### COURSE REVIEW RUBRIC

### Before Starting on the Rubric!

### Have you organised assessment and grading benchmarking? This is required to feed into the review process and forms an important part of benchmarking so we are very clear on the standard and quality of one or more final year units in the course.

### If you have third party arrangements for delivery of units or articulation arrangements, you will need to undertake a panel-based review

### As you are working through, if you identify any areas for improvement, put these into the recommendation table at the back of the rubric

### If you are running a course review, you do not need to run a Course Advisory Board in the same year.

### The thematic review section does not require review by the external reviewer, it is completed for internal thematic review purposes only and will be compiled by Education Quality

### If you have information from accreditation submissions, this can often look at very similar evidence that is being sought from the course review. If information is similar, for example, you have undertaken external benchmarking as part of accreditation, this can be substituted for information requested here on a case-by-case basis. Reach out to [quality@une.edu.au](mailto:quality@une.edu.au)

### Information in square parentheses ‘[‘ and ‘]’ is guidance information for the person completing the rubric and also to provide information to the external reviewer. You can delete this once you have made your response – a copy of the template will be provided to the external reviewer to ensure they understand what was intended for each section.

### Questions as you complete the rubric? Reach out to [quality@une.edu.au](mailto:quality@une.edu.au) so we can assist or point you in the right direction.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course Name |  | | | | |
| Handbook entry URL |  | | | | |
| Any double degrees the course is in (also part of this review) |  | | | | |
| Professional Accreditation | Yes.Accreditation Period:Accreditation Body/ies:Reaccreditation due (date): | Currently being sought with: | | | No |
| Date of last course review and TRIM Reference Number |  | | | | |
| TRIM Reference Number for where this review has been saved |  | | | | |
| Course Duration (years) | FT: | | PT: | | |
| CRICOS registration | Yes. CRICOS Code: | | | No | |
| Course Coordinator |  | | | | |
| Accompanying appendices | 1. Learning Outcome Mapping | | | | |
| 2. Course Advisory Board Agendas and Minutes | | | | |
| 3. QILT Open Ended Feedback | | | | |
| 4. Assessment and Grading Benchmarking (refer to separate form) | | | | |
|  | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| *Add additional rows as necessary* | | | | |

### 

**Rubric Sign off and Completion**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Person** | **Date completed** |
| **Completion of Rubric (Course Coordinator)** |  |  |
| **External Reviewer** |  |  |
| **HOS Response to recommendations and commendations (see final page)** |  |  |
| **DVC Approval** |  |  |

### Core Elements

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Element | Rubric | Measure | Course Coordinator Comments | External Academic Comments |
| Course Philosophy and Approach | N/A | N/A | [This is the reason the course exists. Outline the academic rationale for offering the course. This will be available from the documentation that proposed the course, or from the last review that was undertaken. The philosophy will often include information such as who is being educated, to do what, and potentially what design frameworks or national or international frameworks are being used to underpin the course. There may be a statement on the background of students and their diversity, and whether the course offers reskilling or upskilling, etc.This doesn’t have to be lengthy, but should explain why the course exists, and for who.This should also demonstrate how the course is aligned with Future Fit] |  |
| Alignment with other qualifications | N/A | N/A | [This describes any nested or exit pathway arrangements. Typically, where courses are aligned with each other they would be reviewed at the same time, so changes, such as changes to the curriculum, can be made across a suite of courses. This means that recommendations can be grouped for implementation and minimise administrative duplication through the review process.In addition, alignment with other courses may also explain other measures in this rubric, such as where a course has a very high attrition rate as it is an entry pathway for another course, or has very low EFTSL as it is an exit pathway.] |  |
| Staff engagement | Staff who are teaching units into the course have been consulted in the completion of this rubric. | Yes  No | [Provide an outline of the consultation that has taken place and any key items raised that have fed into this review. This would normally be dot points outlining the type of consultation (town hall meeting, email callout, discussion at teaching and learning committee, etc.) and the key points of feedback, noting dot points are fine. Some feedback may in itself result in a recommendation.Not undertaking sufficient consultation may result in the recommendations arising from a course review not being approved or implemented, or the review being escalated to a full panel review. For these reasons, it is vitally important that the consultation and feedback is sought, captured, and fed into this review document.] | Consultation Appropriate:  Yes  No Comments: |
| Describe any 3rd Party Arrangement, monitoring arrangements, and attendant issues | Any third-party arrangement where this is the primary course in which that arrangement is delivered immediately makes a course high risk and a panel-based course review will need to be undertaken | Third Party Arrangement: High Risk. DO NOT COMPLETE THIS RUBRIC FURTHER.  No Third-Party Arrangement: Low Risk |  | Risk:  High  Low Comments: |
| CDF Alignment | The CDF provides a universal set of design principles for courses at UNE, and is expected to be realised across all of the university’s courses. The CDF principles fall under the four banners of University-wide programs and student pathways, course design and structure, major design and structure, and unit design and structure. Information on the CDF is available [here](https://policies.une.edu.au/download.php?id=512&version=1&associated) | To what extent has the CDF been realised in this course?  Completed  Work in progress  Not started | [An explanation is required only if the course has not yet realised the CDF principles. If the course is not aligned provide a roadmap for when the course will be aligned, and note this as a recommendation arising from the review] | Comments: |
| Outcome mapping | All courses are required to be mapped to ensure that the course learning outcomes are achieved, at the appropriate AQF Level, from the unit learning outcomes to course learning outcomes and graduate attributes. | Attached  In progress and recommendation added | [Commentary is only required in instances where the mapping warrants further explanation. Note that for the pilot, there is a CAUC Phase 3 project that will deliver mapping through CourseLoop. If the mapping is not already completed one of the recommendations arising from this review may be to map the learning outcomes with support from that project] | Mapping is appropriate  Mapping is appropriate, but  Mapping does not demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes Comments: |
| External accreditation | If the course is intended to have external accreditation, it is up to date and no conditions are attached. External accreditation can often stand in for a number of functions of a course review. | No accreditation intended (Low Risk)  Yes, fully accredited (Low Risk)  Accredited with conditions (High Risk)  Issues in attaining accreditation (High Risk) Accreditation Body/ies:Reaccreditation due (date): | [If there are any conditions on accreditation, or if there have been issues in attaining accreditation, describe them here. You should also outline what is being done to address these matters.] | Risk:  High  Low Comments: |
| Course Advisory Boards and Previous Review | Course Advisory Boards have been held annually since last review and appropriate actions undertaken from the Boards. This evidences ongoing continuous improvement of the course.There is a closeout report of implementation of recommendations from the last review (not necessary that all recommendations have been implemented) | Minutes attached  Yes  No  All recommendations implemented  Yes  No | [Outline any matters that arise from the Course Advisory Boards (CABs). These could include that the Boards are functioning very effectively, or an outline of why Boards haven’t met, or why some of the recommendations haven’t been implemented as recommended by the Course Advisory Board, etc.One of the functions of the review process is to identify areas for improvement, so if CABs haven’t been working well or meeting, being upfront here and putting a recommendation in around future steps is an absolutely reasonable outcome.] | Appropriately addressed:  Yes  No  Comments: |
| Student Open ended QILT Feedback | Top three trends for strengths and weaknesses of open-ended student feedback from previous 3 years of SES and GOS are appropriately addressed through the recommendations | Feedback from last 3 years provided by EQD and attached  Yes  No | [Identify the top 3 strengths and 3 areas for improvement in the course, and identify any recommendations that arise from them] | Appropriately addressed:  Yes  No  Comments: |
| Attrition information for the course[[1]](#footnote-1) | *Attrition: The percentage of students in a given year who neither complete, nor return to, any course in the following year.*UNE Rate: 33.15%% (2019) High Risk: >40%  Medium Risk: >25% Low Risk: 25% or below*Student Commitment: The percentage of students who have committed to a unit and attained results, whether pass or fail (not counting incomplete fails).*UNE Rate: 65.14% (2020) High Risk: >10% below UNE rate  Medium Risk: -10% to up to +5% of UNE rate Low Risk: >5% above UNE rate*Student Progress/Success: The percentage of student load (EFTSL) of passed units compared to all units of study attempted (passed + failed + withdrawn).*UNE Rate: 77.39% (2020) High Risk: 10% or more below UNE rate  Medium Risk: -10% to up to +5% of UNE rate Low Risk: 5% or more above UNE rate | Course Attrition Rate (online, commencing):  Course Attrition Rate (on campus, commencing):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk  Course Student Commitment Rate (online):  Course Student Commitment Rate (on campus):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk  Course Student Progress Rate (online):  Course Student Progress Rate (on campus):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk | [The UNE Retention and Engagement Strategy indicates that retention is everyone’s responsibility. Outline steps that are being taken to address attrition in this course, and what steps will be taken in future. You may wish to consider this in line with the open-ended feedback, and also the ‘considered leaving’ measure that is in the following row. In addition, there are a range of dashboards, which support can be provided to access ([quality@une.edu.au](mailto:quality@une.edu.au)), to look at different cohorts and determine which cohorts are at higher risk and so may benefit most from interventions if these are being differentiated by different cohorts. The leading cohorts for attrition are external attendance, part-time, 25+ age group, and socioeconomic status.Changes may require investigation, but could include interventions such as increasing peer engagement, redesigning curriculum, providing formative assessment, updating admission requirements, targeting different cohorts of students, etc.] | Do the actions appropriately reduce the level of risk if the course has one or more flags as high risk, or two or more flags as medium risk?  Yes  No  N/A  Comments: |
| Considered Leaving Measure (Student Experience Survey) | UNE: 18%    High Risk: > 20%  Medium Risk:  18% – 20% Low Risk: <18% | Course Rate:   High Risk   Medium Risk   Low Risk | [Information on why students have considered withdrawing from the course is available from the ‘AQ Course Level Surveys’ dashboard. Once there, you can navigate to ‘SESu Chart’, select the course, and right click on the ‘Considered Leaving’ measure to ‘drill through’ for the reasons students have considered leaving. The ‘Considered Leaving’ measure is the bar at the bottom left of the dashboard. If the considered leaving measure is high, and the attrition measure is also high, this suggests that a recommendation should be realised to improve the rates for the course. Describe any actions that are being undertaken to improve this this measure, based on the reasons students appear to be considering leaving, and insert a potential recommendation] | Do the actions appropriately reduce the level of risk if the course is high or medium risk?   Yes   No   N/A    Comments: |
| Student Engagement and Outcome Measures | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Measure | UNE | | Overall Satisfaction | 4.2 | | Quality of Teaching | 4.0 | | Learning Resources | 4.0 | | Student Support | 3.9 | | Skills Development | 3.7 | | Learner Engagement | 2.7 |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Measure | L | M | H | | Overall Satisfaction | >4.2 | 4.0-4.2 | <4.0 | | Quality of Teaching | >4.0 | 3.3-4.0 | <3.3 | | Learning Resources | >4.0 | 3.3-4.0 | <3.3 | | Student Support | >3.9 | 3.2-3.9 | <3.2 | | Skills Development | >3.7 | 3.1-3.7 | <3.1 | | Learner Engagement | >2.7 | 2.0-2.7 | <2.0 | | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Measure | Course | Risk | | Overall Satisfaction |  |  | | Quality of Teaching |  |  | | Learning Resources |  |  | | Student Support |  |  | | Skills Development |  |  | | Learner Engagement |  |  | | [If two or more of these measures are flagged as high risk, describe any actions that are being undertaken to improve student satisfaction in the course. Further information on the scales that make up each of these measures can be accessed from the ‘AQ Course Level Surveys’ dashboard. Typically, these measures would be considered alongside the open ended QILT feedback from students to give greater context. Actions that might be implemented in a course might include a redesign of curriculum in key units in the curriculum, development of either formal or informal student networks, a rebuild of Moodle content, etc. Remember, the measures themselves might identify that something is happening but not necessarily what. They tell a piece of the puzzle that is fleshed out through a number of different metrics and open ended feedback.] | Do the actions appropriately reduce the level of risk if two or more measures are flagged as high risk?  Yes  No  N/A  Comments: |
| Percentage of graduates in full time employment (Graduate Outcome Survey) | UNE 58%    High Risk: < 55%  Medium Risk:  55% – 58% Low Risk: >58% | Course:  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk | [This measure looks directly at the employment outcomes for the course once students have completed the course. If the course falls into the high or medium risk category, consider what actions might be taken to improve outcomes for graduates. This may include ensuring appropriate industry representation on course advisory boards, engagement with employers as partners, embedding work integrated learning, embedding of career skills in the curriculum, embedding research development for further study, and a range of other measures] | Do the actions appropriately reduce the level of risk if the course is high or medium risk?  Yes  No  N/A  Comments: |
| Student Load | *Total EFTSL*High Risk: <10 EFTSLMedium Risk: 10-20 EFTSLLow Risk: >20 EFTSL*Trends in Commencing EFTSL*High Risk: Commencing EFTSL decline by average 5% or greater in most recent two full yearsMedium Risk: Commencing EFTSL decline of <5% in the most recent two full yearsLow Risk: Commencing EFTSL steady, or increase across most recent two full years | *Total EFTSL:*  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk  *Commencing EFTSL*  Commencing EFTSL (most recent full year):  Commencing EFTSL (one year earlier):  Commencing EFTSL (two years earlier)  Change in commencing EFTSL (%):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk | [If the course is high or medium risk, describe any actions that are being undertaken to grow the course. This includes describing the student market for the course, including cohorts and strategies to attract those cohorts, and how this will develop over the next 5 years. This needs to be aligned with the course philosophy. You may wish to reach out to Marketing for a discussion on sector trends] | Do the actions appropriately reduce the level of risk if the course is high or medium risk?  Yes  No  Comments: |
| Student Load in units | None of the units that are included in the learning outcome mapping for the course have less than 10 enrolments in any given trimester offering | All units have 10 enrolments or more (cotaught units can be combined)  Some units have less than 10 enrolments | [If there are units with less than 10 enrolments that are included in the mapping, outline how low enrolment will be addressed. The course, or aspects of the course, may need to be combined, merged, or redesigned to ensure that students have the opportunity for appropriately generative interactions with peers through their studies. Describe any plans in place to achieve this, and add a recommendation.To determine the number of enrolments in a unit, the ‘BI Unit Monitoring’ dashboard can be used and the ‘Overview’ section selected, and individual courses that are in the mapping document searched for] | Actions appear appropriate to address any low enrolment units:  Yes  No  N/AComments: |
| Benchmarking with comparable courses at other institutions[[2]](#footnote-2) | High Risk: 10% or more below FoE rate in at least one measure (benchmark group)Medium Risk: 5-10% below FoE rate in at least one measure (benchmark group)Low Risk: All measures 5% or less below FoE rate (benchmark group) | Broad FoE New Normal attrition rate (benchmark group):  Course Crude Attrition Rate online (UNE BI Dashboards):  Course Crude Attrition Rate on-campus (UNE BI Dashboards):  Broad FoE New Normal retention rate (benchmark group):  Course retention rate online (UNE BI Dashboards):  Course retention rate on-campus (UNE BI dashboards):  Broad FoE success rate (benchmark group):  Course success rate online (UNE BI Dashboards):  Course success rate on-campus (UNE BI Dashboards):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk |  |  |
| Comparable 6-year completion rates [[3]](#footnote-3) | High Risk: 10% or more below comparable rate (benchmark group)Medium Risk: 5-10% below comparable rate (benchmark group)Low Risk: 5% or less below comparable rate (benchmark group) | Benchmarking group completion rate (FoE/Study Area) (20XX commencing year):  UNE completion rate (FoE/Study Area) (20XX commencing year):  High Risk  Medium Risk  Low Risk |  |  |
| Assessment and Grading benchmarking | Assessment deemed comparable and at appropriate level by external reviewer. | Yes  No | [Based on the assessment and grading benchmarking, competed by a suitably qualified academic at another institution, outline any recommendations on revisions to be made to the course, or units in the course:] | Are the actions appropriate from the assessment and grading benchmarking?  Yes  No  Comments: |
| Are there trends in the discipline, risks to the course, or methods that are being used to enhance staff scholarship, that are not drawn out elsewhere in the review? | N/A | Yes  No | [The Higher Education Standards Framework requires that a course review includes consideration of emerging developments in the field and identified risks to the quality of the course. The rubric has been designed to draw out this information, however, this question provides a space to identify anything that has not been able to be identified in one of the other questions. This could be around academic integrity, for example, or a teaching symposium that all staff will participate in. A ‘no’ response here is perfectly valid.] | Are these trends or risks appropriately identified and captured in the recommendations?  Yes  No  Comments: |

### Benchmarking of Qualifications at Other Institutions

### Choose at least two courses offered at other Australian universities that are comparable to each course being reviewed. Variations between students’ background knowledge and skills across benchmarking partners can be an important factor in evaluating course design, and determining adaptations to course design that accommodate differing entry levels while maximising student success.

### Universities that are consistently used as benchmark partners are Southern Cross University, University of Southern Queensland, Central Queensland University, Flinders University, University of the Sunshine Coast, James Cook University, and Charles Sturt University.

### In some instances, UNE may be offering a course that is unique nationally, or does not have appropriate information readily available from other Australian universities to benchmark against. If this is the case, disciplinary or accreditation bodies can also act as sources of information for benchmarking purposes in providing thresholds, standards, or requirements that need to be met or exceeded. Alternatively, it may be more relevant to benchmark against international partners to determine.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institution | UNE |  |  |
| Course |  |  |  |
| English language admission requirements (IELTS, TOEFL, etc.) |  |  |  |
| Admission requirements |  |  |  |
| Course Learning Outcomes |  |  |  |
| Graduate Attributes |  |  |  |

Are there any comments from the benchmarking above?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Thematic Review

### Thematic elements for a review may change annually depending on the strategic priorities of the university. Any current thematic elements for reviews will be listed here.

### *2021 Thematic Review: Hybrid and Flexible Learning*

### UNE is currently compiling information related to Hybrid and Flexible learning (Hyflex), to identify areas of strength in this space that have a marked impact on the student experience, improve retention, and increase the engagement of students with both the material they are learning, but also with their peers that they are studying with. Given hybrid learning between on campus and online, and arrangements for flexible learning are at the heart of that we do at UNE, and is encapsulated in our strategic plan to create personalised learning journeys that are distinctive int heir accessibility and flexibility, it is timely for us to take stock of our strengths and draw out exemplars of practice that are at the forefront of hybrid and flexible learning.

### In the latest Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching survey (QILT), responses from students on learner engagement were low for UNE in comparison to the sector. The measures for this particular course have already been provided, under the “Student Engagement and Outcome Measures” section of the rubric. The questions that make up the learner engagement metric are designed to identify how students feel in accordance with the following measures:

### Felt prepared for your study

### Had a sense of belonging to your university

### Participated in discussions online or face-to-face

### Worked with other students as part of your study

### Interacted with students outside study requirements

### Interacted with students who are very different from you

### Been given opportunities to interact with local students

The questions around learner engagement might be felt to be targeted towards an ‘on campus’ experience and so not as relevant for online/distance students. However, the engagement of our students, and the creation of a sticky campus, has been prioritised as so important that it is one of the three key themes of the Retention and Engagement Plan, under the theme of ‘sense of belonging’. This sense of belonging needs to be developed for both online and on-campus students to encourage their perception of being a UNE student and having a network of peers and support that they are able to draw upon.

The hybrid and flexible learning thematic review is being used to profile best practice, as well as issues encountered by staff in implementing learner-centred choice and engagement in course design as a retention measure. The thematic will examine the way in which Hyflex curriculum design and assessment embed principles such as:

* **Learner Choice**: to what extent do the units that make up courses provide alternative participation modes that are meaningful and allow all students to choose the mode of engagement that works best for them.
* **Equivalence**: to what extent do on-campus and off campus modes of delivery, while not equal, provide equivalent learning outcomes.
* **Reusability**: to what extent are artefacts from learning activities in each mode captured and can be reused in other modes. For example, representations of in-class activities (recordings, discussion notes, etc) are available online for all students; activities produced by online students (asynchronous discussions, posted files, etc) connect to and support all students.
* **Accessibility**: how do we ensure that students are equipped with the technological resources and skills to equally access all participation modes.

With this in mind, please provide an example from part of the course that demonstrates innovation in the delivery of units and highlights exceptional practice that is being undertaken in the blended learning and/or learner engagement space. This will not be subject to review, but will be used to build a catalogue of practice that may be drawn on and shared by the academic development team or other areas across campus. For example, an activity might include structuring of units designed for collaborative learning, embedding live interactions into units, walking students through utilisation of LMS features, or enhancing the digital literacy of teaching staff to better enable innovations in units.

The response, as a case study, should be not more than 3-4 paragraphs in total across the 3 questions.

### What was achieved?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**For which group of students?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Was it possible to make on and off campus modes of delivery equivalent? If so, how?**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Recommendations and Commendations

### Recommendations should be 1-2 sentences each, and must be able to be achieved in a 12-month period. They should be specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound. When drafting recommendations, consider what is achievable by the course coordinator, and the school, within that time. Recommendations that suggest, for example, that the university change its strategic plan, are unlikely to be achievable. Recommendations that focus on updates to or mapping of curriculum, or intervention strategies for particular cohorts, or improvements to admission requirements, are more likely to be achieved in a particular time period.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Self Review Recommendation from Course Coordinator** | **Timeframe (up to 12 months)** | **Endorsed by reviewer as is** | **If no, explanation from reviewer** | **Revised Recommendation from reviewer, if applicable** |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |
|  |  |  | Yes  No |  |  |

## Further Recommendations from reviewer (add/delete rows as necessary)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Course** | **Recommendation** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Commendations from reviewer (add/delete rows as necessary)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Course** | **Commendation** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## General Comments from reviewer and reflections on the overall status of the course (e.g. performing well, areas for improvement, and whether the course is high risk based on individual rubric elements and so should undertake a panel based review).

|  |
| --- |
| If you wish to make any overall comments on the course/s arising from the review, make them here. This is normally not more than a couple of paragraphs. |

**School Response to Recommendations and Commendations**

The school response should list all of the recommendations and commendations, as well as whether the school accepts the recommendations and commendations and what actions will be undertaken. A recommendation might not be accepted, if, for example, it is not reasonably achievable, may take longer than 12 months to realise, or is outside the scope of a course review. This response will be reviewed and approved by the DVC before the report proceeds through academic governance committees.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Final Review Recommendation** | **School Response/Action** | **Person Responsible** | **Due Date** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Are there any general comments on the commendations and recommendations?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Head of School Sign off: Date:

------------------------------- DD/MM/YYYY

1. Attrition data should compiled from BI dashboards with the following filters: Course is Government Reportable, Course is not XINSTU, Commencing Students, Crude Attrition measure. Student Commitment is listed in the BI Course Monitoring Dashboard as ‘Student Engagement’ and is for all students in the course, not just commencing students, and Student Progress/Success measures are listed in the BI Course Monitoring dashboard as ‘Student Success’, and are for all students in the course, not just commencing students. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <https://www.dese.gov.au/higher-education-statistics/student-data/selected-higher-education-statistics-2019-student-data>, Attrition, Retention and Success Rates, Table A providers, Citizenship ‘Total’, Benchmark Group: Central Queensland University, Charles Sturt University, Flinders University, James Cook University, Southern Cross University, University of Southern Queensland, University of the Sunshine Coast. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.dese.gov.au/higher-education-statistics/student-data/selected-higher-education-statistics-2019-student-data>, navigate to Cohort Analysis - Completion rates, navigate to Cohort Analysis, all commencing students, under category select one of Broad Field of Education/Study Areas 21/Study Areas 45, Cohort Length: 6-year, Table A providers, Benchmark Group: Central Queensland University, Charles Sturt University, Flinders University, James Cook University, Southern Cross University, University of Southern Queensland, University of the Sunshine Coast.

   Note the Department’s data doesn’t break it down by course, so the FoE or Study Area rate for UNE will need to be used [↑](#footnote-ref-3)