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The Bradley Agenda

• 40/20 targets
• Demand-driven system
• Quality and regulation body
• Research and Teaching linked
• “Indexation”
• A tertiary education sector
• One-off 10% increase in funding
• Review cluster rates
Government Response

- 20/40 targets with funding
- Partial indexation from 2012
- TEQSA
- Structural Adjustment Fund
- Sustainable Research Excellence (SRE)
- Joint Res. Engagement (JRE)
- Collaborative Res. Networks
- Excellence in Res. Aust. (ERA)
- Compacts?

Why are performance indicators needed?

1. Quality System
   - Demand driven system
   - Institution sets entry standards and exit standards
   - TEQSA must have real measures of quality
   - L&T performance indicators part of this story
Why are performance indicators needed?

2. Institutional Development
   • If you can’t measure and compare, improvement is difficult
   • You don’t know when you achieve it

3. Status of L&T
   • The LTPF, with all its flaws, has enhanced the position of L&T in our institutions

In summary:

Properly designed and used, performance indicators can help deliver:

- Quality in the system
- L&T development within institutions
- Raise status of L&T
What is needed in indicators?
(partly addressed in Discussion Paper)

• Need to be statistically stable
  (CEQ, GDS annual data at institutional level, are not)

• Should not be excessively lagged
  ▪ Do student responses integrate experiences?
  ▪ Averaging helps statistical variability

• Need to compare “apples with apples”
  ▪ Quality of intake
  ▪ Aspirations of students
  ▪ Discipline mix
  ▪ External/regional factors

Absolute verses incremental change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolute measure</th>
<th>Incremental Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Why not fund excellence?</td>
<td>• Remove issue of “apples with apples”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can we measure the excellence?</td>
<td>• Yes, but increase statistical variability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transparent</td>
<td>• What about the outstanding performers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Yes, but is it meaningful?</td>
<td>• Can they continue to improve?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creates league tables</td>
<td>• We don’t fund research this way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Good or bad?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issues of corrections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How do we do this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## A comparison with research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Performance funded</th>
<th>L&amp;T Volume funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Drives differentiation of standards</td>
<td>• Drives uniformity of standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Once you have the funding, very difficult to lose position and visa versa</td>
<td>• Difficult to differentiate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regarded as good</td>
<td>• Regarded as good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality and funding levels are strongly linked
Need the correct balance between volume and performance funding
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