree of alignment between the Research and Research Training Plan and the faculty operational plans has been sought. Given that preparation of the current Research and Research Training Plan is fairly recent (finalised in 2005) the effect of this initiative is yet to be seen.

Monash seems to be on track for achieving its objectives in terms of HDR load and share of HDR completions. A concentrated effort is needed, however, for Monash to meet its objectives with respect to per capita national completions. The actions planned to address this objective will undoubtedly help move Monash in the desired direction. Furthermore, Monash needs to ensure that the faculty research training policies for masters by research students are well aligned with the University objectives and thus instrumental in systematically moving toward the achievement of the University objectives with respect to HDR students.

### **5.5 *Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire***

Monash's response rate in the Postgraduate Research Experience Questionnaire (PREQ) has been declining over the last three years to 15.4% in 2004 and Monash typically performs below the other Australian Go8 universities. Declining PREQ response rates are not unique to Monash. Response rates have been declining sector-wide. Monash is currently investigating ways of increasing response rates. In the meantime Monash has been focusing on the PRSS, where the 2005 survey had a response rate of 40% and the satisfaction with supervision has been increasing in the period from 1999 to 2005.

## 6 RESEARCH

According to Monash Directions 2025 the University values excellence in research and scholarship and has an aim to be a research-intensive university:

*We will support the development of research leaders of international standing while moving to a position where every member of the academic staff of Monash University is engaged in research activities.*

*To achieve this aim, we will keep under review the meaning of research engagement for these purposes and our resulting expectations of academic staff, and give particular support to research which aspires to be amongst the world's best.*

### 6.1 Research Planning

Following a review of research and research training management in 2004, the Research and Research Training Plan (2006–2010) has been developed. The plan is built around three main objectives:

- Research Excellence
- Impact through Research Training
- Impact Through Engagement and Collaboration

#### 6.1.1 Research Activity

The Research and Research Management Review recommended that the definition of 'research activity' be reviewed. As a consequence the Research and Research Training Plan has as one of its key targets that at least 80% of academic staff be research active by 2008 according to measures based on the level of academic appointment and tied to mean levels of performance by discipline across the Go8. The definition is also intended to help the University monitor the proportion of HDR supervisors who are research active. At the same time, it is recognised that the level and kind of research activity may vary from faculty to faculty. The project is currently with the Research Committee. The importance accorded to research will also be reflected directly in the weightings for academic staff seeking promotion from 2007. Research and teaching will be required to be weighted at least 30% each and service at a minimum of 10%.

The Panel endorses the decision to develop common definitions of 'being research active' that are relevant to disciplines and academic levels. This will be particularly important for the development of research activity at MUM and MSA where there seems to be a wider diversity in the definition than at other Monash campuses.

A common definition of and criteria for research activity will be critical for the University in determining whether the target of 80% research activity is met and sustained. Given that Monash has set 2008 as the deadline for the achievement of its aim in regard to research activity, there is a considerable urgency for the University to agree on a definition acknowledging what 'research active' means and reflecting discipline-specific factors and academic levels, as appropriate. When the project to determine research activity is terminated, it will be important for the University to ensure that the decisions are incorporated and appropriately reflected into the workload models within the faculties.

### **Affirmation 5**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's decision to develop a university-wide definition of the term 'research active', which is essential in determining the attainment and sustainability of its goals for research performance.**

Monash's goals for research performance are particularly challenging for MUM and MSA. Both are relatively young campuses and they are still building their research strengths. The strategy for both campuses has been to first concentrate on developing a strong teaching environment and building the research after the former has been put in place. Malaysia as the older of the two has already started on its trajectory to build a research profile that adds value to Monash's research aspirations. But both campuses have to focus on engaging in activities that attract high quality research staff, the establishment of research collaboration with relevant departments/schools or centres, the development of a research culture, and supporting research development of present staff, for example through mentoring schemes. The importance of these activities is being signalled through the recent employment of a Research Director at each of the campuses. Furthermore, as noted in the plans for both campuses enrolment of PhD students is essential before either campus can lay claim to being truly research intensive. It is a positive step that six scholarships per school are available for masters/PhD students at MUM.

#### 6.1.2 Scholarship

In addition to valuing excellence in research, Monash states that it equally values scholarship. Scholarship is seen as an activity which spans teaching and research and is a reflective activity undertaken by academic staff to inform their teaching practice.

The Audit Panel learned at the Audit Visit that the importance of scholarship has been overtaken by the focus on research and that there is a need to pay more attention to scholarly practice for example by integrating the concept explicitly into the measures taken to increase research performance.

#### 6.1.3 Research Collaboration

Monash aims to make an impact through engagement and collaboration supported through research collaboration with a range of stakeholders in Australia and overseas, such as participation in 21 Cooperative Research Centres, 102 Australian Research Council Linkage projects involving collaboration with partner organisations in industry, business and the government sector, and collaborative scientific activities with the Australian Stem Cell Centre and the University of California, San Diego. In the future Monash plans to concentrate on establishing affiliations with institutions with a strong research profile and which will strengthen Monash's research activities.

Most of the collaboration is vested within the faculties, schools/departments or research centres and institutes. The evidence indicates that Monash is valued as a partner by the stakeholders. Discussions with stakeholders at the Audit Visit indicated that Monash could increase its engagement with research partners at university level and use the collaboration with stakeholders to inform University directions more broadly. Monash has since 2005 worked on the development of an Industry Engagement Strategy which will include structures and processes for Monash to engage with industry as well as measures, targets, timelines and costs. This initiative is likely to strengthen the university-level engagement with industry and should be aligned with the Community Engagement Framework (section 7.1).

## 6.2 *Research Organisation*

### 6.2.1 Organisational Structures

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) (DVC (Research)) is responsible for the development of strategic research policy and research management. Faculty deans are responsible for research activities at faculty level supported by Associate Deans (Research). The Monash University Research Committee is responsible for providing advice to the DVC (Research) on research policies and coordination and communication of University research policy and administration. The research activities are further supported by the Research Office which provides information, advice and administrative services related to research or research related-activities. Research occurs within faculties at school/department level and within research centres and institutes which can be at faculty, school/department, and university level.

In response to a recommendation in the Research and Research Management Review, the University reformed the Committee of Associate Deans (Research) into the Monash University Research Committee, with new terms of reference and an extended membership. The Audit Panel is supportive of the formation of the new committee which appropriately involves associate deans (research) in planning and monitoring research activity and in overseeing implementation of the Research and Research Training Plan 2006–2010.

In addition to the structures mentioned above, the University is currently establishing a number of cross-departmental and cross-faculty research institutes intended to help build critical mass to have national and international impact. The philosophy behind the institutes is that discipline excellence will drive multidisciplinary excellence. Each institute will be expected to play a role in realising the strategic advantages through the establishment of research nodes across campuses. The strategy is in particular intended to help build research performance, for example at MUM and MSA.

The development of the multidisciplinary institutes is supported by seed funding to new and existing cross-faculty institutes. The decision to make the institute directors accountable to the DVC (Research) rather than the relevant deans represents a clear recognition of the University-wide nature of the institutes.

It will be important that the future reviews of the research institutes (to be undertaken every three years) ensure that progress is recorded and remedial action taken for the University to be able to continuously assess the value of the institutes against the objectives in the short term and ensure that they do not continue after their useful life span in the long term.

Monash's goals for increasing research performance are particular challenging for MUM and MSA (section 6.1.1) as two young campuses and to some extent for Gippsland which has traditionally been a teaching-intensive campus. Monash has recognised the need to establish structures that will support Gippsland, MUM and MSA in developing their research strengths and integrate these campuses' research strength into the University's main areas of research.

#### **Affirmation 6**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's intention to establish structures that will support the development of research activities at the Gippsland campus, Monash University Malaysia and Monash South Africa and will integrate their research strengths into the University's main areas of research.**

The Panel endorses the strategy to establish university-level institutes that span faculty and department/school boundaries through the development of research nodes as this is seen as a vehicle for increasing, not only the research productivity of Monash, but also for facilitating the

development of research activity at the campuses in South Africa, Malaysia and Gippsland. Research director positions at Gippsland, MUM and MSA have been established and filled to support the strengthening of the University's research objectives. A premise for this strategy to work at MUM and MSA is that there are sufficient staff with the necessary research capabilities within the designated research areas which build on Monash's research strengths.

### 6.2.2 Research Infrastructure

The Research Office (RO) has since the Research and Research Management Review (2004) been subject to considerable change. A fundamental restructure has led to an increase in staff and in the number of activities offered. This process has allowed the RO to align its responsibilities better with the needs of the University. Areas which have received increased attention are for example ethics compliance procedures and contract management.

The restructure of the RO has filtered down to faculty level where support services for research are being increased. There is still a number of areas where the central RO and faculty offices are not well-aligned. The University recognises this challenge.

Although the changes are still recent, the evidence suggests that the strengthening of the RO has on the whole been satisfactory from a strategic point of view.

Another area which has received attention since the 2004 review is information management which is critical for Monash to be able to effectively monitor its research performance. In 2005 Monash developed the 'Total Access Research and Data Information System' (TARDIS). TARDIS was originally built as a repository for research-related data. TARDIS can integrate data from Monash's corporate systems and produces reports on publications, research grants and contracts and HDR activity. The integrated system allows easier access to research and research performance information of individual staff, schools/departments and faculties. The improved registration, reporting and access to information will facilitate the planning of research activities with respect to research directions. A Research Information Management Strategy is being developed to encapsulate systems governance, systems development, data collection and business processes which relate to research and research training.

## 6.3 *Research Performance*

The targets to improve research performance are set at university level. Reporting on faculty and campus level through the faculty operational and campus plans was introduced in 2006. The Vice-Chancellors Group (VCG) will monitor the progress toward faculty and campus goals.

Monash's research-related sector-wide performance indicators relate primarily to income and publications. The KPIs include share of National Competitive Grants (NCG) (8<sup>th</sup> in 2003), Share of non NCG, 5<sup>th</sup> in 2003), Share of unweighed publications (4<sup>th</sup> in 2003) and Share of weighted publications (4<sup>th</sup> in 2003). The target for Monash is to be among the top three in the Go8 by 2008 on these measures (PF vol 1, p130).

Monash's share of Go8 and sector research income has fluctuated from year to year over the last four years and will need to improve to reach its target of being in the top three of the Go8 by 2008. Over the period the trend, in research income in particular compared to sector-wide performance, is upwards from \$1,359.0m in 2000 to \$2,050.3m in 2004. Growth in income was halved, however, from 15% to 8% from 2003 to 2004 (National Research Income, IAF 2005).

Monash's performance in unweighted and weighted publications has improved both compared to the sector and to the Go8. Weighted research publication output increased by 44% between 2000–2004.

The aspiration to be one of the top performers in the Go8 is a significant stretch target and Monash has to improve its performance both compared to the Go8 targets and its internal targets. The targets are serving the purpose, however, of sending a strong message to academic staff about the need for staff to improve their research performance. This message is clearly being heard by staff, and the panel found on all campuses that most staff were behind this and keen to increase their productivity in many cases.

Staff will need significant support to achieve this. The University is putting a serious effort into supporting the attainment of its goals, such as the redefinition of the role of the Committee of Associate Deans (Research), developing additional human resources policies such as mentoring schemes for under-performing new staff and retirement schemes for research staff, and attention is paid to research in performance management.

### **Commendation 11**

**AUQA commends Monash University for putting in place an integrated set of strategies to improve research performance and its success in raising the profile of research and obtaining a commitment from staff in all campuses to contribute to achievement of the ambitious stretch research targets set for the university.**

## 7 ENGAGEMENT

The Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework: 2004–2008 includes the following value with respect to engagement:

*Monash will be fully engaged with its communities including local schools, governments, industry, professions and the general public.*

In addition, Monash Directions 2025 emphasises *the University's desire to be 'a university in the world' that values the engagement between our campuses and the various communities that we serve.*

The Monash University Act 1958, requires the University to promote critical enquiry within the University and in the general community.

### 7.1 *Community Engagement Framework*

Community engagement is one of the responsibilities under the remit of the Vice-President (Advancement), a position which was established in 2005. Currently faculties and divisions engage with various community groups in the context of the Community Service Policy. An engagement profile is formulated as part of academic staff performance management and community services activities are among the criteria for promotion.

According to the 2005 Annual Plan, Monash University needs to 'be more systematic' about external relationships and create clearer leadership responsibilities and expectations for different kinds of engagement relationships and to set appropriate targets. In order to fulfil this objective; the discussion paper 'A Proposal to Establish a Community Engagement Framework' was circulated within the university in June 2006.

The Audit Panel was presented with many examples of strategically funded and well-run community engagement activities at the Australian campuses as well as in Malaysia and South Africa. The activities seemed to be driven primarily by the priorities of the campus and the faculty staff involved rather than by an apparent university-wide strategic approach to community engagement. AUQA endorses Monash University's decision to develop a more systematic approach to community engagement.

The Audit Panel found evidence that the University could benefit from the establishment of a cross-campus infrastructure that would facilitate the implementation of an enhanced community engagement agenda. Increased interaction across campuses would permit campuses and faculties to share good practices, not only in regard to the initiation of engagement activities but also in regard to the level and type of communication the campuses and faculties have with community stakeholders.

#### **Affirmation 7**

**AUQA affirms Monash University's initiative to develop a Community Engagement Framework that more effectively identifies new directions and coordinates activities, monitors predefined targets, and allows the university to better share experiences across campuses.**

## 7.2 *Engagement Activities*

Monash distinguishes between engagement with alumni, prospective students and schools, governments, industry, the professions and local communities. The Audit Panel was presented with evidence both in the Portfolio and in the interviews during the Audit Visits that the University is actively engaged with these stakeholder groups.

One area which has been the focus of attention is prospective schools and students. Examples of activities in this area are:

- Monash South Africa opens its premises to Grade 10, 11 and 12 learners on Saturdays.
- The 'Monash Club' for high school students at the Monash Campus in Malaysia. High school students attending fairs at the campus are invited to join the Monash Club which entitles them to a free club magazine and invitations to club activities. The current membership is 5000 and it provides Monash access to contact details of to a large number of potential students.
- The Monash Enhancement Studies Program in Australia

The Monash Enhancement Studies Program allows high-achieving Year 12 students to study a first-year subject as part of their Year 12 Program at the University. In the period from 2003 to 2005 approximately 50% of the students enrolled at Monash after completion of the program.

The number of students enrolling at Monash from the Enhancement Program has gone down in the period from 2003 (279) to 2005 (183), as has the number of students participating in the Enhancement Program.

In 2003 Monash introduced an Employer Survey, which was conducted in Australia. It provides feedback from employers on a range of areas. It will be repeated every fifth year and MUM will be included in the next Employer Survey. MSA will be included if the number of graduates is sufficient to warrant its participation in the survey.

There is a particular resource in the alumni group who already has some level of knowledge of the University, and there is a well-functioning infrastructure to communicate with alumni via the range of services that the university offers the alumni, such as the alumni newsletter 'At Monash' and the alumni networks which are listed on the Alumni Relations Unit website.

The University keeps formal as well as informal relations with a large number of stakeholders at campus, faculty, and university level for example through the activities mentioned above. However, the University can more actively benefit from its network of stakeholders and use them as a source of inspiration on key issues related to the University's strategic direction. This would require that the main stakeholder groups were more consistently kept informed about the University's strategic directions and major strategic initiatives and that the contact with stakeholders was formalised. The experiences of managing the Gippsland Advisory Council, a statutory body under the provisions of the *Monash University (Chisholm and Gippsland) Act 1990*, could provide examples of good practice in regard to the organisation of consultation of external stakeholders. Furthermore it would be useful for the University to develop systematic measures aimed at registering the outcomes of the various engagement activities in order to monitor which activities are delivering the most effective outcomes.

## 8 INTERNATIONAL

Monash Directions 2025 presents Monash's aspiration to be a leading international university:

*We will demonstrate a deep commitment to internationalism and cross-cultural communication, through our campuses in Australia, Malaysia and South Africa, our centres in Europe and our networks in other countries.*

The international focus is reinforced in 'Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Framework 2004–2008' which states that:

*Although remaining centred in Australia, Monash will be fully engaged internationally and, anticipating an increasing trend to global systems of education, industry, trade and governance, ensure that all our educational programs have strong international content and focus.*

Internationalisation spans the entire organisation. Aspects of internationalisation that relate to other core activities (for example teaching and learning) are addressed in respective sections of this report. This section addresses matters that are particular to Monash's international strategy.

### 8.1 Strategy

At the time of the Audit Visit, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) (DVC (International)) had just finished preparing the International Plan 2007–2010 which was made available to the Audit Panel. The plan replaces the existing Global Development Framework 2002–2006. An important source of information for the preparation of the International Plan was the International Self-Review which was finalised in 2005. The plan is intended to strengthen Monash's international activities even further and comprises four main objectives:

- *Optimise our research, learning and teaching, community engagement and financial benefits from our international partnerships*
- *Optimise our research, learning and teaching, community engagement, and financial benefits from our international footprint*
- *Enhance our research profile through new international presences*
- *Foster the culture of internationalism amongst the broader Monash community*

The International Plan will be an important element in the process of bringing Monash from an entrepreneurial approach to internationalisation to introducing a more formalised approach which is aligned with Monash's current strategic directions.

Given the importance to Monash of being an international university and the focus accorded to internationalisation of the University, the Audit Panel was presented with surprisingly different interpretations of the meaning of 'internationalisation' amongst staff. In most cases it was seen to refer to offshore activities and global outreach in a variety of settings.

In discussions with staff it was also evident to the Panel that there was not a common understanding of the concept of 'internationalisation of the curriculum'. Monash's Policy on the Internationalisation of the Curriculum (2005) notes that internationalisation means 'the provision of curricula, pedagogies and assessment that foster understanding of national and global perspectives, and of how these intersect and interact with personal perspectives. Learning experiences at Monash will develop students' ability to engage with multiple frameworks, contrasting value-systems and open-ended situations'. In discussions with staff the Audit Panel heard little reference to these values and reflection on pedagogy and assessment.

The concept of ‘internationalisation’ and how it impacts on the University’s activities is not well understood or consistently interpreted across the university. It would be of value to the University if in addition to the International Plan a Statement of International Purpose was developed to support and integrate the understanding of internationalisation within the university community. This will be important to achieve the University vision.

### **Recommendation 9**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University develop a ‘Statement of International Purpose’ to support and integrate the understanding of internationalisation more effectively into the activities of the university.**

One of the areas that employers were asked to rate in the Employer Survey (2003) was their satisfaction with Monash graduates. Graduates’ ability to operate in an international and multicultural context was ranked as one of the Monash graduates’ weaker attributes, but at the same time not considered to be one of the most important attributes. A clarification of the meaning of internationalisation, not least internationalisation of the curriculum, is likely to also have a positive effect on the students’ international profile.

## **8.2 Management**

The DVC (International) position was created and filled in 2005. The DVC (International) is responsible for setting the University’s strategic direction for international engagement in research and teaching. The Advancement Portfolio includes the Marketing and Public Affairs Division which since 2005 has been responsible for recruitment of domestic as well as international students. The two portfolios intersect in regard to issues related to international students.

The Vice-Chancellor’s Group (International) (VCGI), oversees implementation of international strategy. Its members comprise the DVC (I) and the chairs of the Regional Steering Groups. The Regional Steering Groups of which there are six, each covering a main region, have been established to facilitate the governance and coordination of international matters. A standing committee under the Academic Board, the Transnational Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee (TQAIC) is responsible for assuring the quality of the collaborative teaching arrangements. The DVC (International) chairs the TQAIC. The responsibilities for approval of different types of international activities are shared between Council, the Vice-Chancellor, the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the DVC (International). Responsibility for the development and approval of courses, including courses taught offshore, is devolved to faculties which are required to seek approvals for certain types of transnational activities as specified in the Approvals Process for Transnational Activities document (section 4.3.1).

The management of international activities appears somewhat diffused in the matrix structure (section 1.2.5) which emphasises the need for a strengthened common direction and rigorous coordination which will be provided by the International Plan. The Audit Panel recognises that the advancement and the international portfolios are still new and it is too early to make any strong judgements on the two positions and their distinctive roles. It is clear, however, that it is necessary to monitor the development of the division of labour between the two positions and possibly strengthen the integration between the two portfolios.

## **8.3 Transnational Collaborations**

### **8.3.1 Approval**

The requirements for the development and approval of new transnational activities are laid out in the Approval Processes for Transnational Activities document. The process includes the types of

activities that the University can enter into and specifies who is involved in the approval process. The process consists of four phases: initial considerations, decision to proceed with faculty approval, decision to proceed with university approval, and university approval.

Council makes decisions on the establishment of new centres and campuses at the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor. Approval of various types of teaching arrangements involves as a minimum the DVC (International). An exception to this is faculty/division/campus level exchanges and Memoranda of Understanding or collaborations. These types of activities only have to be reported to the DVC (International). Where financial risk is involved the Chief Financial Officer also reviews and approves the proposal.

The evidence suggests that Monash has a comprehensive and effective process for the approval of international collaboration that ensures that activities of strategic and financial importance are approved by senior management.

### 8.3.2 Recruitment Agents

Student recruitment and the management of recruitment agents are the responsibility of the International Division under the Vice-President (Advancement)'s portfolio. Monash has contractual arrangements with 142 agent representatives. The agents are responsible for recruiting students to Monash University, Monash College and Monash University English Language Centre.

The appointment of agents involves an assessment of the prospective agent based on criteria, referees' reports, and a personal interview. The decision to enter into a contract with a specific agent is assessed by the manager of the offshore student recruitment and the contract signed by the Deputy Vice-President (Advancement) who reports to the Vice-President (Advancement).

The agent contract specifies the responsibilities of the agent and sets out the minimum requirements for the agents' knowledge about Australian legal requirements that apply when recruiting international students to study in Australia (such as the ESOS Act), and agents are offered to participate in various training activities. Before contract renewal the performance of the agent is assessed on a number of criteria such as numbers of applications, offers, commencements and conversion ratios.

The evidence suggests that this important aspect of the University's risk management is well-organised and controlled.

### 8.3.3 Collaborative Teaching Arrangements

Monash University has a long tradition of offering its courses offshore as part of collaborative teaching arrangements with partner institutions. In March 2006 Monash had 12 collaborative teaching agreements some of which relate to multiple courses. In 2005 there were students enrolled in approximately 70 courses offered as part of these collaborative teaching arrangements (Supplementary Material (SM) 57: List of active off-shore teaching agreements).

Teaching is typically delivered as either distance education with local teaching staff responsible for running tutorials or teaching undertaken by Monash staff who fly-in-and-fly-out and with the support of local tutors. The course coordinator is typically responsible for a course wherever it is taught and cooperates with the relevant unit leaders. Equivalence between the courses taught offshore is ensured through the use of the same curriculum and assessment is overseen and moderated by Monash staff. The interviews with staff and students from the teaching partners showed, however, that the tutors are not familiar with Monash's teaching values. They do not receive any systematic induction to the course that they are involved in from Monash staff or information about Monash University, its strategic direction and its basic values. This situation is

accentuated by the fact that the tutors at the two partners visited by the Audit Panel are responsible not only for Monash University's tutorials, but also for other institutions', including other Australian universities.

The Panel is in no doubt that the students enrolled with partners get a degree which is academically equivalent to a Monash degree taught at one of the Monash campuses. The study experience offshore on the other hand does not in all cases reflect Monash values. Monash could ensure that offshore students are better exposed to a Monash study experience by systematically introducing staff and students to Monash University and its values.

#### **Recommendation 10**

**AUQA recommends that Monash University develop procedures to introduce local staff involved in courses taught as part of collaborative teaching arrangements offshore to the University values, such as student-centred and flexible learning, to ensure that the study experience is equivalent.**

The lack of integration of local teaching staff could partly be due to the diffusion of coordination and overview of activities related to these programs in the matrix management structure and to a lack of university-level policies. This may under certain circumstances expose the University to a higher than necessary reputational (and possibly other kinds of) risk. Some of these concerns are offset by the quality assurance framework for delivery of Monash University courses which requires that the identical course is offered regardless of location, and that teaching and assessment are undertaken by Monash University staff.

#### 8.3.4 Review of Operations

In accordance with the International Plan, Monash will enhance its research profile through new international presences, including high quality research alliances with international partners. As part of this process Monash is reviewing its current collaborative teaching arrangements to decide whether the partners comply with the desired enhanced research focus. During the period of the audit, Monash has terminated cooperation with one partner and terminated one course with another partner. The University still retains a large number of offshore teaching programs.

The Audit Panel endorses the University's decision to reconsider which collaborative arrangements should continue in the light of its strategic direction.

TQAIC undertakes reviews of the collaborative teaching arrangements and the courses offered as part of these in three-year cycles. The reviews focus on the suitability of the contractual arrangements as well as the effectiveness of their implementation, the comparative performance and satisfaction of students and financial viability. The Audit Panel had access to a number of reviews, including reviews that covered the offshore courses studied by the Panel, which confirmed the rigor of the review process and that the partner was involved in the review.

Exit strategies are included in Monash contracts for collaborative arrangements and TQAIC oversees the suitability and implementation of the exit strategy. The Audit Panel found that the exit strategies in place for the programs sampled as part of the audit are appropriate and appropriately implemented by both Monash and the partners.

#### 8.3.5 Staffing

The International Self-Review (2005) concluded that offshore employment issues were broad and complex and should be the attention of a dedicated committee. It recommended that the

International Staffing Advisory Group (which had not met since 2002) be reactivated for that purpose.

Considerable attention is given at university level, for example through the work of the International Staffing Advisory Group, to the working conditions for staff working short- or long-term on an assignment/secondment in a Monash campus or centre. There are university-level guidelines that apply for staff working under these circumstances. The responsibility for decisions relating to staff teaching courses as part of collaborative arrangements offshore is as for other courses devolved to faculties. The faculty identifies the relevant staff, provides administrative back-up and implements faculty policy.

In addition to these guidelines, there is equally a need to formulate minimum university-wide criteria for staff teaching courses as part of collaborative teaching arrangements outside Australia. These criteria could build on good practices from the approaches already in place in the faculties active offshore.

#### **8.4 *Staff and Student Mobility***

The increased emphasis on internationalisation has also led to a greater recognition within Monash that if the University's international vision is to prove successful there needs to be a much stronger framework (and funding) to support staff and student mobility between and across the university's various campuses and its exchange partners.

Monash has developed the Monash Mobility Framework which comprises strategies that encourage as well as support physical mobility of staff and students both within and outside the Monash campus network. The framework consists of the:

- Student International Mobility Scheme
- Intra-Monash Mobility Scheme
- Professional Development Scheme

The framework was considered by Academic Board in the beginning of 2006.

An element of the Monash Mobility Framework is the 'Monash Abroad' program which provides students with an opportunity and some funding to spend one to two semesters of their degree with one of Monash's 120 exchange partners.

Monash Abroad was reviewed in 2004 due to the growth of student mobility having been lower than expected and performance fallen behind that of other Australian universities. As a reaction to the findings of the review, promotional activities and operations underwent an overhaul in 2005. Furthermore the budget of Monash Abroad has been increased from A\$1.2m in 2005 to A\$1.8m in 2006 to fund an increase in student travel.

So far the results for 2006 are mainly positive. There is for example a positive trend in total applications, student exchanges and students spending a semester or more abroad and intercampus exchange. However, there has been no increase in the number of Australian students going to MUM or MSA. Monash will continue to increase the travel grant funding as an encouragement for students to study abroad. The University needs to continue to pay particular attention to increasing intercampus travel and especially encourage staff based in Australia to go to MUM and MSA.

Monash also offers specific programs with integrated study abroad periods. The Bachelor of Arts (Global) degree and the Chinese In-Country Program are examples of this. The Chinese In-Country Program, which is part of the Monash Chinese Studies Program, offers short, highly intensive Chinese language training taught at two Chinese universities in Shanghai and Beijing. It

allows students to complete the equivalent of one or two units of Chinese language study in three or six weeks in a Chinese language and cultural environment. Students may be eligible for funding from Monash Abroad. Since 2001, 900 students have participated in the program. This type of program provides a useful model for Monash to adapt in other teaching and learning contexts.

Monash recognises that mobility entails a significant cost. Appropriate structures and financial support to move people are critical for the international vision not to be tarnished. It is important that Monash continues to monitor the financial support needed to reach its targets and to allocate sufficient funds for this purpose.

### 8.5 *Monash College*

Monash University has a number of subsidiaries. One of them is Monash College Group a wholly owned company of the University which is the result of a restructure of Monash International Pty Ltd in 2005. Monash College Group comprises five businesses including Monash College (MC), Monash University English Language Centre, Monash University Foundation Year, Monash Academy Study Groups (including Home Stay) and Monash Information Technology. According to the International Plan, Monash will strengthen the role of MC in supporting the University's objectives.

MC is a private provider of higher education. Its courses are accredited for delivery in Victoria by the Higher Education and Regulatory Division (HERD) of the Victorian Department of Education and Training. MC's pathway programs are offered in five areas (Arts, Art and Design, Business and Economics, Information Technology and Engineering) and articulate into the second year of Monash undergraduate courses. In addition to its delivery of programs in Melbourne, it has offshore licensed partners in China (Guangzhou), Indonesia and Singapore. MC has obtained the necessary approvals for operation in these countries.

The establishment of Monash College Group has clarified and strengthened the relations between Monash College and Monash University, especially the interface between Monash College and the university faculties participating in MC activities. MC has a Board of Studies involving representatives from MC and University faculties which have an involvement with MC. The Board is the principal academic body of MC and responsible for the quality of MC programs. The Board has established the 'Boards of Examiners' to review and declare final assessments for all MC students. Membership of the Boards of Examiners includes examiners appointed from Monash academic staff together with MC staff. MC teachers receive moderators' reports. Furthermore the links between MC and the faculties are maintained through area specific field of study managers.

MC's quality system, which is documented in MC's Quality Management Manual, comprises regular internal reviews of standards and curricula and triennial visiting panel reviews which involve experts who are external to MC. The quality system is currently under review. MC builds on policies and procedures of Monash University where they seem appropriate and adapts these to the MC context. In addition to the internal quality assurance measures, MC is subject to five-yearly reaccreditation reviews by HERD and must report annually to the Victorian Minister of Education.

MC's current structure and links with the faculties aligns MC's courses with the quality requirements of the University. This combined with the positive results in terms of student outcomes achieved by MC (section 3.5.3) places the University in a good position to capitalise even further on the cooperation with MC as anticipated in the International Plan.

## 9 MONASH UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA AND MONASH SOUTH AFRICA

Given Monash University Malaysia's and Monash South Africa's position as campuses in the Monash University campus network comments on these two campuses have been incorporated throughout the report. The following chapter includes observations on the particular characteristics of the campuses which are not covered elsewhere.

### 9.1 *Monash University Malaysia*

Monash University Malaysia (MUM) began operating in 1998. MUM is a partnership between Monash University and Sunway College Sdn Bhd and the MUM Board of Directors is its governing authority (section 1.2.1). The academic leader is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (MUM). A Chief Executive is appointed by the Malaysian Government. The current Chief Executive is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (MUM). A Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor position was established in mid 2005. An Executive Director is responsible for and has oversight of financial management and infrastructure planning.

MUM has five academic schools: Business, Engineering, Arts and Sciences, Information Technology and most recently Medicine and Health Services. MUM offers a total of 11 undergraduate degrees, including three honours degrees, and six postgraduate degrees, including the MPhil and PhD.

The total number of students has grown from 417 in 1998 to 2763 as of March 2006. In 2005 23% of the students were from countries other than Malaysia. The number of academic staff has grown from 53 in 2000 to 131 in 2005.

#### 9.1.1 Governance

MUM is established under the provisions of the *Private Higher Educational Institutions Act 1996*. According to the operating agreement between the parties, Monash is responsible for academic matters, while Sunway College is responsible for the administration of the campus in particular with respect to financial management and the provision of adequate resources for the support of teaching, learning and research in accordance with Monash's requirements (PF vol 2, p196). The division of labour is being adhered to and there is an effective cooperation between Monash and Sunway College which seems to build on a set of shared objectives and mutual trust.

#### 9.1.2 Campus Characteristics

MUM undertook a campus self-review in 2004 which has been an effective driver of improvement for the development of MUM. Staff and students are clearly proud of being associated with Monash University. Both staff and students highlighted the size of the Malaysian campus as one of MUM's main strengths which means that students have easy access to their teachers, support staff and senior management, including the Pro Vice-Chancellor (MUM). The course managers, who are responsible for the administration of courses, for example admission, advice, and student records, and school managers who are responsible for the administrative operation of schools appeared to have a particularly positive impact on the effective implementation of the campus' administrative activities.

The Audit Panel was presented with several examples of the short communication channels having led to the rapid introduction of local approaches in response to particular quality issues. An example of this is the staff-student liaison committees that assure a rapid response to issues raised by students primarily in regard to teaching or administrative matters.

### 9.1.3 Stakeholder Engagement

Monash University and Sunway College were invited by the Malaysian Government to establish MUM. The desire on the part of the Malaysian Government to open its borders to foreign universities has definitely helped MUM establish its position in Malaysia. The acceptance of Monash University in Malaysia has also been facilitated through the cooperation with a local education provider. Furthermore, it has been a deliberate strategy for MUM over the last years to develop a closer contact with government, in particular the bodies responsible for approving foreign providers in Malaysia. This work has been undertaken in close cooperation with the other foreign branch university campuses operating in Malaysia.

MUM has developed the 'Monash Malaysia Research' proposal against the objectives of the Ninth Malaysia Plan and the purpose of the proposal is to support the development of MUM's research position. The Ninth Malaysia plan for example introduces the establishment of Centres of Excellence at a number of Malaysian universities. MUM has identified joint collaboration projects with a number of these universities which is an important step in MUM's endeavours to strengthen its research capabilities.

### 9.1.4 Facilities

Currently MUM shares a building which also partly houses the Sunway University College. MUM has recently added a medical school to the campus and a new campus is under construction. The first stage of the campus will be completed in 2007. The Audit Panel was given a presentation of the plans for the campus and was given a tour to the construction site. The new campus will provide considerable research facilities and learning space. A Learning Commons building is placed in the centre of the campus. The opening of the new campus and the increase in the range of courses offered is likely to further strengthen MUM's profile as an attractive education provider in Malaysia.

### 9.1.5 Student Support

The evidence shows that MUM has a number of strengths with respect to student support. MUM administers a language test for new students aimed at identifying which students would benefit from contacting the Language Learning Support Unit. MUM has a very active student association which has introduced a 'buddy program' where groups of 8 to 10 new students work with older students during orientation week and maintain links with each other throughout the first semester.

### 9.1.6 Performance Management

Performance management of academic staff at MUM occurs according to the Monash policy. There is a tradition for bonus rewards in Malaysia to express appreciation and recognition of the staff member's loyalty and contribution. The bonus payment is not typically tied to performance. An important part of MUM's efforts to strengthen its research performance and to bring the level of research in closer alignment with University expectations is the introduction of a new reward and bonus system that links bonus payment to performance. A bonus of half a month's salary will be paid to all staff, however, independent of performance. Further bonuses will be based on assessment of performance with a loading of teaching 40%, research 40%, administration 20%. The scheme is based on the Monash Questionnaire Series on Teaching (MonQueST) (section 4.2.1) results. MonQueST is a voluntary system, but MonQueST results may be used to support an application for promotion or other staff development and appraisal activities. MonQueST profiles and aggregates are also made available for the use of academic promotion committees in interpreting individual results. Given that MonQueST is a voluntary system and its use in the bonus system context is new, it is important that the bonus and reward system be carefully monitored.

### 9.1.7 The Quality Portfolio

A position of Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor was introduced mid 2005 with responsibility for oversight of the planning and quality of learning and teaching, and research and research training. The appointment of the Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor has been an important step for MUM in terms of increasing the attention given to the organisation of follow-up activities to surveys and reviews and supporting the implementation of the quality cycle.

## 9.2 *Monash South Africa*

Monash South Africa (MSA) began operating in 2001. MSA has three academic schools, ie: Arts, Business and Economics and Information Technology. MSA offers four undergraduate degree courses, all of which have been accredited by the South African Higher Education Quality Committee, and the Academic Development Program for students who do not fulfill the requirements for direct entry. At the time of the Audit MSA did not offer any postgraduate degrees, but two postgraduate coursework degrees have been accredited.

The total number of students has grown from 235 in 2003 to 524 students in 2005 (819 as of 30 June 2006). The first students graduated in 2003. In 2005 the total number of academic staff was 67 and 92 administrative and support staff.

### 9.2.1 Governance

MSA is a not-for-profit private higher provider registered with the South African Department of Education under the Higher Education Act of 1997 and incorporated under the Companies Act. MSA is a wholly owned campus of Monash University. The Board is chaired by the Deputy Chancellor. The academic leader is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (MSA). A Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor is responsible for academic affairs including the line management of the heads of school and reports to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (MSA).

Monash University has a clear vision for MSA (section 1.1.1). MSA is an important part of Monash's ambition to be an international university and is considered to have a positive impact on its reputation and thus its ability to attract international students to all its campuses. Monash's intent in operating in South Africa is to be a 'public good' university and to contribute actively and effectively not only in South Africa's but Africa's development. MSA has in a short period of time established a strong platform for its further development. This starting point is essential for MSA to successfully comply with future requirements especially in regard to research performance and recruitment of sufficient staff and students with the right profile. Monash has a very visible commitment to the development of MSA.

The University emphasised that the intention is not to make money, but to break even. The deadline to break-even in South Africa has been extended from 2008 to 2011. The University is aware of the challenges in terms of meeting the 2011 deadline and MSA is given the necessary financial attention by the University with the support of the Monash Council. Monash has a number of strategies in place to address the challenges for example measures to reduce the deficit and increase the number of fee-paying students to generate income. It should be noted that the number of students has gone up consistently since MSA's establishment.

### 9.2.2 Campus Characteristics

Monash has developed MSA on a greenfield site and has invested in purpose-built infrastructure and facilities, such as student accommodation, which will accommodate up to 700 students in 2007, computer laboratories and a Learning Commons building will be ready in 2007. MSA is a very vibrant campus with exemplar facilities that support the learning experience and make it possible for both domestic and foreign students to live on campus.

As at MUM, staff and students are generally very proud of being a part of MSA and there is a high degree of pioneering spirit among staff and willingness to make MSA a success. The enthusiasm and commitment of staff and students to the campus was in particular noted by the Panel.

The atmosphere and smallness of the campus with its easy access to facilities and to staff, are clearly important drivers for the development of MSA and its ability to attract students and staff to the campus. The high level of student satisfaction is expressed in the Monash Experience Questionnaire (MEQ). In 2005 96% of respondents (80.5% response rate) were broadly satisfied with their study experience which is an increase from 91.2% in 2003. This is the highest level of satisfaction of any of the campuses.

### 9.2.3 Stakeholder Relations

Since its establishment MSA has had an Advisory Board for each school as a part of its community engagement strategy. These boards were recently discontinued and will be replaced by reference groups whose members will be representatives from government, business and the South African higher education sector. There is a need for MSA to increase the awareness of Monash University in South Africa and in the region. Both the reference groups and the individual members of the reference groups can play a significant role in increasing the promotion of MSA in South Africa on the one hand and on the other hand in providing advice to MSA of other ways of strengthening MSA's position. The establishment of the new reference groups should therefore be given immediate attention.

### 9.2.4 Staff Development

There is a local Staff Development Committee at MSA. According to the committee members the committee has only recently clarified its role which is to develop a strategic approach to staff development and have an advisory role in that regard.

The Audit Visit provided clear evidence that there are good opportunities for staff, general as well as academic, to participate in development activities both in terms of the financial resources and the time available for these activities. Several academic staff have completed or are currently participating in the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education (GCHE) or the Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education and Training which is a South African qualification which has been approved by the University's Teaching Qualification Committee as equivalent to the GCHE, and a number of staff are either pursuing their masters degree or a PhD. The two latter activities are considered to be cornerstones of MSA's preparation for its increase in research performance. Since the appointment of the Director Research in May 2006 a number of research-related workshops and training sessions have been offered. There is a Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching (CALT) staff member on campus. The academic staff development and student learning support provided by CALT are no doubt relevant for the individual staff member, but the Audit Panel endorses the decision by the Staff Development Committee to introduce a strategic approach to staff development.

### 9.2.5 The Quality Portfolio

A position of Director Institutional Planning and Quality Assurance is unique to MSA. The director reports to the Pro Vice-Chancellor of MSA and works closely with the Centre for Higher Education Quality. The focus on quality and quality assurance through the director position has facilitated a rapid introduction and awareness of the concept of 'Quality at Monash' and the quality cycle within the organisation. The driver of the quality agenda is to a large extent vested within that position. Due to the introduction of new quality assurance measures the quality portfolio is currently being extended. If the current level of activity is to be maintained, consideration needs to be given to the resources which will need to be allocated to this area in the future.

## 10 SUPPORT SERVICES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Monash's commitment to providing quality support services for students and staff is incorporated in *Excellence and Diversity: Strategic Directions 2004–2008* which notes that as part of Monash's aim to strive for excellence in management, Monash will ensure that the quality of the support services for students and staff are excellent.

Monash's statement of purpose also signals that as part of Monash's aim to seek to improve the human condition it will do so through research, and education and a commitment to social justice, human rights and a sustainable environment.

### 10.1 *Financial Management*

The Vice-President (Finance) and Chief Financial Officer oversees the financial management, funding and capital works of Monash.

In 2003 Monash introduced a new financial management process aimed at increasing the awareness of costs within the University. The process builds on the principle that all revenue earned by a faculty is attributed to the faculty. There is an unfunded gap between the revenue derived from research activity and the full costs of this activity which is met through internal funding. Faculties carry all direct expenses for staff salaries and non-staff-related expenses. The faculties are also charged for costs incurred for centrally provided services based on drivers relating to the faculty's consumption.

To support the effective implementation of this process, the University developed the service level agreement (SLA) project in 2001. Service statements have been negotiated between all major central support service areas and the faculties. They define the services to be provided to faculties, the service levels, key performance indicators (KPIs) for monitoring purposes, and regular reporting of service performance and standards.

Although deemed time consuming by many staff, the introduction of SLAs has contributed to increasing the awareness of costs. It is positive that the effectiveness of the SLAs is continuously being reviewed through the KPIs, to increase their usefulness.

The process seems to be a driver for quality in the services provision as the quality of the service that is expected is made explicit in the agreements. The Audit Panel also found several examples of how the SLAs function as a vehicle for collaboration between providers and the faculties to ensure alignment of services with faculty needs. It is currently a prerequisite for the financial model that all services are provided by internal service providers. For the focus on cost to be brought to an even higher level, the University may wish to consider opening up the provision of services to external providers.

#### **Commendation 12**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of service level agreement as a means of increasing transparency of services and awareness of costs as well as being a vehicle of collaboration which can ensure an increased alignment between internal services and faculty needs.**

## 10.2 *Risk Management*

Monash's risk management framework, approved by Council, lays out the University's risk management process and the role and responsibilities of key stakeholders. The responsibility for risk management is vested in the Audit and Risk Management Office. Monash has adopted the Australasian Risk Management Standard (AS/NZS 4360:2004). The principle applied is that risk management is integrated into the work of the operational units and therefore the Audit and Risk Management Office is responsible for providing advice in the form of tools and templates. A comprehensive risk management profile is developed for each operational unit. Furthermore a Risk Management Network, comprising risk coordinators and nominees of deans, divisional directors, and chief executive officers has been established to share experiences of common interest.

In addition to the risk management framework, the Audit and Risk Management Office has facilitated the implementation of a crisis management and recovery planning process which builds on the identification of possible crisis events and the relevant response. Scenarios developed by the University Security Manager are run regularly at each campus to test preparations. Crisis management and recovery planning are in place at all campuses, and the Crisis Management and Recovery Teams work with relevant emergency services. The Audit and Risk Management Office is responsible for reviewing these arrangements and for reporting to Council's Audit Committee on the adequacy of the arrangements.

The risk management profiles and the crisis management and recovery planning seem to appropriately cover the types of risks that the University can reasonably be expected to be exposed to and include appropriate responses. This is particularly relevant for MUM and MSA where risks need to be identified and assessed in the local legal, institutional and cultural context.

### **Commendation 13**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its comprehensive risk management framework and crisis management and recovery planning.**

## 10.3 *Support services*

### 10.3.1 Management

The administrative operations of Monash are divided into the following five divisions:

- Facilities and Services
- Human Resources
- Information Technology Services
- Student and Community Services
- University Solicitor

The Vice-President (Administration) is responsible for these divisions.

The general direction and priorities of the work of the divisions are set in the Support Services Strategic Plan 2005–2007. On the basis of the plan each division prepares its own operational plan. The responsibilities of the divisions are highly interrelated. Most of the priorities in the support services strategic plan also require coordination with other operational functions of the University in particular the faculty managers. The University has recently launched a shared services project to identify areas for improving the effectiveness of the service delivery and to save resources. The University was awaiting the results of the project at the time of the audit.

The Audit Panel endorses the decision to increase the focus on improving the effectiveness of service delivery through the shared services project in order to minimise duplication of effort and reduce the administrative burden. The administrative divisions depend on an effective cooperation with the faculties. An important aspect of the process to improve the service delivery is to ensure a common understanding of direction through clearly defined responsibilities between the central and the faculty level.

Monash is currently developing an information management strategy. The strategy will cover all aspects of the University's work including education, research, community engagement, commercial activities and intellectual property. Due to Monash's size and complex organisation and its reliance on electronic information systems as a means of communication, the introduction of the information management strategy will be an important source of information.

### 10.3.2 Information Technology Services

The Information Technology Services Division (ITS) is responsible for most of the IT infrastructure, including the network and internet connections, workgroup and central host servers, corporate applications and databases, the much of educational and research technology support and a service desk and client communication function. Faculties may elect to extend or add to central services to meet special requirements. There have been special challenges both at MUM and MSA due to the national infrastructure, such as broadband speed. These issues are being addressed through close cooperation between ITS in Australia and at MUM and MSA. At the time of the Audit the ITS Director at MUM is for example on secondment from Australia.

ITS has developed a range of mechanisms to receive feedback from its key stakeholders. It conducts special purpose surveys and has been subject to an external review conducted by an external provider. These feedback mechanisms and its operational plan provides ITS with regular feedback on progress towards its targets.

Given the importance of electronic communication, the University relies heavily on a stable IT platform such as email accounts for staff and students, the integrated inquiry and online customer 24-hour self-service system available to both staff and students 'ask.Monash', the 'my.monash' portal, which was particularly appreciated by the students interviewed. MEQ results show that students are generally satisfied with the access to information technology resources and the trend is positive. The evidence available to the Audit Panel suggests that Monash has adequate risk management procedures in place to protect the university from a catastrophic collapse of its information systems.

### 10.3.3 Library

The Monash Library operates across all campuses, with eight branch libraries in Australia and associated libraries at MUM and MSA. The library has a service level agreement with MUM and is developing one for MSA. It also provides services to the Monash off-campus students supported by a service unit at the Gippsland campus. All Monash students, wherever they are studying, have electronic access to the Library's electronic resources and services.

The library's planning priorities are set in the Support Services Strategic Plan and the library operational plan. Other strategic initiatives are laid out in separate documents, such as the Facilities Master Plan. The Library's achievement of its plans and targets is monitored in a number of ways, such as the key performance indicators included in the service level agreements, self-review, the national Rodski Survey and the MEQ.

The level of satisfaction measured in the MEQ has improved from 2003 to 2005 and is generally high on the two measures included, which are 'access to services' and 'resources are appropriate

for the need of the students'. The Library's planning and quality assurance procedures seem to be well embedded, and to have a positive impact on the running of the Library and the provision of services, including at MUM and MSA.

Some of the library's strategic projects are linked to the strategic priorities of the University. It is part of the Facilities Master Plan to turn the libraries into Learning Commons which will combine library services with other education services, such as IT. The library services do already support teaching and learning activities. The library for example provides access to the audio streaming of approximately 200 different classes through the Monash University Lectures Online. This facility was appreciated by the students interviewed, especially the international students, as the opportunity to replay a lecture and focus on areas which they had not well understood facilitates their learning. The library is working with academics to support the development of the students' information literacy skills.

A considerable number of the Library's electronic resources are used to support staff's and HDR students research activities. These needs are often identified through specific research projects and other means. The Panel learned at the Audit Visit that library staff do not consider their processes to identify the needs of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework students in terms of electronic resources to be as rigorous. The Library may want to reconsider its mechanisms for ensuring that the library's electronic resources are appropriately balanced to the needs of the various users.

#### **Commendation 14**

**AUQA commends the Monash University Library for its educational support services, such as Monash University Lectures Online and its information literacy activities, that support the achievement of the University's objectives in teaching and learning.**

#### 10.3.4 Student Administrative Services

The Student and Community Services Division is responsible for student services including student administration, client services, student systems, occupational health and safety and environment, equity and diversity business improvement projects, records and archives and community services.

There are Student Service Centres located on each campus. Monash has since 2000 been working toward establishing single points of delivery for students across a range of services and combining central and faculty services. The first example of a centre that integrates faculty and general student services, ie student administration, admissions and information technology support and combines back and front office functions, is the Caulfield Service Centre which has existed since 2002. The centre was reviewed in 2004 and although the review identified a number of areas that needed attention, such as a clearer mission and better integration with faculty teams, the main conclusion was that the centre and its integrated approach is generally improving the support provided to students. During the Audit Visit, the Audit Panel was informed that the model will be introduced to other campuses.

#### **Commendation 15**

**AUQA commends Monash University for the development and implementation of the Caulfield Service Centre model which has simplified student access to services through the establishment of a single point of contact.**

In addition to the support provided by the Student Service Centres, the International Student Services Unit provides specialised services for international students through international offices located at all the Australian campuses. Due to the size of MUM and MSA students tend to also consult their teachers rather than primarily make use of the formal support services. The close relations between staff and students and the opportunities for informal advice that follow were appreciated by both staff and students.

The first MEQ administered in 2003 covered areas related to students' views of administration in addition to academic matters. In 2004 the student satisfaction with administrative services was covered in the Student Services Survey. Monash introduced the Monash Support Experience Questionnaire in 2006 to measure students' satisfaction with central as well as faculty level services. It will be run in alternate years with the MEQ and replace the Student Services Survey. AUQA endorses this approach.

Given the size of Monash's student population and the mix of domestic and international students as well as off-campus students, providing excellent support services to all students is a challenge. The Audit Panel were presented with examples that some administrative procedures, for example the payment of fees and admissions, seem very detailed which can result in long response times. Some of the procedures may benefit from simplification and the integrated service model may well be a step in that direction.

#### 10.3.5 Grievance Procedures

Monash has a Student Academic and Administrative Grievance Policy. Academic and administrative grievances are received by the Manager, Student Administration who is also responsible for investigating and resolving grievances. All faculties are required to appoint a senior academic staff member to hear and respond to complaints.

The Student Academic and Administrative Grievance Procedures were subject to review in 2004. The review recommended the introduction of a network of staff at faculty, campus, and university level to deal with grievances and highlighted the need to inform students more broadly about the grievance procedures and suggested that staff involved in handling grievances be offered training.

The review recommendations have not been reflected explicitly in the grievance policy. From the Panel's discussion with students their level of information about the grievance procedures and policy, such as the opportunity to discuss their grievance with a faculty staff member, is wanting. AUQA encourages the University to expedite the implementation of the recommendations of the review and in particular with regard to communicating the grievance policy and procedures widely to students.

#### 10.3.6 Occupational Health Safety and Environment

Monash is committed to responsible environmental management through its statement of purpose. This is reflected in the development of an Environment Policy which is overseen by an Environment Policy Committee reporting directly to the Vice-Chancellor. Environmental issues are overseen at faculty and divisional level by environmental advisors who work closely with the Occupational Health Safety and Environment (OHSE) Unit. The management and implementation of OHSE activities are effectively dealt with through the establishment of geographical OHSE zones and OHSE zone committees. The latter have increased the focus on OHSE issues and the committees facilitate a quicker response to issues raised.

Monash has prepared triple bottom line reports since 2001 which are incorporated into the Annual Reports. Sustainability related measures (energy consumption and water consumption) are included in the University KPIs and are benchmarked against the Go8. Monash has the lowest

water consumption in the Go8 (kL per EFTSU), but has had fluctuating results in energy consumption.

In addition to the activities directly aimed at meeting the KPIs, Monash runs a range of environmental programs and initiatives. One of them is the Green Office Program which was initiated by a Monash student in 2000 and aims at improving environmental sustainability practices within the University by raising the awareness of staff and students of the environmental effects of their daily work practices. Two hundred volunteers have been trained in environmental issues aimed at supporting the implementation of the program.

Monash has identified suitable organisational structures and a range of activities that can facilitate the implementation of its environmental ambitions.

### **Commendation 16**

**AUQA commends Monash University for its environmental programs, the implementation of which is supported by effective organisational structures.**



## **APPENDIX A: MONASH UNIVERSITY**

### **History and Locations**

Monash University was established by Act of Parliament in 1958. Named after the prominent Australian Sir John Monash, it was the first of the so-called 'new' universities and was founded in the belief that every qualified person who wished to enter a university should be able to do so.

Monash University is a member of Australia's Group of Eight research-intensive universities. It is distinctive within the group, however, in operating across multiple locations. Monash comprises six campuses in Victoria (Berwick, Caulfield, Clayton, Gippsland, Parkville and Peninsula); campuses in Malaysia and South Africa; and two centres (London and Prato, Italy). The Melbourne Office in Collins Street provides a city venue for meetings and events. The University works with a number of city and rural teaching hospitals, principally the Monash Medical Centre, the Alfred Hospital and the Alfred Medical Research and Education Precinct.

Monash aspires to be recognised as one of the best universities in the world by 2025, distinctive because its research-intensive international focus enables it to address important theoretical and practical challenges, and develop graduates who will wish to do the same.

Monash has particular research strengths in areas including the biomedical sciences, chemistry, engineering, epidemiology and preventive medicine, geography and environmental sciences, injury prevention, medicine and reproductive and regenerative medicine. Monash sees itself as a 'university of the world', and its research strengths reflect the view that research must not only be excellent but ultimately accessible and useable by government, policy-makers, business and the general community. Monash is home to the Australian Synchrotron, the Australian Stem Cell Centre and the Monash Science Technology Research and Innovation Precinct.

### **Academic Profile**

Monash offers a wide range of disciplines through its ten faculties of Art and Design; Arts; Business and Economics; Education; Engineering; Information Technology; Law; Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences; Pharmacy (Victorian College of Pharmacy); and Science. An extensive range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses is offered through both on-campus and off-campus learning, with 789 courses offered in the 2006 academic year. Monash employs approximately 5,500 full-time equivalent staff (excluding casual staff), of which approximately 2,500 are full-time equivalent academic staff.

The University's 2005 student population of approximately 52,400 was drawn from more than 100 countries. From its earliest days, Monash has taken pride in being a highly internationalised university. In line with its history, values and strategic intentions, international students continue to constitute a significant proportion of all enrolments (approximately 30%) which is the largest proportion of any Australian university.

Monash College Group, a wholly owned subsidiary company of Monash University, provides a range of educational services including pathway programs into the University through Monash College, Monash University English Language Centre and Monash University Foundation Year.

**Statistics 2005**

<b>Enrolments (head count)</b>	
Total student enrolments:	52,400
Higher degree by research:	3,060
Attendance mode:	
On-campus	42,348
Off-campus	8,344
Multi-modal	1,708
<b>Full time equivalent (FTE) staff</b>	
Academic	2,657
General	2,884
<b>Total Operating Revenues:</b>	\$822,039,000
<b>Total Operating Expenses:</b>	\$740,821,000

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

### Mission

By means of quality audits of universities and accrediting agencies, and otherwise, AUQA will provide public assurance of the quality of Australia's universities and other institutions of higher education, and will assist in improving the academic quality of these institutions.

### Objectives

1. Arrange and manage a system of periodic audits of quality assurance arrangements relating to the activities of Australian universities, other self-accrediting institutions and state and territory higher education accreditation bodies.
2. Monitor, review, analyse and provide public reports on quality assurance arrangements in self-accrediting institutions, and on processes and procedures of state and territory accreditation authorities, and on the impact of those processes on quality of programs.
3. Report on the criteria for the accreditation of new universities and non-university higher education courses as a result of information obtained during the audit of institutions and state and territory accreditation processes.
4. Report on the relative standards of the Australian higher education system and its quality assurance processes, including their international standing, as a result of information obtained during the audit process.

### Values

AUQA will be:

- *Thorough*: AUQA carries out all its audits as thoroughly as possible.
- *Supportive*: recognising institutional autonomy in setting objectives and implementing processes to achieve them, AUQA acts to facilitate and support this.
- *Flexible*: AUQA operates flexibly, in order to acknowledge and reinforce institutional diversity.
- *Cooperative*: recognising that the achievement of quality in any organisation depends on a commitment to quality within the organisation itself, AUQA 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.

## Vision

- AUQA's judgements will be widely recognised as objective, fair, accurate, perceptive, rigorous and useful: AUQA has established detailed and effective procedures for audit, that include auditor appointment and training, extensive and thorough investigation, and consistent implementation.
- AUQA will work in partnership with institutions and accrediting agencies to add value to their activities: AUQA audit is based on self-review, acknowledges the characteristics of the institution or agency being audited, and accepts comment from the auditee on the best way of expressing the audit findings.
- AUQA's advice will be sought on matters related to quality assurance in higher education: AUQA will carry out consulting activities, including workshops, publications, and advising, and will publish and maintain a database of good practice.
- AUQA will be recognised among its international peers as a leading quality assurance agency: AUQA will build international links to learn from and provide leadership to other agencies, and will work with other agencies to the benefit of Australian institutions.

## **APPENDIX C: THE AUDIT PANEL**

Professor Marie Carroll, Director, Quality Enhancement and Statistical Services, Australian National University

Professor David Goodman, Pro Vice-Chancellor (International), University of Technology, Sydney

Ms Dorte Kristoffersen, Audit Director, AUQA

Emeritus Professor Adrian Lee, University of New South Wales, (Panel Chair)

Dr Anne Martin, Consultant

Professor Michael Lewis Shattock, Visiting Professor, Institute of Education, the University of London

Observer:

Mr Rob Fearnside, Project Executive, the Victorian Qualifications Authority

## APPENDIX D: ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

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

AB .....	Academic Board
AQF .....	Australian Qualifications Framework
AUQA .....	Australian Universities Quality Agency
CADRES .....	Committee of Associate Deans (Research)
CALT.....	Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching
CeLTS .....	Centre for Learning and Teaching Support
CEQ .....	Course Experience Questionnaire
CHEQ .....	Centre for Higher Education Quality
CLEAR.....	Communicating in the Language of English for Academics and Researchers
DEST .....	Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training
DVCs .....	Deputy Vice-Chancellors
DVC (International).....	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International)
DVC (Research) .....	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)
ECRs.....	Early Career Researchers
EFTSL .....	equivalent full-time student load
ENTER .....	Equivalent National Tertiary Entrance Rank
ESOS Act .....	<i>Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000</i>
GCHE .....	Graduate Certificate in Higher Education
GDS .....	Graduate Destination Survey
Go8 .....	Group of Eight
HDR.....	Higher Degree by Research
HEQC .....	Higher Education Quality Committee (South Africa)
HERD .....	Higher Education and Regulatory Division
IAF.....	Institutional Assessment Framework
IT .....	Information Technology
ITS .....	Information Technology Services Division
KPIs .....	Key Performance Indicators
MCEETYA.....	Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs
MC.....	Monash College
MEQ .....	Monash Experience Questionnaire
MonQueST .....	Monash Questionnaire Series on Teaching
MPhil .....	Master of Philosophy
MRGS.....	Monash Research Graduate School
MSA .....	Monash South Africa

MSEQ.....	Monash Support Experience Questionnaire
MUM.....	Monash University Malaysia
MUSO .....	Monash University Studies Online
NCG .....	National Competitive Grant
National Governance Protocols	National Governance Protocols for Higher Education Providers available at: <a href="http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/programmes_funding/forms_guidelines/national_governance_protocols.htm">http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/programmes_funding/forms_guidelines/national_governance_protocols.htm</a>
National Protocols/Protocols .....	<i>National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes</i>
OHSE .....	Occupational Health Safety and Environment
PF p .....	Portfolio page reference
Portfolio.....	Quality Audit Portfolio (vol 1–3)
PREQ.....	Postgraduate Research Experience Survey
PVCs.....	Pro Vice-Chancellors
PVC (Quality) .....	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality)
PRSS.....	Postgraduate Research Supervision Survey
RGSC .....	Research Graduate School Committee
RO .....	Research Office
SDVC .....	Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor
SLA .....	Service Level Agreement
SMC .....	Senior Management Committee
TARDIS .....	Total Access Research Data Information System
THES.....	The Times Higher Education Supplement
TQAIC.....	Transnational Quality Assurance and Improvement Committee
VC .....	Vice-Chancellor
VCE.....	Victorian Certificate of Education
VCG .....	Vice-Chancellor’s Group
VCGI.....	Vice-Chancellor’s Group (International)
VTAC.....	Victorian Tertiary Admission Centre

