

**DIRECTORATE FOR EDUCATION
INSTITUTIONAL MANAGEMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNING BOARD**

Group of National Experts on the AHELO Feasibility Study

INSTITUTION REPORTS

9th meeting of the AHELO GNE

Paris, 19-20 March 2012

This document was prepared by the ACER Consortium.

The AHELO GNE is invited to COMMENT on the proposed institution reports.

Contact:
Consortium: ahelo@acer.edu.au
OECD Directorate for Education: Diane.Lalancette@oecd.org

JT03317558

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

OECD AHELO Feasibility Study
INSTITUTION NAME
2012 Institution Report

INTRODUCTION TO THIS REPORT

AHELO overview

This section will provide a brief overview of AHELO – focus, scope, context, rationales and relevance, aims and objectives, assessment methods, timelines, etc. It will detail where institutions can find more information about AHELO and support resources.

Report characteristics

Description of the general nature, purpose and structure of the AHELO Institution Report. The AHELO Institution Report will be graphically designed. Specifications will be given for the supplied HEI data file.

Results snapshot

A few short institution-specific sentences or a graph or two highlighting key results for the HEI. In lieu of an executive summary, and designed to pique interest in the report.

ASSESSMENT CONTEXTS

Relevant contexts

This section will advise and define relevant general and specific contexts of relevance to the AHELO Institution Report. It will introduce the concepts that underpin cross-institutional benchmarking with reference to strata such as institution size and student numbers, institution type, curriculum structure, selectivity, faculty characteristics, etc. It will report characteristics of the testing period, and the institution's testing sessions. General, strand- and institution-specific caveats will be listed.

Participants

This section provides definitions and summary information about populations and samples, both for the HEI and the strand internationally. Data is provided for the full international group and for the institution. As relevant, information is presented for institutions, faculty and students.

Table 1: HEI population

	Count
International	
Within system	

Table 2: Student population, sample and yield

	International		Institution	
	Count	%	Count	%
Population				
Sample				
Responses				

Table 3: Faculty population, sample and yield

	International		Institution	
	Count	%	Count	%
Population				
Sample				
Responses				

Reading the results

This section will provide instructions, in the form of marked-up diagrams, for reading the statistics presented in the Institution Report.

EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS**International and national contexts**

This section will give a brief description of relevant international and system (national or regional) contexts, drawing from available system level information and data provided by the Institution Context Instrument (ICI).

Teaching and learning contexts

To provide institutions with a picture of the context in which the assessment has been conducted, summary results are provided for selected variables measured by the Institution Context Instrument (ICI), Faculty Context Instrument (FCI) and Student Context Instrument (SCI). Contextualised by national and international benchmark figures, data will be summarised in a range of textual, graphical and tabular formats, and may cover:

- academic challenge (from SCI);
- industry experience (from SCI);
- graduate expectations (from SCI);
- interactions with faculty (from SCI);
- active learning (from SCI);
- retention and outcomes (from ICI);
- student satisfaction (from SCI);
- students' gender, age, language/ethnicity, enrolment (from SCI);
- teaching characteristics (from FCI);
- curriculum characteristics (from FCI);
- education structures (from ICI); and
- faculty characteristics (from ICI).

Graphical presentations will be used where at all possible, making particular use of innovative graphics such as the 'flowers' in the OECD Better Life Index (which resonates well with the approach proposed for U-Multirank).

LEARNING OUTCOMES

This section provides statistics on student performance for the institution and benchmark groups. A single large (dummy) table is shown here to make clear the single and bivariate results to be reported.

One scale per strand will be reported (titled 'Generic Skills', 'Economics' or 'Engineering'). If possible given data characteristics (NB: to be determined during scaling) additional scores will be provided per strand (i.e. at the 'subscale', 'substrand' or 'learning outcome' level). No single-item indicators will be reported (i.e. scores based on just a single data element).

These reports will draw on count and percentage data (particularly percentiles (likely deciles, %s), and on means (\bar{X}) and standard deviations (SD) and standard errors for the mean ($SE(\bar{X})$). As possible given criterion referencing work that is possible to complete within 2012, results will be reported as percentage of students attaining well defined levels of performance.

Each HEI will receive only results for the strand in which it participated. If a HEI participants in multiple strands they will receive multiple reports.

A diverse range of tabular, graphical and textual summaries will be provided. Institutions will be given a report that is well designed, detailed and easy to interpret. It will not contain obscure statistics.

The following outcome scores will be reported:

- Within HEI:
 - HEI total score;
 - Sub-groups within the HEI;
- Between HEI:
 - Within system total;
 - International total; and
 - Sub-groups within HEIs.

Table 4: Within HEI results (HEI total and by student characteristics)

		Score			
		X	SE(X)	SD	%s
HEI total					
Academic challenge	Lower				
	Higher				
Industry experience	Lower				
	Higher				
Graduate expectations	Research				
	Work				
Interactions with faculty	Lower				
	Higher				
Active learning	Lower				
	Higher				
Student satisfaction	Lower				
	Higher				
Gender	Male				
	Female				
Age	Lower group				
	Middle group				
	Higher group				
Main home language	Instructional				
	Other				
Enrolment type	Full time				
	Part time				
Field of Education	General				
	Education				
	Humanities				
	Social science, business, law				
	Science				
	Engineering				
	Agriculture				
	Health/welfare				
Services					

Table 5: Between HEI results (international total and by HEI characteristics)

		Score				HEI count
		X	SE(X)	SD	%s	
Within system total						
International total						
Institution Size	Large					
	Medium					
	Small					
Institution Funding	Public funding >75%					
	Public funding 50-74%					
	Public funding 25-49%					
	Public funding <25%					
Highest Qualification	Bachelor (ISCED 5A first degree)					
	Masters (ISCED 5A second degree)					
	Doctorate (ISCED 6)					
Bachelor Curriculum	Specialised					
	General/broad					
	Blend					
Institutional Emphasis	Research					
	Teaching					
	Even balance of research and teaching					
Institution Location	Major city					
	Regional city					
	Small town/rural area					
Student Pathways	More than 25% of students enter via a non-traditional pathway					
	More than 75% of students enter via a traditional pathway					
Department Size	Large					
	Medium					
	Small					
Years to Completion	Fewer than three					
	Three					
	Four					
	Five					
	More than five					

USING THE REPORT

This section will provide a summary of what the AHELO Institution Report seeks to achieve, and opportunities for using the data and for engaging with the study. The advice will be normative and contextualised by strand.

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

A list of institutions participating in the strand, with flags for those in the country.