



TUNING AUSTRALIA PILOT PROJECT 2010 - 2011

**Report from the Tuning Educational Structures
Experts' Group**

Groningen, March 2011

Tuning Australia Pilot Project - Contract Nr EAC-2010-1006-000-001

This project has been supported by the Directorate-General for Education and Culture of the European Commission.

This publication reflects the views of the authors only, and the European Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained within.

Contents

Section 1: Introduction	3
1.1 Background and Context	
1.2 Project Proposals and Objectives	
1.3 Process and Deliveries	
Section 2: Summary of observations by the European Tuning Experts' Group	8
Section 3: Conclusions and Recommendations	11
Appendix 1: Tuning Experts' Individual Reports	15
Appendix 2: Programme of Site Visit Tuning Experts' Group	40

Section 1: Introduction

1.1 Background and Context

The Tuning Australia Pilot Project has been designed to meet the undertaking of the European Union-Australia Partnership Framework to “*jointly develop a Tuning Australia pilot project to define the learning outcomes representative of higher education degrees in specific disciplines across different degree levels*”.¹ It is a follow-up initiative to the 2009 EU-Australia Policy Dialogue on university reforms and modernisation agendas, in which projects associated with the development of discipline-specific learning outcomes in Europe and Australia were formally brought together for the first time, with the intention of enhancing definitions and improving linkages between higher education systems in the EU and Australia. The projects involved are the European Tuning Educational Structures Project and the Australian Learning and Teaching Standards Project.

European Tuning Project

Tuning Educational Structures in Europe is a university-driven project which offers a universal approach to implementing the Bologna Process at the level of higher educational institutions and subject areas. The Tuning approach consists of a methodology to (re-) design, develop, implement and evaluate study programmes for each of the three Bologna cycles.

The Tuning methodology serves as a platform for developing reference points at subject area level. Among these subject areas are: chemistry, physics, mathematics, earth sciences, medicine, nursing, history, social work, music, performing arts, fine arts, architecture, education sciences including teacher training, European studies (as an example of interdisciplinary studies), business administration and engineering. This work is based on a wide consultation with stakeholder, including employers, graduates, students and academic staff.

The reference points are relevant for making programmes of studies comparable, compatible and transparent. These reference points are expressed in terms of learning outcomes and competences, distinguishing between generic, transversal, and subject-specific ones.

Tuning contributes to the development and enhancement of high-quality competitive study programmes by focussing on fitness *of* purpose (to meet expectations) and fitness *for* purpose (to meet aims).

¹Included as Action 5 of the list of immediate Actions to be undertaken in the framework of Objective 5 of the European Union-Australia Partnership Framework Framework: to strengthen cooperation between the EU and Australia in science, research, technology and innovation, education and culture and to facilitate the movement of people.

The Tuning approach is fully in line with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance (2005) issued by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education and has been instrumental in developing the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area (2005) and the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (2008).

Learning and Teaching Academic Standards (LTAS) Project

The Australian Government is developing a new Higher Education Quality and Regulatory Framework which includes the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA). TEQSA will be a national body for regulation and quality assurance of tertiary education against agreed standards.

The standards framework is in development and comprises several elements. The Australian Government has funded the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) to undertake a one year project to develop Learning and Teaching Academic Standards in a number of discipline areas and propose a longer term process for the development and maintenance of academic standards across all discipline areas. The project began in February 2010 and will conclude with its first phase in 2011.

Eight broad discipline areas were identified: architecture and building; arts, humanities and social sciences; business, management and economics; creative and performing arts; engineering and technology; health, medicine, and veterinary science; law; and science. A Discipline scholar was appointed to lead each discipline cluster to achieve the project outcomes. The key deliverable for each Discipline Scholar is the production of a document identifying minimum learning outcomes for the specified discipline at an agreed level. A number of disciplines have already completed their work on the demonstration project, with learning outcomes and supporting documentation developed. An overall project report documenting the work undertaken in 2010 has also been published. This report evaluates the process and outcomes and highlights opportunities and recommendations for sustainability of the process in the future.

1.2. Project Proposal and Objectives

The project set-up was designed at a preparatory meeting which took place in Sydney in April 2010. At that meeting which was attended by one of the two joint coordinators of the Tuning Europe Project, Robert Wagenaar, as well as the LTAS coordinator, Christine Ewan, and several discipline scholars of the LTAS Project, many similarities between the Tuning approach and the LTAS project were identified. Formal interaction between key players in the Tuning project and the Australian project was therefore seen to be beneficial to both projects, and a pilot project was proposed and funded by the Australian Government and the European Union. The Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) contributed \$60,000 from its 2009-10 International Education and Training allocation under a funding agreement with the ALTC given the responsibility to manage those funds to achieve the agreed objectives of this project. The European Commission contributed a total of 55.000 € for the implementation of its part of this joint project.

The objectives of this pilot project were to:

- Facilitate greater cooperation between key higher education stakeholders in Australia and the European Union
- Share experiences of the Australian Standards Project and the European Tuning project to enable more effective long-term outcomes for each project
- Enable closer ties between academic discipline communities in Australia and Europe
- Enable closer ties between higher education policy makers in Australia and Europe
- Investigate the alignment of academic standards and reference points in higher education for Australia and Europe
- Establish a foundation for the development of a shared understanding and language for Australian and European higher education stakeholders in their approaches to curriculum development, standards, qualifications frameworks and quality assurance.

1.3 Process and Deliverables

To implement the pilot project two coordinators were appointed, the joint coordinator of the Tuning Projects, Robert Wagenaar and the LTAS project coordinator, Christine Ewan. In their turn, they jointly selected seven discipline-specific scholars, three from Australia and four from Europe. Pilot project coordinators and disciplinary scholars collaboratively developed the programmes of meetings. In this respect the group of Australian experts and the group of European experts followed different strategies. In the case of the Australian discipline scholars individual programmes of meetings were set-up with informed colleagues in their respective fields. These colleagues were leaders of Tuning Subject Area groups, but in some cases also relevant personal contacts of the scholars involved. The Australian disciplinary scholars involved were:

- Associate Professor Mark Freeman (Discipline Scholar for Business, Management, and Economics)
- Professor Jonathan Holmes (Discipline Scholar for Creative and Performing Arts), and
- Professor Amanda Henderson (Discipline Scholar for Health, Medicine, and Veterinary Science)

Three other Discipline Scholars also took advantage of planned overseas visits to discuss issues related to the Tuning collaboration with overseas counterparts. These visits were funded by the ALTC. These scholars were:

- Professor Ian Cameron (Discipline Scholar for Engineering and ICT)
- Associate Professor Maree O'keefe (Discipline Scholar for Health, Medicine, and Veterinary Science), and
- Professor Susan Jones (Discipline Scholar for Science).

All scholars mentioned above prepared their visit by studying relevant documentation. In most cases the document *Tuning Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programmes* were made available as a basis for discussion and reflection. Each travelling discipline scholar provided an individual report on their engagement and the outcomes of their visit.

The actual meetings took place during the period December 2010 – February 2011. These meetings included a visit to France and Belgium of the Australian project coordinator, Christine Ewan, who attended the fifth European Quality Assurance Forum of the European University Association. She also met Tuning experts in the field of Gender Studies and had discussions with officials of the Directorate General for Education and Culture.

The group of European Tuning experts, coordinated by the European coordinator, Robert Wagenaar, made the visit to Australia jointly. This approach was taken, because it was the first visit to Australia of all experts and –more importantly - it would allow for joint reflection during and after the trip. The scholars were:

- Julia Gonzalez (University of Deusto-Bilbao): Tuning expert for Social Sciences and joint Tuning coordinator;
- Ann Katherine Isaacs (University of Pisa): Tuning Expert for History and coordinator of the European thematic network projects for History, CliehNet and CliehWorld and the EU Sixth Framework research Network of Excellence CliehRES;
- Constantin Spiridonidis (University of Thessaloniki): Tuning Expert for Architecture and coordinator of the European thematic network for Architecture;
- Jeremy Cox: Tuning Expert for Music and Creative and Performing Arts and coordinator of the Tuning projects executed by the thematic network for Music Polifonia; presently Chief Executive, European Association of Conservatoires (AEC), Utrecht (NL)

The visit of the European experts' group was prepared at meetings attended by LTAS coordinator Christine Ewan, Bodo Richter (European Commission), and the joint coordinators of the Tuning Projects, Julia Gonzalez and Robert Wagenaar which took place in Brussels on the 25th of November 2010.

A set of materials on Australian higher education and recent developments therein was made available to the European experts' group some time before the actual visit. The material comprised the relevant documentation produced by the Australian government and the ALTC as well as that produced by the discipline groups, in response to the implementation of the ALTC's actions to produce threshold learning outcomes statements, to form an agreed basis for the activities of the proposed new Quality and Accreditation Agency, TEQSA.

The meetings of the European delegation with their Australian counterparts took place effectively from Monday 14 to Friday 18 February 2011. The programme was collaboratively prepared by the pilot project coordinator with the support of the Australian Learning & Teaching Council, several discipline scholars and the European Delegation to Australia and New Zealand, in particular Lynne Hunter, Adviser. The full programme is attached in annex.

Section 2: Summary of the observations of the European Tuning Experts' Group

The five days visit included meetings with the parties identified in the project description:

- The Australian Learning & Teaching Council (ALTC), including its CEO Carol Nicoll
- Discipline scholars involved in the LTAS project, including its coordinator Christine Ewan
- The Australian Universities Quality Agency
- Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER) (in relation to the OECD-AHELO-project)
- The Chair Universities Australia
- The Management and scholars of the University of Melbourne, Monash University, Queensland University of Technology (QUT) and University of Canberra
- The ANU Quality & Standard's Committee
- The Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)

The meetings took place in successively Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Canberra.

The meetings were preceded by a preparatory meeting / fine-tuning meeting on Sunday 13 February 2011 which was attended by all Tuning Experts.

Detailed information of the meetings held can be found in the attached reports of the four individual experts. This section concentrates on common impressions and observations of the European experts' group and is based on the individual reports as well as joint reflection during the visit.

During the different meetings the Tuning Experts' Group explained the purpose of the visit. Background information was given about the work established in Europe by the different Tuning Projects against the background of the Bologna Process including the endorsed Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance, the Qualifications Framework for the European Higher Education Area and the European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning. Furthermore, information was exchanged about the working procedures and strategies of the different Tuning Subject Area Groups and the impact of the Tuning project outcomes so far.

Vice versa, information was shared regarding the state of affairs in Australia with respect to the enhancement of the quality assurance system, the revision of the Australian Qualifications Framework, the work being done in the context of the LTAS project by its discipline scholars, the position and role of universities (including the group of eight), the Melbourne model versus other degree programme models.

The following impressions and observations are highlighted, making the distinction between context, similarities and differences.

Context: Both the European and the Australian higher education sectors have a proper concern for the quality of their educational offerings in a global environment. The Australian HE sector mostly focuses on, and draws upon, developments taking place in the United Kingdom and the United States. However, there is also serious awareness – perhaps as an effect of the LTAS project - about the Tuning projects and process. Globally, Australia is an important provider of higher education and has a strong interest in protecting its brand name against inferior providers.

Similarities: Both in Europe and Australia there is a push for reforming the Higher Education sector; in Australia as an outcome of the Bradley report, in Europe as the result of the Bologna Process and the Lisbon / Europe 2020 objectives. Learning outcomes are the guiding concept in this respect, with the focus being on how to formulate these in such a way that they are/become measurable. Both regions have developed Qualifications Frameworks which are based on learning outcomes. Although the importance of excellence in research is seen as critical to universities, both in Europe and Australia there is awareness about the importance of the quality of the educational processes and the students' academic experiences against the background of their future role in both society and a sustainable economy. Tuning and LTAS are built on the assumption that reference points / standards should be designed by discipline scholars on the basis of intense debate.

Differences: On the one hand Europe has focussed on reference points which enable the definition of aspirational (expected and intended) outcomes, defining the essence of a subject area. These are helpful in the design, enhancement and recognition of degree programmes while preserving diversity. The use of reference points allows for variety and for significant level of specificity or profiling of each programme and institution. On the other hand, Australia is engaged in defining minimum threshold levels in its LTAS project. Reference points - according to the Tuning approach - are an important tool in the individual profiling of a student in a particular discipline. This distinction in approach might be a more fundamental dichotomy of philosophy and requires further dialogue:

“In the reference points approach, the primary responsibility for learning is seen as situated with the student, with the institution responsible for guiding that learning in such a way that, at cardinal points such as the completion of a particular programme, it can be seen to have led to the development of a set of competences that are recognisable in relation to a particular graduate profile. In the threshold standards approach, there is an implicit – and sometimes explicit – assumption of a direct one-on-one correlation between what is taught (and how it is taught) and the standards achieved by the student. Clearly, poor provider standards will inhibit a student's learning, while high standards will encourage and nurture it. Nevertheless, a properly student-centred approach to higher education sees the responsibility for success as shared between the HE student and the HE institution where they study.”
(quotation from Jeremy Cox's individual report)

Furthermore, Tuning makes the distinction between competences to be obtained by the learner and learning outcomes - setting a verifiable level of competence – determined by the academic staff. Australia, in line with the British tradition, limits itself to the use of learning outcomes, leaving the word 'competence' to the vocational and educational training sector. Tuning is very well aware of this issue, but its experts maintain that the two terms and the related concepts are required for a better and broader understanding in both the higher education and vocational sectors. This point, too, requires further reflection by the two groups.

Another observation is the different perception of mobility and internationalisation. Both elements are seen in Europe, with its multiplicity of countries, as drivers for boosting quality because of competitive attractiveness but also for pooling expertise in partnerships. In Australia mobility is not perceived in this way. Australian higher education institutions are mainly focused on being attractive providers for degree seeking foreign students.

With regard to the level of specialisation, another difference was observed. In Australia, Higher Education institutions offer Bachelors of Arts and Bachelor of Science degrees. These are broad

programmes of great variation in which, in most cases there is less than 50% emphasis on the core 'discipline'. In Europe, most programmes are either subject-area based, which might be limited to a major, or are interdisciplinary programmes based on a consistent profile. As in the British system, Australian universities (with the exception of Melbourne) offer Honours-year programmes, which in practice are a Bachelor + one extra year of specialisation. Although Melbourne seems superficially closer to the European pattern than the other systems in Australia, it has its own features given the breadth of the Bachelor model developed at the University of Melbourne.

Section 3: Conclusions and Recommendations

The visits of individual Australian discipline scholars to Europe, as well as the visit of the European Experts' Group, has been experienced as extremely valuable for a better understanding and appreciation of each others' systems and initiatives to enhance the quality of higher education degree programmes.

The very many lively debates that took place in Europe and Australia from December 2010 to February 2011 between Australian and European experts show mutual interest in cooperation. The European and Australian higher education sectors have their differences in culture and approach, but there are also many similarities. The common willingness to reform on the basis of a well-defined agenda is an important binding factor. The same is true for the comparable approach regarding assuring the quality of degree programmes and basing the programmes on Learning Outcomes as part of (a) Qualifications Framework(s).

Conclusions

At a concluding meeting with DEEWR, the observations of the EU-Tuning delegation during their visit were discussed. These can serve as conclusions:

- The Australian Discipline Scholars acknowledge the value of the Tuning work. The Tuning project is perceived as an important contribution to the international debate about learning, teaching and assessment;
- The Tuning Experts' Group is impressed by the good start in establishing threshold standards for Australian higher education. However, in their view, it is also important to look at excellence and how to ensure its continuity. Australia and Europe share the desire to be highly competitive, which requires by definition a guarantee of a minimum threshold, but it also requires building excellence. Students go to Australia or to Europe to find excellence, not minimum thresholds;
- Tuning focuses on desired or expected learning outcomes, emphasising the aspirational level. The Australian model appears to be based on the UK understanding of minimum thresholds. Tuning posits that its approach is somewhat different but quite useful insofar as it aims at providing reference points for developing the higher levels to which HE aspires;
- The tremendous work that has been done in Australia on assessment is acknowledged and Australia's great know-how in this field is recognised;
- In Europe important progress has been made on programme design, competences, guidelines and reference points for achieving "excellence", and on student-workload based credits;
- Tuning realises that implementing the Learning Outcomes approach entails a long process of winning the hearts and minds of academics and students. It is the Tuning conviction that this process should be led and owned by the professors involved. This process has only started in Europe, however a number of significant advances have been made. The recent publication of the Tuning Guidelines on Degree Profiles is very important step in this direction because it shows how to establish Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes. This product might also be useful

for the LTAS project, and particularly for encouraging a focus on the aspirational 'excellent' levels, in addition to the threshold levels.

- The possibility of the Australian Councils of Deans playing a (greater) role in the Standards Project is mentioned as potentially analogous to the role that European Thematic Networks have played in the Tuning process.

The Tuning Experts' Group is convinced that a follow-up of this Pilot Project will be of mutual benefit. There are many items which will stimulate progress both in Australia and Europe if the work is closely coordinated. Cooperation will allow for aligning concepts and language which, in turn, will facilitate mutual understanding, transparency and recognition of periods of studies.

A further dialogue seems worth exploring regarding the understanding of the relationship between learning outcomes and competences, the concepts of 'threshold' and 'desired' outcomes, the role of credits in measuring workload and achieved learning outcomes, the comparison of the European Qualifications Frameworks and the Australian Qualifications Framework, the establishing of links between the Discipline Scholars as representatives of the Council of Deans and the European Thematic Network Programmes, internationalisation of the student experience, methodologies regarding teaching and learning and assessment and assessment evaluation.

In final conclusion it can be stated that the project has been highly successful in meeting the project objectives by:

- facilitating greater cooperation of key higher education stakeholders;
- sharing experiences of the Australian Standards Project and the European Tuning project experts;
- enabling closer ties between academic discipline communities;
- enabling closer ties between higher education policy makers in Australia and Europe;
- starting alignment of academic standards and reference points;
- establishing a foundation for the development of a shared understanding and language for curriculum development, standards, qualifications frameworks and quality assurance.

Recommendations

There is real willingness in the academic communities in Australia and Europe to develop further cooperation. Therefore and on the basis of the above conclusions, a sustainable structure as well as a roadmap should be developed for this cooperation. The roadmap should contain a list of items of mutual interest to which should be pursued collaboratively:

- enhancing and maintaining discipline engagement so that the developed outcomes of both projects are implemented/ revised as appropriate;
- establishing administrative processes to provide evidence that outcomes have been attained;
- assisting discipline groups to forge and maintain links, in particular those between Discipline Scholars and relevant Subject Area Networks in Europe ;
- establishing a framework for the alignment of the European and Australian quality standards and relevant frameworks ;
- enhancing techniques of programme design and defining profiles;
- aligning (key) competences, learning outcomes and teaching and learning approaches
- exploring the assessment of learning outcomes, including assessment evaluation;

- developing an agreed student-centred credit system (such as ECTS / ACTS) in order to facilitate recognition and planning of the educational offer in a transnational context;
- developing strategies for the internationalisation of the student learning experience.

Specifically, it is proposed to establish an expert group consisting of the Tuning Experts and the Australian Discipline Scholars responsible for the LTAS disciplinary reports. In the coming year this group should build on the outcomes of the pilot project to develop a robust and detailed framework for strengthening the cooperation of European and Australian higher education institutions based on the items identified above. It should focus on the alignment and further development of the Tuning reference points and the LTAS outcomes, and the promotion of these initiatives in academic communities, both in Australia and Europe. Furthermore, structures should be set up and common ground should be identified to further develop the work done. This work should touch upon all aspects of programme design and delivery, that is profiling, (key) competences, learning outcomes, credit systems, approaches/methods of teaching, learning and assessment and quality assurance and enhancement in a global environment.

Appendix 1:

Tuning Experts' Individual Reports Site Visit 14-18 February 2011

Jeremy Cox

Julia Gonzalez

Ann Katherine Isaacs

Constantin Spiridonidis

Individual Report by Jeremy Cox

Chief Executive, European Association of Conservatoires (AEC), Utrecht – The Netherlands

Introduction:

This report records individual observations, conclusions and recommendations that I would wish to make in the light of the site visit to Australia between the 14th and 18th February 2011. Since the EU delegation visited as a group, and held extensive discussions amongst its members during the visit, there will be inevitable (and desirable) overlap between the points raised here, those in other individual reports and those in the synoptic report produced by the project coordinators.

As the member of the EU delegation addressing the sector of the creative and performing arts, I was in frequent communication with the ALTC Discipline Scholar, Professor Jonathan Holmes, prior to the delegation's visit, and held a meeting with him at the offices of the AEC in Utrecht on the 4th February 2011. As part of the briefing material for this meeting, Professor Holmes provided me with the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Statement for Creative and Performing Arts, December 2010. Along with the other contextualizing material that was made available, this document gave a very helpful basis for our discussion and for those which took place during the site visit.

In general terms, I found the Academic Standards Statement document to be a remarkable and highly commendable achievement when related to the timescale over which it was produced, given that such documents in Europe have generally emerged from processes conducted over a number of years. Professor Holmes spoke of the inspiringly committed and animated ways in which colleagues had engaged with the formulation and consultation process, and this theme was to recur frequently in the testimony of colleagues during the site visit. From this perspective alone, the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project, would appear to have had a powerful and beneficial impact.

The Statement Document tracks very clearly the way in which the Discipline Scholar and his colleagues drew upon existing documents available internationally, especially those from the UK, Europe and the US, when drawing up their own standards statement. This, in itself, provides a propitious basis on which to build Australo-European cooperation, especially because the Tuning documents produced by the European Thematic Networks inter}artes (Fine Art & Design, Dance & Theatre) and Polifonia (Music) seem to have been among the most relevant for the team in its work.

At the same time, there are certain important differences of approach between the Tuning Process and that adopted by the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project, above all the distinction between the concept in Tuning of such statements providing *Reference Points* for programme designers in the discipline and that in the Standards project of their being used to define *Threshold Standards* for providers across the sector. This is an issue around which many of the richest and most dialectical discussions of the site visit turned. Before going on to summarise my impressions of the various meeting held during the visit itself, I should emphasise that, from the perspective of the value of future contact and collaborative working, I believe that the differences that were uncovered provide at least as positive a basis for further work as do the similarities identified.

Observations Relating to the Meetings of the Visit

Monday, 14th February:

0930-1630 Australian Learning & Training Council (ALTC)

It could not have been foreseen, but was clearly unfortunate, that the EU delegation's visit to the offices of the ALTC fell on its first full day of operation following the news about the Council's future. Given the timing, the attitude and demeanour of ALTC staff was commendably positive and their pride in what the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project had achieved was evident. Whilst it is not for foreign delegates to comment overtly on internal policy, it did seem to us as a team that the momentum generated by this project risked being lost with the demise of the ALTC and was well worth seeking to maintain by whatever means might be felt to be most appropriate.

There was an interesting discussion around the Learning Outcome statements that had been produced and their intended function as benchmarking standards. In particular, the question of whether standards should be set at a minimum threshold or should have a more aspirational character was debated. Within the philosophy of Tuning, threshold standards are seen as setting a disappointingly low goal, as well as being difficult to frame in such a way as to define unequivocally whether or not they have been met. Conversely, the desire to have such thresholds and to confirm that providers were delivering at least to these thresholds is clearly seen as a powerful driver within the Australian context and, as the delegation learned, is partly related to the diverse pattern of providers, private as well as public.

There were a number of presentations illustrating an impressive array of systems and methodologies that have been developed in Australia to test the consistency and comparability of marking standards. These show that there is a wealth of expertise that has been developed in the country, upon which European colleagues might find it very helpful to draw.

Tuesday, 15th February:

1400-1600 Melbourne School of Education

In this meeting, many of the themes established on the first day were repeated but it was possible to go into greater detail and for the delegation to gain a deeper understanding of the drivers dictating priorities within the Australian system. The cardinal importance of the Honours Year began to emerge and, along with this, certain key differences between the Australian approach to the Bachelor, Masters, Doctorate progression (often eliminating the second step where an Honours Year has been completed) and the approach now established in Europe as a result of the Bologna reforms. In this context, it was natural, given the venue of the meeting, that the Melbourne Model should form an important part of the discussion. Although superficially closer to the European pattern than the systems found elsewhere in Australia, this model, too, has distinctive features in terms of its deliberate breadth during the Bachelor phase. The question of depth-versus-breadth, where Australia and Europe currently stand on this issue and how they are respectively envisaging moving forward offered a further area of fruitful information-sharing.

Wednesday, 16th February

0900-1130 Australian Universities Quality Agency

The delegation's meeting with the Agency clarified many aspects relating to the emergence of the new quality body TEQSA, in particular the rationalisation of state and Commonwealth QA

systems that it is designed to bring about. It also helped the delegation to understand why an integrated approach to QA scrutiny of all HE providers was leading to an emphasis across the whole sector upon threshold standards. The meeting served to strengthen a sense that the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project might struggle to find an appropriate organisational sponsor in a post-ALTC landscape.

1200-1230 Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)

This meeting offered a valuable insight into the activities of ACER and underlined the importance of the Australian contribution to measurement and assurance methodologies internationally. It also raised the possibility of Australo-European cooperation taking the form of mutual activity within South-East Asia, Latin America and even India.

1430-1600 Meeting with Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), Monash University

This was a particularly animated and fruitful discussion which, as well as offering further clarification of the range and diversity of provision within Australia, highlighted the special issues that arise when a Australian university provider operates in a variety of countries outside Australia itself. In this context, tools such as a national qualifications framework are not necessarily easily comprehended in different national situations. This led to consideration of whether there might be benefit in considering a kind of 'meta-framework' which would assist translation between national systems.

Thursday, 17th February

1000-1630 Queensland University of Technology (QUT)

1015 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars, QUT's Assistant Deans Teaching and Learning and Professors Suzi Vaughan and Stephen Towers (QUT Office of Teaching Quality)

This meeting broadened and deepened the delegation's understanding of the Australian system in a number of ways, as did the various sessions that followed throughout the day.

1100 Business Discipline "Assurance of Learning". Professor Lyn Simpson

Professor Simpson's presentation was an impressive example of how electronically-based tools can play a powerful role in QA but was equally compelling for the simplicity and clarity of some of the approaches used – e.g. the colour-coding of the key strands of competence being assessed.

1200 Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, QUT Vice-Chancellor and Chair Universities Australia

It was very useful for the delegation to receive the perspective of Professor Coaldrake, both from the point of view of his own institution and from that of Universities Australia.

1330 Professor Martin Betts (Chair ADBED, Councillor ACED), Professor Ian Cameron (Joint Discipline Scholar Engineering ICT)

In this session the role of the Councils of Deans in quality assurance issues, both prior to the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project and during its reception and ratification, was highlighted. It is clear that these Councils provide powerful and valuable opinion-forming

bodies in the various disciplines and they offer a model that might have useful implications for the European system.

1430 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars – Prof Amanda Henderson, Prof Sue Savage, Prof Ian Cameron, and Dr Don Lebler (Deputy Director – Learning and Teaching, Queensland Conservatorium)

This discussion underlined still further the beneficial and developmental nature of the process initiated by the Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project. The experiences of individuals, whether in their internal discussions or European visits, had clearly been entirely positive and, in some cases, transformative.

February 18th February

1000-1200 Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)

At this meeting, the delegation reported on some of its key impressions from the week. The occasion was an opportunity to re-emphasise the importance of finding a way to maintain the momentum created by the ALTC Learning and Teaching Academic Standards Project. There was general agreement on the part of both the delegation and DEEWR that further EU-Australian cooperation was desirable and could be envisaged in a number of areas. More precise recommendations were to flow from the reports of the visit - of which the current document is one component.

1415-1530 Round Table hosted by ANU Quality & Standard's Committee – including Assistant Deans Education from Colleges and senior people from University of Canberra

This final session saw animated discussion of the concept of *Competence* as it is understood in the Australian context and in the specific terminology of Tuning. The disparities between the two sets of definitions underlined the importance of transparency and, perhaps paradoxically, reinforced the importance of maintaining a dialogue between the evolving systems for the enhancement of learning and teaching in Europe and Australia.

Conclusions

It is clear that issues of quality assurance are currently undergoing a major phase of transition in Australia. The creation of a new Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) means uncertainty, not only for those currently engaged in working for bodies that are likely to be subsumed into this new agency, but for the sector as a whole. By the end of its visit, the delegation could understand the motivation behind the process that is in train but also the concerns of some as to what form the new landscape might take.

Throughout the visit, a constant and recurring theme was the distinction – and, to some extent, conflict – between the use of Learning Outcomes as reference points helping to define the profile of a graduate in a particular discipline and their application as determinants of threshold standards defining the adequacy or otherwise of a given HE provider. Beneath this distinction lies an even more fundamental dichotomy of philosophy: in the reference points approach, the primary responsibility for learning is seen as situated with the student, with the institution responsible for guiding that learning in such a way that, at cardinal points such as the completion of a particular programme, it can be seen to have led to the development of a set of

competences that are recognisable in relation to a particular graduate profile. In the threshold standards approach, there is an implicit – and sometimes explicit – assumption of a direct one-on-one correlation between what is taught (and how it is taught) and the standards achieved by the student. Clearly, poor provider standards will inhibit a student's learning, while high standards will encourage and nurture it. Nevertheless, a properly student-centred approach to higher education sees the responsibility for success as shared between the HE student and the HE institution where they study.

Speaking personally, as one member of the EU delegation, I believe that further dialogue between EU and Australian experts may be highly beneficial in working through these issues and ensuring that, in its concern to protect the 'brand' of its higher education, the Australian system nevertheless maintains its stated commitment to diversity, autonomy and the encouragement of students to take the responsibility for their development through higher education into their own hands.

Recommendations

I would recommend:

- That a means be found to continue the work of the Discipline Scholars and to maintain the momentum established by their consultative work on learning and teaching standards
- That this might include establishing, where possible, links between these Scholars and the relevant Thematic Networks operating in Europe
- That a dialogue be maintained between the, hopefully ongoing, work of learning and teaching standards in Australia and the similarly evolving methodologies of the Tuning process
- That this dialogue encompass issues such as assessment (and assessment evaluation) methodologies; credit-point systems and their contribution to transparency; and internationalisation of the student experience to reflect the dynamic global environment in which today's students will make their careers.

These recommendations are very much in line with the objectives of the pilot project which were to:

- Facilitate greater cooperation between key higher education stakeholders in Australia and the European Union
- Share experiences of the Australian Standards Project and the European Tuning project to enable more effective long term outcomes for each project
- Enable closer ties between academic discipline communities in Australia and Europe
- Enable closer ties between higher education policy makers in Australia and Europe
- Align academic standards and reference points in higher education for Australia and Europe
- Establish a foundation for the development of a shared understanding and language for Australian and European higher education stakeholders in their approaches to curriculum development, standards, qualifications frameworks and quality assurance

Individual Report by Julia Gonzalez

Vice – Rector University of Deusto, Bilbao - Spain

Main observations

- **On the context**

-One of the first observations refers to the level of reflection and commitment to issues of Higher Education. The Australian HE sector is obviously concerned with the development of quality and it has developed Institutions which are witnesses of these concerns. Many of these institutions and groups were visited during the week and show clearly the serious undertakings in favour of higher education.

-Although the main Educational developments taking place in different parts of the world seem to have some sort of correspondence here which proves the intellectual search for being present in different world developments in the field of HE, Qualifications Frameworks, Tuning, Benchmark System, AHELO project...and the Australian interpretation, specific way of structuring or pioneering contribution, the impact of HE trends from UK are very visible. However, there seems to be a growing awareness of the strengths and the limitations of this impact which could envisage a more genuine search for an authentic Australian answer and positioning in a field where it stands as an important player.

-Because Australia is an important player in the field of HE in the world and particularly in the region where it is located. The level of young people in the streets, the percentage of tertiary students coming from other countries to follow education in its Institutions proves the consideration it enjoys and the importance of the sector. It also relates to some of the emphasis of some of the measures taken such as the emphasis in measures of protection of the sector as could be regarded the Standards System project and the desire to guarantee the minimum level against inadequate providers

-In fact, the issue of provision of education seems to be one of the main drivers for the changes and decisions taking place in the field. However, one has the impression that a well established system of education with English as the first language, with a long tradition of attracting large numbers of young people from surrounding countries with booming young student populations could be stable until one observes the inner trends of the same countries to build up their own systems on the one hand and the desire for them to have other types of relationship which involve distinctive measures of higher and more equal cooperation.

-A further contextual element in relation with the project worthy of mentioning was the awareness of the Tuning Project that everyone of the people attending seem to have about the Tuning Project and Process in particular as it relates to its meaning and connection

- **On the similarities**

-One of the similarities emerges from the fact that in both Australia and Europe there is an important push for reform in several aspects of Higher Education. It is in times of reform and change that cooperation and exploring paths ahead jointly become of great importance.

-In both systems, there has been a rising awareness that while excellence in research is a critical path for the universities, teaching and learning need to occupy a place in the

planning of HE and in the development of the objectives of a real development in the quality of the educational process and the students academic experience at university.

-Learning outcomes systems are central in both Australian and European systems. For a significant number of years now Australian Universities are said to have been interested in the learning outcomes of courses and programmes and considered to have used them to measure the quality of their performance. However, in both cases, the road to count on very clear, specific and well capable of being measured outcomes. A significant amount of work is still to be accomplished.

- Qualification Frameworks. Both regions have elaborated Qualifications frameworks to facilitate the identification of the Qualifications and their progression in the system.

-But even more, the Australian Quality system and the European Quality system have importance resemblance in the present situation. This is the case with the Quality Agency, very similar in terms of approach, principles and guidelines to the European developments.

-International standards. The Tuning Project seems to be quite well known by the key academics in Australia and looked upon as a relevant tool in the search for international standards.

- **On the differences**

- However, a number of differences ought to be drawn in some cases related to the issues where coincidence seems to take place.

-Thus, while the Tuning reference points could be considered in some respects as global standards, in reality they never intended to be. They were born as a joint search for the degree profiles which serve as points of reference, agreed by the academic community in a search for defining the elements which could constitute the essence of the subject areas and which could help in the recognition of degrees while preserving a vast area of diversity which foster variety and allowed for a significant level of profiling of the programme and the institution. It would be critical for a future joint development to understand fully the reasons behind the search for reference points on the part of the developers and the background behind the standards.

-Several debates were held in relation to the use of competences and learning outcomes. While both relate to outcome based learning, one of the approaches, also coinciding with the British tradition will limit itself to the use of learning outcomes leaving for the more vocational training the word competence. The debates and reflections maintained in the Tuning Project on this issue have long been known. Tuning experts maintain the two terms are required for a better and broader understanding. The dialogue with society demands the use of competences as a more wholesome concept of abilities, capacities, knowledge and expertise that a person may have been able to develop at a particular time in his or her education. We could talk about the competence for critical, or creative or systemic thinking, competence of leadership or implementation of theory into practice.

-While looking at the processes undertaken by each of the regions one has the impression that things have happened at different moments in Australia and Europe, to quote an example, while in Europe Tuning and therefore the reference points for each of the subject areas started first and then the Qualifications Framework was developed in Australia, the order was changed and therefore one can examine the advantages and disadvantages of moving from the concrete to the more general or the other way around. The order of the process could be seen as having significant underpinnings.

-Important elements seem to have different wait in each of the HE systems and in the policies which have emerged in the different cases. Thus, one observes that the meaning of internationalization in HE seem to have a different meaning I each context- from a large country composed with a main inland to a multiplicity of countries with histories and frontiers strongly interconnected and who had decided to build a project together. The same is the case with mobility, joint programmes, attracting young and promising students.

Conclusions

- **There is mutual interest in cooperation.** The number of people attending the very many meetings which were planned, the punctuality and very interesting sharing and debates that took place, the animated debate and the clear expressions of the attendants showed a high level of interest and a desired to continue and explore the possibilities of a joint project which looked interesting to the different publics which attended the encounters. The conclusion that a future cooperation is welcomed seemed to come up both in public and in private conversations.
- **There will be mutual benefit.** The level of development in relation to programme development clearly speaks for mutual benefit. In fact, there are issues where one of the academic communities may make the other to move forward and other issues where the opposite would probably occur. In this context, While European academics have devoted more time and energy to issues related to collective thinking and joint development, understanding the essential elements of the profiling of the degrees and credit –in terms of learner’s engagement, the Australian academic communities have a long term experience in Qualifications Frameworks and issues such as assessment and evidence of learning where there contribution could be of extreme relevance to the work being done in Europe. A win-win situation is envisaged with each of the parties advancing in understanding and in methodologies and approaches for advancement into a better practice of the outcome based learning that both seem to seek.
- **Jointly they can contribute to global development.** Both regions are called to work together to a growth in the development and improvement of Higher Education in different parts of the world. In this globalized system languages and approaches cannot survive if they are not universally understood. So, both regions are called to contribute to the development of the type of language which is understood and shared by the most or all the countries in such a way that what is good and excellent could be recognized and made it grow in accuracy that favours mutual understanding, transparency and recognition.
- **There seems to be the will to cooperate.** Despite the new developments ending with the close down of the Teaching and Learning Council, there seems to be a genuine idea that the joint project should be continued. This seems to be true at several levels-the Ministry, the different organizations visited and the individual academics that we saw, all seemed to have a determined will to invest energy and dedication.

Recommendations

- **Nominate the body or group to do the follow up.** Further from the reporting required to finalize the first phase where a type of feasibility/interest study was carried out, the next immediate step to be recommended would be to advance in clarity as to who should, from the Australian side, be responsible of the project, stimulate and accompany the groups of professionals.
- **Move forward.** The study done during the intense week of work among the Australian academic communities will prove that it is the moment to advance jointly and to develop a road map which is adjusted to the interests of both sides, the investment made has had the fruits of present identification of capacities and strengths and should not be let to miss the momentum but rather build on what has been developed.
- **Deepen understanding.** Despite the fact that the academic communities are both belonging to cultural mindsets which are relatively close to each other, there is a lot to listen and fully understand in order to build on solid ground and to make the learning experience to the full.
- **Select initial issues and common interests.** The Tuning experience is the coming together to debate in the concrete issues of a subject area group: the mutual understanding of the essence of the field and the diversity that can embrace, the main and essential competences which would constitute the backbone of the profile, the demands and needs of society as they emerge and the best methodologies for keeping posted, the innovative approaches to teaching, learning and assessment of the competences defined, the difference ways of developing excellence and quality at programme level. It is, therefore important to select a number of concrete issues to create debate and understanding around them. Trust follows and joint objectives emerge. Issues suggested in this context could be assessment where the Australian Community has advanced significantly, credit and curriculum planning where European groups have had a significant experience or issues where both want to move forward such as quality or competence for the future society and for the future degrees and employment. Main developments will take place when a number of communities have the opportunity of starting to discuss, to understand each other and to create common thinking.
- **Plan road ahead with main players.** One of the excellent developments of the first phase of the project is that it interconnected the main players and made them aware and part of the developments taking place. It is true that Tuning is a bottom up movement which has made possible what otherwise would not have been possible if only taking place from above. However, it is relevant to take into consideration all the stakeholders if the plans are to succeed. Higher Education is not only the responsibility of the Universities but, to certain degree, it belongs to the entire society and this needs to be present in different forms.
The road map needs to be developed and it is the task of the academics communities, however, the rest of the players in Higher Education need to accompany the process, and enrich the debate.

Individual Report by Ann Katherine Isaacs

University of Pisa, Pisa – Italy

Introduction and background

Over a period of a week, from 14 to 18 February 2011, I was privileged to travel to four principal Australian cities, meeting key persons in the Australian higher education world, in order to examine the situations in Europe and in Australia, compare understandings and map areas in which collaboration can be of reciprocal benefit.

In preparation for the visit, a complete set of materials on Australian higher education and recent developments therein had been made available. This comprised the relevant documentation produced by the Australian government and the ALTC as well as that produced by the discipline groups, in response to the implementation of the ALTC's actions to stimulate and organise the production of threshold learning outcomes statements, to form an agreed basis for the activities of the proposed new Quality and Accreditation Agency, TEQSA.

In addition to studying the documentation regarding the process of setting up a new Qualifications Framework, new learning-teaching standards and TEQSA, I gave particular attention to the documentation relative to the Social Sciences and Humanities, and most specifically to the that produced by the History discipline group. I was able to access and study not only the draft prepared by the discipline group but also the numerous substantial replies from History departments and historians' associations elicited during the consultation on the draft.

The questions I formulated before the visit had to do with the actual purpose of the History document, since it was not clear to me what use would be made of it in the future – especially because of the questions surrounding the exact scope of the new quality agency. I noted with interest that the Tuning Europe and the Tuning Latin America History Subject Area Group documentation had been considered by the Australian discipline scholar and group – or at least, the Subject Specific competences of the two projects were included in a synoptic table used by the discipline group in its work.

The preparatory study of the material led to singling out a number of questions and areas for discussion, principally:

1. how are the terms 'standard' and 'learning outcomes' being used;
2. whether these indicate or are associated with a required (i.e. 'pass/fail') level or with a desired or expected level of accomplishment;
3. how (indeed whether) credits are being used;
4. how the three columns of the existing AQF will be coordinated in the new QF;
5. whether TEQSA is intended to be an accreditation agency, a quality assurance or enhancement agency, or both.

Of course with my colleagues we became aware, in preparing for the meetings, that 3 weeks previously the ALTC had learned that it would be discontinued for budgetary reasons relating to the recent dramatic hurricane damage. This was an unexpected factor which certainly affected the atmosphere in a negative sense, since there was much disappointment and uncertainty; but it also rendered the discussions and debate particularly interesting. In part perhaps because of

the changing situation, the representatives of the Australian higher education sector whom we met shared with us a number of observations and concerns, and the talks were probably more incisive and informative than they would have been a month earlier.

During the five days of our 'travelling visit' we were able to clarify, at least to a large extent, the five questions listed above, to elicit new questions as we became better acquainted with the Australian system(s), and to map the areas which in our judgement can usefully be the object of future collaboration.

Day 1 (14 February 2011)

Melbourne, all day meeting at the ALTC

The meeting kicked off with introductions and overviews by the CEO of ALTC (Carol Nicoll), by the Australian leader of the project and leader of the LTAS initiative, Christine Ewan, and by Robert Wagenaar, Tuning project Joint Coordinator, who gave a synthetic view of the project aims and of Tuning. These interventions were followed by three power point presentations by the European members, Constantine Spiridonidis, Jeremy Cox and myself. Our presentations aimed at showing in brief how Tuning has developed, its aims, methods and achievements in general; for the pilot subject areas (Isaacs, as History chair); and for the Thematic Networks that had developed some of the same directions before beginning Tuning and then opted to join officially (Architecture, Spiridonidis; Music, Cox).

After some discussion, most of the Australian participants, in turn, gave brief presentations and discussions of the initiatives they were developing. These included, among others, the following:

- Marie Carroll, of the University of Sydney, represented the "Group of Eight" (eight important AU universities who have joined in an association), and explained the efforts of the Group to ensure that there are common verifiable standards among the Eight. They are implementing a pilot 'quality verification system' in the areas initially of Chemistry, History, Psychology and Accounting: this entails peer review by assessors chosen from a pool of senior academics who will look at random samples of each grade given for the 'capstone' unit, with the aim of guaranteeing that the systems are sound, fair and compatible. This process aims at enhancing internal quality procedures and at ensuring public confidence.
- Geoff Scott, University of Western Sydney – by 'video' (actually audio-) conference
- Sean Brawley, University of South Wales, History, described the 'bottom-up' process of elaboration of the History and Geography standards and the consultation on them.
- Mark Freeman, University of Sydney, Discipline Scholar for Accounting, described the process of elaborating the TLOs, discussing the attempt to involve the Deans of the subject area and to engage with academics at their annual meeting.;
- Simon Barrie, University of Sydney, discussed the necessity of distinguishing between the activities of Accreditation, Quality enhancement and Quality culture.

In the ensuing discussions a number of points came up and it was possible to at least begin to clarify some of the matters that the European delegation did not know or had not understood about the Australian situation, and vice versa.

In particular it became clear that whereas in Europe we had started from the Subject Areas (building on and with ECTS and the Bologna Process), subsequently developing the QF for the EHEA, then the EQF, the NQFs and now the SQFs, Australia had started the other way around: from the first AQF, then to the sectors (through the ALTC project), and the disciplinary areas are

the end point in the process. Another matter which came up, but required further clarification during the following days, was the realisation that graduates normally receive a Bachelor of Arts or of Sciences, but that these are very general degrees, in which our 'subject areas' (e.g. History) may play a very minor role.

We also noted that there was a great deal of interest in and sophisticated work being done on assessment. In the discussion, the necessity of focussing on 'quality culture' was emphasised.

Day 2 (15 February 2011), Melbourne

Afternoon meeting at the Melbourne School of Education

We had the opportunity before the meeting of having a working lunch with Roger Hadgraft, who was working on the text by the Engineering and ICT discipline group. This gave us a chance to discuss and clarify some questions and doubts.

The meeting was chaired by Pip Pattison, and around 15 people were present from various HEIs and subject areas. I was pleased to meet a second historian, Adrian Jones of Latrobe University, a member of the History Discipline Group. One of the goals of the day was to understand the 'Melbourne model' and how it was seen from within and outside of the 'Group of Eight'. We were also able to find out which were the 'self-accrediting' institutions, and to understand that their autonomous accrediting activities refer to programme accreditation.

One of the questions discussed at some length was the 'honours' year understood as a fourth year leading to a 'heavier' Bachelor degree, its link with funding matters, and its relevance in international transparency. It was suggested by Adrian Jones that the implementation of this model would be to the detriment of young people coming from less highly educated families, who would not understand the need for the expense of the fourth year. The funding issues (larger subsidies in the first cycle, and hence an interest in keeping the fourth year in the Bachelor degree) seemed to be the determining ones, along with the role of important international providers played particularly by the large public universities of the Group of Eight, and their desire to market a high level offer for incoming students.

We also asked about tuition fees and established that they are orders of magnitude higher than in the EU, but also that a system of subsidies and loans attenuates their impact to a considerable extent.

Day 3 (16 February 2011)

Melbourne, morning: meeting at AUQA, Australian Universities Quality Agency.

We met with David Woodhouse, head of the AUQA and two of his colleagues, Dr Michael Tomlinson and Rob Carmichael. At the beginning David Woodhouse clarified the framework in which AUQA works, and made brief reference to the changes foreseen with the demise of the AUQA and the creation of TEQSA. Robert Wagenaar briefly explained the Tuning-Australia project and how in the European Higher Education Area, with 47 countries, it was necessary to find shared reference points, which are not limited to threshold 'standards'; and that the important point is to be able to identify not only a pass level but also -- or rather -- a level of excellence. The meeting was largely dedicated to understanding the activities of AUQA and what -- it may be hypothesised -- will be the activities of TEQSA, all of which however is still uncertain and depends on legislation still to be finalised. The present context, in which the single states have accreditation and quality agencies, and in which there is a perceived need for centralisation and rationalisation, was also explained and discussed. Whereas AUQA during its

many years of operation entered into formative or constructive dialogue with universities in the attempt to improve quality, the overriding objective of TEQSA would appear to be guaranteeing a minimum level for accreditation, thus reassuring the international and national public about the baseline quality of the educational offer.

However, we were told that perhaps TEQSA will also have quality enhancement functions. In any case it would seem that the Universities in their fight to preserve their reputation have to distinguish themselves from the vocational institutions, and it seems that the press and public are not always aware that the HE sector is quite variegated.

Melbourne, afternoon, meeting at ACER, Australian Council for Educational Research

ACER is an independent non-profit organisation based in Melbourne, where it has more than 300 employees, and with offices in the main cities of Australia including the federal capital, and in Delhi, Dubai and London. It is well known for its role in international assessment of school education in the PISA framework for the OECD. It also administers admission examinations to medical faculties in the UK and IE, and works on assessment both at entry and at completion of studies in a number of places. It cooperates closely with the Australian Bank Authority and with the World Bank, and in various projects in Asia (India, Tajikstan, Brunai, for example).

Before the meeting began, I had an interesting discussion with Peter McGukian, the person responsible for the international relations of ACER. The discussion hinged on and explored the role of Australia and ACER with respect to South East Asia, an area in which Europe and Australia have strong HE interests, not necessarily of competition, but it would seem potentially of synergy as well.

The formal part of the meeting begins with a presentation of ACER and its activities, by Professor Hamish Coates, Research Director for Higher Education, who stressed the role of ACER in HE, both for admissions and at the end of programmes. This was followed by Robert Wagenaar, who mentioned the collaboration in the AHELO project, and clarified that the present visit is in the framework of the EU-Australia Dialogue 'Tuning Australia' initiative. Peter McGukian described the international activities of ACER. The discussion then turned to the recent developments in the AU higher education system, and to the issues concerning 'standards'. The ambiguity of the term was lamented by several, and it was agreed that it is necessary to find terms and definitions which are helpful in building excellence, rather than turning the main efforts toward definitions of lower thresholds.

Julian Fraillon, director of research for assessment and reporting in the areas of Mathematics, Science and Technology, presented a sophisticated software to be used in assessing achievement in engineering programmes.

The discussion continued, touching specifically the ASEAN and Asian Pacific areas, and possible initiatives that will affect interaction and attraction the area. The multi-criterial alternatives to linear 'ranking' of universities are discussed. Julia Gonzalez brought up the question of licensing and how to measure quality.

Meeting with Marnie Hughes-Warrington, Monash University

After the meeting with the ACER representatives, Prof. Marnie Hughes-Warrington, Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) of Monash University, gave a lively presentation of her views on the HE situation in Australia, from the point of view of Monash University, which at

present is quite a successful competitor to Melbourne, having 80.000 students, and running several programmes abroad, which make it necessary to look for adequate international accreditation. Since Prof. Hughes-Warrington is a historian, it was possible for me to clarify with her several issues, including what we had heard previously about the Bachelor in Arts and Bachelor in Sciences degrees: that is in substance that they are such general degrees that the quantity of work carried out in a specific discipline, such as history or biology, is quite minimal. It results, from the material Prof. Hughes illustrated and subsequently sent me by email, that there is very great variation, and although it seems fair to say that most often there is only slight emphasis on the 'discipline degree' – 30% out of the whole – there are exceptions to this rule. This was important in understanding the 'level' of the threshold learning outcomes established by the History discipline group.

We discussed in detail the way various programmes are organised, especially the health professions where internships may be embedded. Overall, the most important conclusion seems to be that given Monash's (and Australia's) important interest and role as an international provider, convergence towards an EU framework such as the QF or EQF would be very helpful, as would be a more systematic and transparent use of credits.

Day 4 (17 February 2011), Brisbane

The meeting took place at QUT, Queensland University of Technology, and was chaired by Susan Savage, Assistant Dean for Teaching and Learning and Discipline scholar for Architecture in the ALTC project.

The meeting began with a brief presentation made by Robert Wagenaar on the aims of our visit and of the 'policy dialogue'. We emphasised the fact that in the EHEA, considering that it comprises 47 countries, we have had to find 'reference points' to which all can relate and which can be used as tools for quality and transparency, but not as an invasive or prescriptive framework.

Professor Lyn Simpson of the Dean's Office of the QUT Business School made an interesting presentation on how QUT has worked to enhance the quality of the Business Bachelor programme, to prepare for international accreditation. She told about, and we asked for and received, a *Handbook* 'for students' on how to get the most out of their studies. It seems that teachers also were very eager to own and use this Handbook, and indeed (I have now read it) it is a very well made and useful tool that certainly can serve as an inspiration for similar products. Prof. Simpson explained how the efforts of those responsible for organising Business studies led to singling out 5 general areas of learning which go across all disciplines in the Faculty. There is a system of formative assessment at a mid point in each course and for the final 'capstone' course or project. We were able to clarify that the term 'capstone' is understood (as we heard in Sydney on day 1) as a single course or piece of work which permits verification of whether the key competences have been achieved. We heard from Lyn Simpson that an example at the QUT Business School might be a project in which the student had created a successful commercial spot.

Lyn Simpson described and demonstrated the use of a special assessment software: its peculiarity is that it allows independent evaluation by both the professors and the students of the student achievement in the 5 areas: the teachers then are able to view how the students rated themselves and also how the various criteria are evaluated. The system permits feed-forward and feed-back, and to fine-tune and review assessment criteria.

The discussion on this presentation was intense and a number of questions were brought up by both the AU and the EU members. These had to do with whether it is possible to 'design a graduate'; whether in the end it is not also true that the competences and understanding developed by the student may go beyond what teachers are prepared to and able to understand. In sum, the tools presented were considered very useful, and the aspects which were aimed at enabling students to become protagonists of their own learning and the creation of their own profile seem important in a 'student-centred' framework.

Vice-Chancellor Professor Peter Coaldrake joined the meeting around mid-day and gave us a picture of the opportunities and constraints created by the economic situation and changing visa policies in Australia. He illustrated with some eloquence the complications of awaiting the new legislation on TEQSA and similia, about which very little is certain. He explained the necessity of the discipline scholars' work on thresholds, and how it relates to the perceived necessity of ensuring that all providers are up to par; however, it is obvious that the work of the discipline scholars and the discipline groups cannot be limited to stating the minimum acceptable levels.

Professor Martin Betts, Dean of the Faculty of Built Environment and Engineering, presented the situation from the point of view of the Australian Council of Engineering Deans: who in essence are those who have the hands-on experience of collaboration with an eye to positioning Australian Engineering studies at a high international level. Discussion developed about the Australasian Academic standards and the "Washington Group", of which "Engineers Australia" are members whereas European engineering degrees are not accepted by it. AHELO and the ALTC were discussed, the upshot being that the Deans support the disciplinary scholars and their work, and that Deans' councils may provide a way to go forward even in the absence of the ALTC, but internationally it is essential for committed people to develop a global framework, going beyond the national one.

Susan Savage discussed the problems relating to Architecture, and the difficulties surrounding the creation of meta frameworks in consideration of the quite different statutes of Architecture studies in different countries (and universities).

Day 5 (18 February 2011), Canberra

Morning session, Ministry, Department of Employment, Education and Workplace Relations

The meeting aimed at exploring the results of the visit of the EU delegation, and looking at areas where it is of mutual interest to develop collaboration. It was initially chaired by Di Weddell, DEEWR Manager of the International Strategy Branch, who judged the AU-EU partnership very useful for the HE area, emphasising the significance of 'like minds' working together, and the importance of our having been able to get the 'live feel' of Australian higher education during our travelling visit during the week.

Robert Wagenaar then gave an initial assessment of our experiences and findings, noting with pleasure that the Tuning results have been taken on board in the work of the discipline groups; mentioning the potential in the Deans' councils and declaring that for such initiatives to work it is essential to bring academics together. He pointed to the importance of an international context, which makes such work more rewarding and more relevant.

He went on to touch on the following points which I paraphrase:

- We are impressed with the good start in establishing threshold standards. However, in our view, it is also important to look at excellence and how to ensure and enhance it. Australia and Europe share a desire to be highly competitive, and this requires of course a guarantee of a

minimum threshold, but it also requires building excellence. Students come to Australia or to Europe to find excellence, not minimum thresholds.

- In Tuning we focus on desired or expected learning outcomes, on the aspirational level. The Australian model appears to be based on the UK understanding of threshold; we posit that ours is somewhat different and quite useful insofar as it aims at providing reference points for developing the higher levels to which serious HE aspires.

- We have noted the tremendous work done in Australia on assessment.

- We can say that in Europe we have worked hard and obtained very important results on competences, guidelines and reference points for achieving “excellence”, and on student-workload based credits.

- Australia seems to have put huge efforts into assessment and to have great know-how in this area.

- We have also found out that Australia and Europe with Latin America are unique in the world, because of the way we take employability into account.

- This means that we have found a common agenda and complementarity. Lining up should be done from the point of view of institutions; this process has to be owned by the professors.

- We still have a lot to do in Europe, fighting for the ‘hearts and minds’ of academics – and students – however a number of significant advances have been made: most recently, our Guidelines on Degree Profiles is very important and shows how to establish Programme Competences and Programme Learning Outcomes. This product should be useful for the ‘standards’ project, and particularly for bringing it to bear on the aspirational ‘excellent’ levels, and not only on threshold levels.

- It will be used in the Diploma Supplement, and hence have international relevance.

- We see a possibility of the Councils of Deans playing a role in the Standards Project. In Europe we have had the great benefit of having the Thematic Networks elaborate the reference points and guidelines in conjunction with Tuning. Work is still going on, which we will share with you. We realise that we are only one world region and that we are a competitor, Nonetheless we believe that collaboration is useful for both; we are creating integrated programmes for Asian countries.

Di Weddel notes that students want employability; for employability competences are what counts.

Christine Ewan, ALTC, intervenes, to discuss the issue of continuation of the process begun. For now Deans with employers are continuing the work started in the ALTC project. Of course the next steps were supposed to be assessment, and also to take the criteria from threshold level to excellence, with the support of the Deans’ councils and the employers. The Deans’ councils need support to be able to do this.

Catherine Vandermark, DEEWR Quality Manager, takes over the presidency at this point as Di Weddell is forced to leave the meeting. She says that the current problems are temporary and that Australia is interested in working with Tuning; there are big changes coming in Australian HE; she tells about the new AUQF and the changes in funding plans and their probable effects. This will place the universities in the position of having to ‘go out and enrol students’. The number of graduates is supposed to increase dramatically in future years. The ‘autonomous’ (self-accrediting) universities are committed to helping the government push this project forward. The objective is to have a quality driven system and TEQSA will have an important role in making this work.

We then hear a presentation on TEQSA by Lisa Scholfield, DEEWR branch manager for TEQSA: she illustrated its relation to the Bradley report and hence to the perceived and agreed needs for the updating of Australian HE. She explains how AUQA will be 'rolled into' TEQSA, and hence how 'quality', standards and assessment will all be in the hands of TEQSA.

At this point a general discussion develops, in which, among other things, it is pointed out that in the Bologna framework accreditation and quality assurance and enhancement are to be handled by separate independent bodies, perhaps for valid reasons.

Summing up: Robert Wagenaar argues that international referencing is the only way forward when moving from 'standards' to 'excellence', and brings up the work done in AHELO. He also discusses credits, which, although not included in the EQF, are a very important element in the QF for the EHEA. It is essential to be able to measure volume of learning, linking them to level descriptors, we should see how to combine forces to accomplish this. We should find strategies to continue our interaction – not necessarily always face-to-face, after a 24 hour flight. From the Tuning side there is willingness to collaborate.

Catherine Vandermark comments that it is of benefit for students to be mobile and receive a quality education wherever they are.

Julia Gonzalez, summing up, indicates 3 points 1) it is important to understand how the two 'processes' can be linked; 2) we need to get the enthusiasm of the two communities (AU/EU) together; 3) the future is here: in the societies Asia and its citizens, and we have a role to play together for them.

Afternoon session, Australian National University

During the afternoon we are hosted for our final session by the Australian National University. Quite a large and representative group of people from ANU, from the University of Canberra and others interested in HE are present. The meeting is chaired by Professor Elizabeth Deane, Pro Vice-Chancellor for Students of ANU. It entails firstly a presentation of the ANU and then another about its internal quality building and benchmarking activities. The "Group of Eight", its purposes and activities, are also illustrated. After these structured presentations, and a brief presentation of Tuning and of the framework of the visit of the travelling group of European experts, the rest of the session is dedicated to a general discussion amongst all present on Australian HE, on the future legislation, on the ways that standards, reference points, quality procedure and assessment are understood in AU and in the EU.

Of particular interest to me, as Coordinator of CLIOHWORLD, the Erasmus Academic Network on History, including History of European Integration and of the European Union, are the comments by Pablo Jiménez, Liaison Officer of the ANU Centre for European Studies, representing Prof. Jacqueline Lo, Director of the Centre. He illustrates the programmes and research activities of the Centre and subsequently we agree on further collaboration.

Summing up, the EU delegation mentions once again the different emphasis that Tuning provides, in creating tools for building excellence -- in an international framework and above the threshold level -- aiming at an idea of excellence which stresses the shared excellence of a system, rather than that of a very few privileged HEIs surrounded by a depressed and depressing HE landscape. Possibilities of cooperation are further explored, and the advisability of having a student-based credit system is mentioned.

Conclusions and recommendations

At the end of the five days, we realised that there were still questions in our minds about many matters, both systemic and with regard to details. We know very well from past experience that each educational system is unique and contains many specific 'checks and balances' that may not be visible to outsiders; even insiders may not recognise them. Nonetheless we felt that we had gained infinitely greater insight in the course of our journey, both into the key questions identified at the beginning and into the Australian system in general, the issues it is facing and how it is dealing with them.

It appears that we share many perceptions and concerns. We identified certain key areas in which we are convinced that the Tuning experience can be of use in Australia. These are, in brief:

1. In techniques of programme design, for example with reference to our new Guide on Degree Profiles;
2. In focussing on competences to be developed by the student and aspirational learning outcome, to be formulated by academics, both at course unit level and at programme level; and aligning competences, learning outcomes and learning/teaching approaches;
3. in connecting with the great amount of international work done on the above at subject area – i.e. discipline – level;
4. in developing an agreed student-centred credit system such as ECTS in order to facilitate recognition and planning of the educational offer.

It is also clear to us that Australian Universities and the Australian HE system as a whole have developed techniques and understandings of assessment to a very high degree, much higher than is the case, in general, in the Bologna area. It is also clear that the work done in the ALTC project by the discipline groups and the Deans' councils on establishing threshold criteria for first cycle degrees can be very useful when combined with the Tuning approach.

In our view, the unavoidable conclusion is that further collaboration would be of mutual benefit and that all possible steps should be made to encourage and support it.

Contacts with Historians

As regards specifically the History "discipline area", or as we would say in Tuning, the History "subject area", I was very lucky to have the opportunity to study at close hand the activities of the History group, and to be able to consider the feedback obtained from a great number of Universities and professional associations. It was useful for me to meet three historians, including the 'discipline' scholar and two members of the discipline group, and to make contact with them. The European History Networks will certainly be in touch and try to organise joint activities and projects in the future. I was given the opportunity to record quite a long DVD interview, in which I explained the results obtained by the History Networks in conjunction with the Tuning projects, and the process by which they were achieved.

I am confident that our collaboration will develop in the future, and express my thanks to the Project organisers, to Lynne Hunter of the EU delegation, and to all the participants in the lively and useful discussions that were held during the five very intense days.

Individual Report by Constantine Spiridonidis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki - Greece

Overview

This report presents a number of thoughts, remarks, considerations and ideas as they emerged from my participation in the visit of a EU delegation in Australia paid in the framework of the Tuning Australia project. The report is structured in four parts. In the first part, the evaluation of the visit is presented in the light of the objectives of the Tuning Australia project. The second part concerns the mapping of the differences between the educational system in EU and Australia as these were detected in the discussions taking place in the meetings we had in Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane and Canberra (see below). The third part focuses on the similarities and the common characteristics that someone could observe as a basis for future collaboration. In the fourth part some possible axes of collaboration are presented, based upon the references of parts two and three.

The report is based upon the debates and the information exchange that took place over the following meetings:

Monday	14.3. 2011	Sydney	09:30-16:30	Australian Learning & Training Council (ALTC)
Tuesday	15.3. 2011	Melbourne	09:00-11:30	Australian Universities Quality Agency
Tuesday	15.3. 2011	Melbourne	14:00-16:00	Melbourne School of Education
Wednesday	16.3. 2011	Melbourne	12:00-12:30	Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)
Wednesday	16.3. 2011	Melbourne	14:30-16:00	Meeting with Prof. Marnie Hughes-Warrington Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching), Monash University
Thursday	17.3.2011	Brisbane	10:00-16:30	Queensland University of Technology (QUT)
Thursday	17.3.2011	Brisbane	11:00	Business Discipline "Assurance of Learning". Prof. Lyn Simpson
Thursday	17.3.2011	Brisbane	12:00	Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, QUT Vice-Chancellor and Chair Universities Australia
Thursday	17.3.2011	Brisbane	14:30	Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars – Prof Amanda Henderson, Prof Sue Savage, Prof Ian Cameron.
Friday	18.3.2011	Canberra	10:00-12:00	Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR)
Friday	18.3.2011	Canberra	1415-1530	Round Table hosted by ANU Quality & Standard's Committee – including Assistant Deans Education from Colleges and senior people from University of Canberra.

1. The visit under Tuning Australia project objectives

The visit was planned to assure contact with the key higher education stakeholders in Australia in order to prepare the soil for a greater cooperation between EU and Australia. As a first step this can be considered successful as it established links, which have certainly possibilities for further development.

In all meetings the delegation exchanged knowledge, experience, expertise and views on higher education quality and on the strategies implemented or planned on both sides for its assurance. This exchange, even if it did not follow a specialized agenda and developed dynamically, offered significant insights to the parties involved. Each part had the possibility to better understand its own approaches by understanding the approaches of the others. The discussions in the meetings were directed, as it was expected, primarily towards the overall structure of the higher education systems implemented from both sides without giving significant ground for more specialized and subject oriented discussions. However contacts with persons belonging to different academic environments and subject areas can assure a better continuation on more subject-oriented investigations of the higher education offered in Australia and Europe. The visit certainly created a ground for further development of ties, which could virtually have an impact on the policy making on both sides. As an overall remark one can easily state that the visit was extremely successful and contributed in a very positive way to the establishment of a foundation for the development of a shared understanding and language for Australian and European higher education stakeholders in their approaches to curriculum development, standards, qualifications frameworks and quality assurance.

2. Differences between Higher Education in Australia and Europe

The mapping of the differences between the systems on higher education implemented in Australia and European Union and more specifically between the quality policies applied or planned, will be based upon three complementary axes: The first is the comparison of the general policy lines on which the development of each system is based. The second is the strategies through which this general policy is realized. The third axis will examine the means and the tools used to assure the above-mentioned strategies and policies.

2.1. Differences in policy for Higher Education

The first point concerns the policy on higher education quality in both continents. From the discussion we had it became apparent that the current main lines of policy on higher education in Australia as well as in Europe are looking towards the assurance of a (high) quality level of graduates so that they can offer qualified services to the society and the market. In order to achieve this objective the Australian political system is looking into the appropriate definition of standards and benchmarks in order to organize institutional mechanisms, which will control the capacity of institutions providing higher education to assure these standards to their graduates, and the ability of their graduates' to adequately meet these standards.

The European policy for Higher Education appears to have different strategic objectives. By defining through Lisbon and Bologna the objective of a knowledge-based society and economy, the quest of quality in EU is not defined only on the basis of the level of services offered to a demanding society and the markets but mainly on the quality of innovation that this knowledge will be able to generate, with direct impact to the economical development and competitiveness

of Europe with other international competitors. In order to achieve this objective EU has already implemented policies, actions and measures aiming at creating the European Higher Education Area, which is expected to be a mechanism generating excellence.

2.2. Differences in strategy for Higher Education

It is evident that we are confronted with two different policies for higher education, which develop two different strategies. Even though they have quality as a common objective, behind that there is a completely different conception/perception of this quality. In the former, the quality is measured through values defined by standards, in the latter through the degree to which limits of the acceptable are transcended. The former understands quality as a measurable fixed ideal, a model described by standards, the latter conceives quality as a dynamic situation where rules are invented and applied in order to get the maximum possible distance from the minimum threshold, benchmark, the necessary, the acceptable.

Moreover, the above-mentioned differences provoke differences in the nature of processes implemented to assure quality. The first is applying a concept of teacher-based higher education in which the quality standards mainly concern the measurable level of knowledge to be offered. The second is applying a project-based concept in which the quality emerges through a graduate's profile structured upon competences to be achieved.

2.3. Differences in the means and tools

The Australian approach expects to raise the quality of higher education by controlling the knowledge-based input offered by the Universities by regulating it on a national level and legitimizing it by the experts committee defined and depended on the State. According to the European approach, on the contrary, the competences-based output is defined by the Universities, and the 'State' supports its implementation by creating an appropriate framework of means, actions and regulations.

The means to regulate the enhancement of quality are, in the case of Australia, of institutional-legislative nature (definition of academics Committee, preparation of standards, legislation, implementation). On the contrary, in Europe the system gives a significant ground to the academics to describe the expected profiles as a set of competences as well as to define the reference points assuring these competences. In parallel, the political system implements a number of institutional measures contributing to the enhancement of the quality. Three of these measures are the most significant: The two cycles structure, mobility, and the ECTS.

The Australian system is structured on three cycles Bachelor, Masters and PhD and it is different compared to Europe on two significant points: 1. The employability condition that Bologna sets for the bachelor graduates in Europe encourages the weak students to leave higher education raising this way the quality of the students in the master's level and consequently the quality of studies on this level. In the case of Australia the bachelor's graduates' employability was not clearly mentioned as a condition but if we take into account the case of Melbourne where the bachelor is a broad educational platform giving access to a number of disciplines, we can assume that the employability as a means towards quality is not seriously considered.

Mobility in Europe is considered the most significant tool for the expected quality in Higher education.

Mobility is encouraged and supported by European programs as it gives the possibility to higher education institutions to select the most qualified candidates to complete their bachelor in other institutions. To achieve this advantage, all institutions have to become sufficiently attractive. This way the competitive attractiveness as a strategic axis of the European higher education area strategy becomes a factor of quality enhancement. From the discussions in Australia such a centrally or peripherally designed strategy did not surface. Mobility is possible but not organized in a way to become a tool for developing the quality in higher education.

The Australian system appears to be a teacher-centered system, as the time of the student does not take part of the design of the curricula. The primary material of the structure of curricula remains the subject areas in terms of modules and the time dedicated to the teaching of different subject areas. The students' time economy remains proportional to the teaching time gravity, which practically means that the workload of the students is not controlled in the design of the curricula and the particular modules. This is definitely against students' performance and output quality, as in many subject areas student workload is disproportional to teaching time.

3. Similarities between Higher Education in Australia and Europe

From the debates that took place over the delegation visit in Australia we can observe a number of similarities between the existing situation in higher education and its planned perspectives which could be considered in the case of the continuation of this project.

Both parties are in a reform process even if these processes have different temporalities. It means that both are envisaging new perspectives and develop new expectations regarding the future of higher education in an internationalized world. As these reforms are under development, the debate about policies, strategies, means and tools acquire significant importance and create a solid ground for the collaboration between the two areas.

More specifically, the quest for better quality as a focal point of all proposed reforms is common on both sides. It is interesting to notice that this discussion about quality in higher education on national level appears to be a new condition. As Australian partners mentioned repeatedly, the discussion about quality was, to that point, developed and completed inside institutions without externalization and without being able to obtain a national character. The situation is similar in Europe as before Bologna there were no centralized initiatives on European level and not in all

cases on national level. Thus, the development of quality policies is a new experience for the development of which the collaboration could have a positive impact.

Both parties want to give an identity to their higher education. Europe wants to create the European Higher education Area, which will overcome the national systems and the complexity of the different educational environments. A similar condition is happening in Australia. Even if the fact that the one nation with one language has significant advantages Australia appears to request for a new Australian identity in its educational system which will go beyond the existing passive mixture of characteristics of British and American higher education system. Under these circumstances, the question of identity of the education system is defined as one interesting common issue.

Last but not least, both parties wish to become more attractive to the international competition in higher education and innovation production. Australia is very attractive to the East and South Asian Countries with big populations, and not distinctive quality of higher education. In other words, Australia is a significant pole of attraction like Europe and for this reason is a very significant competitor in the international higher education 'market'.

4. Possibilities for further collaboration

The perspective of collaboration between Australia and the European Union responds to a necessity, which is emerging from the academic as well as from the political level.

As to the academic level, this collaboration could offer interesting insights into the reform process followed by both sides. Starting from the common characteristics mentioned above, the collaboration has to investigate the possibility to establish complementarities between the two systems implemented in both sides. The possibility to redefine the orientation of the Australian system towards excellence must not be considered as impossible taking into account the fact that the future of the Council for academic learning and teaching standards is not at all clear. If the minimum can be assured by the Australian standards, there is still the need to define the maximum and in this case the Tuning project can give a solid starting point. This can develop in complementarity with the academic standards logic, which can be reformulated to become compatible with the competences concept and their indicators. This platform of collaboration will also be useful for the European part as the acceptance level of the tuning competences indicators can easily be described as minimum acceptable also useful for the European debate on academic quality.

On the political level the close collaboration between Australia and Europe appears more than necessary, as both sides want to know how each competitor organizes the system of higher education. The closer the two systems, the better the knowledge about the other, the better the management of the competition and the development of the strategies to attract students.

The delegation's visit created a positive momentum, which gives promising hints for a successful continuation.

Appendix 2:

Programme of Site Visit Tuning Experts' Group

Australia 14-18 February 2011

TUNING AUSTRALIA PROJECT

Site visit of a European Tuning delegation to Higher Education institutions and experts in Australia - Date: 14-18 February 2011

Delegation:

Robert Wagenaar, EU Coordinator, University of Groningen (NL)

Julia Gonzalez, University of Deusto (ES)

Ann Katherine Isaacs, Università degli Studi di Pisa (IT)

Constantine Spiridonidis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (EL)

Jeremy Cox, Chief Executive of the European Association of Conservatoires, Utrecht (NL)

12/13th February

Sat/Sun Arrival of members of the European Delegation – see Annex 1

14 February:

Monday

0900 Taxi to Australian Learning & Training Council (ALTC)

0930-1630 Australian Learning & Training Council (ALTC)
Level 14, 300 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010
Contact: Dr Adam Morgan, Senior Project Officer
TEL: +61 2 8667 8524
MOB: 0407 332 708
Rachael Johnston – 02 8667 8545

1630 Return to hotel and collect bags

1830 Taxi to airport

2000 QF 0487 Depart Sydney – Arrive Melbourne 2135

15 February

Tuesday The University of Melbourne, School of Engineering
Contact Person: Roger Hadgraft
TEL: +61 3 8344 1303
MOB: 0412 809 597
E: roger.hadgraft@unimelb.edu.au

0900-1230 Free time

1230-1330 Meet Roger Hadgraft in the lobby of Stamford Hotel for lunch
Walk to Carlton

1400-1600 Melbourne School of Education
Venue: The Frank Tate Room, Level 9, 100 Leicester Street, Carlton

1930 Dinner TBA

16 February

Wednesday

0900-1130 Australian Universities Quality Agency
Level 10, 123 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, VIC 3000
TEL: +61 3 9664 1000

1200-1230 Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER)
19 Prospect Hill Road (Private Bag 55)
Camberwell, Victoria, 3124, Australia
(Includes lunch)

1430-1600 Meeting with Professor Marnie Hughes-Warrington Pro Vice-Chancellor
(Learning and Teaching), Monash University
Venue for meeting: ACER – as above.

1630 Taxi to airport

1905 QF0634 Depart Melbourne Arrive Brisbane 2015
(Note one hour time difference)

17th February

Thursday

1000-1630 Queensland University of Technology (QUT)
U214 Council Room, Gardens Point Campus, George St, Brisbane
Contact: Susan Savage, Discipline Scholar ALTC
Email: s.savage@qut.edu.au Tel: (07) 3138 4070; M: 0416 137 578
or Kirsten Roberts Email: K2.Roberts@qut.edu.au

1000 Convene, welcome and introductions

1015 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars, QUT's Assistant Deans Teaching
and Learning and Professors Suzi Vaughan and Stephen Towers (QUT Office of
Teaching Quality)

1100 Business Discipline "Assurance of Learning". Professor Lyn Simpson (Lyn will
describe the QUT Business School's systematic implementation of course
learning outcomes).

1200 Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, QUT Vice-Chancellor and Chair Universities
Australia (session includes lunch), Professor Michael Lavarch? (Law Deans)

1330 Professor Martin Betts (Chair ADBED, Councillor ACED), Professor Ian Cameron
(Joint Discipline Scholar Engineering ICT), Professor Michael Lavarch (Law
Deans)

- 1430 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars – Prof Amanda Henderson, Prof Sue Savage, Prof Ian Cameron, and Professor Huib Schippers (Director Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc), Dr Don Lebler (Deputy Director –Learning and Teaching, Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc) and Professor Paul Draper (Deputy Director – Research Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc)
- 1630 Close
- 1700 Taxi to airport –30-50 minutes depending on traffic
- 1905 QF0959 Depart Brisbane Arrive Canberra 2155
Taxi to hotel

18 February

Friday

- 0930 Meet Lynne Hunter in Lobby of Hotel – walk to DEEWR (about 20 minutes)
- 1000-1200 Australian Government Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) University Avenue, Canberra 2601
Contact person: Steve Nerlich, Director, Research, Analysis and Europe Unit, International Strategy Branch
Tel: (61 2) 62409386; Fax (61 2) 6123 6449; MOB: 0434 650438
Also contact: Heather Gregory (DEEWR)
Lynne Hunter, EU Delegation Tel: 62712742; MOB: 0418486018
See Annex 4 for detailed agenda.
- 1200 Walk with Lynne Hunter to ANU
- 1230-1400 Lunch hosted by ANU Quality & Standard's Committee
- 1415-1530 Round Table – including Assistant Deans Education from Colleges and senior people from University of Canberra.
Contact: Dennis Alexander PhD, Executive Officer, Quality & Alliances, Office of the Vice-Chancellor, Australian National University email: dennis.alexander@anu.edu.au; ph: 6125 7081
- 1530-1700 Free time
- 1700 Taxi to Airport – takes about 15-20 minutes depending on traffic
- 1830 QF0806 Depart Canberra Arrive Sydney 1925
Taxi to Hotel

19 February

Saturday

Departure of Mr. Jeremy Cox, Mrs Julia Gonzalez, Mrs. Anne Katherine Isaacs, Mr. Robert Wagenaar

20 February

Sunday

Departure of Mr Constantin Spiridonidis and family

ANNEX 1

Tuning Australia: Arrival and departure places, dates and times of European delegation

Name	Date and time of arrival in Sydney	Date and time of departure from Sydney
Mr. Jeremy COX	13 FEB 06:50; BA0015	19 FEB 16:25; BA0016
Mrs. Julia GONZALEZ	13 FEB 06:50; QF 0320	19 FEB 16.25; QF 0319
Mrs. Ann Katherine ISAACS	12 FEB 20:20; SQ0211	19 FEB 18:50; SQ 0242
Mr. Constantin SPIRIDONIDIS*	8 FEB 22:30	20 FEB ?
Mr. Robert WAGENAAR	13 FEB09:35; KL 4105	19 FEB, 15:40; KL 4104

* Mr. Spiridonidis travels with his family and has arranged his own flights and his own accommodation until the departure on Monday the 14th to Melbourne

Date	Flight	Place of Departure	Place of Arrival	Dep time	Arr. time
14FEB	QF 0487	Sydney	Melbourne	20:00	21:35
16FEB	QF 0634	Melbourne	Brisbane	19:05	20:15
17FEB	QF 0959	Brisbane	Canberra	19:05	21:55
18FEB	QF 0806	Canberra	Sydney	18:30	19:25

ANNEX 2

EU-Australia Tuning Pilot Project: Sydney Meeting
9.30 am – 3.00 pm, Monday 14 February 2011 ALTC Boardroom, Level 14, 300 Elizabeth Street, Surry Hills

Agenda:

9.30 Meet and greet/coffee

10.00 Welcome and introductions – Dr Carol Nicoll/Prof. Christine Ewan

10.15 Presentations by EU Tuning Expert Travelling Group and discussion

11.15 Short break

11.30 Presentations by LTAS team and invited guests and discussion

12.30 Lunch

1.15 Discussion of key issues arising from presentations and 'where to from here' (eg assessment, implementation, maintenance)

3.00 Close of formal proceedings – opportunities for informal discussion

Attendees:

Robert Wagenaar, Tuning Project General Co-ordinator, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Julia Gonzalez, University of Deusto (ES)

Ann Katherine Isaacs, Università degli Studi di Pisa (IT)

Constantin Spiridonidis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (EL)

Jeremy Cox, European Association of Conservatoires, Utrecht, The Netherlands

Carol Nicoll, ALTC Chief Executive Officer

Christine Ewan, ALTC LTAS Project Director

Mark Freeman, Discipline Scholar: Business, Management and Economics, University of Sydney

Sidney Newton, Discipline Scholar: Building, University of New South Wales

Sean Brawley, University of New South Wales

Geoff Scott, University of Western Sydney (by teleconference)

Jacquelyn Cranney, University of New South Wales

Les Kirkup, University of Technology, Sydney

Marie Carroll, University of Sydney

Ian Maxwell, University of Sydney

Simon Barrie, University of Sydney

Charlotte Taylor, University of Sydney

Heather Monkhouse, University of Tasmania

Keith Willey, University of Technology, Sydney

ANNEX 3

**Tuning Australia Pilot Project's European Delegation Visit
U214 Council Room²,
Queensland University of Technology, Gardens Point Campus, George St, Brisbane
Thursday 17 February 2011, 10am – 4.30pm**

Attendees

Tuning Delegation:

Dr Robert Wagenaar, EU co-ordinator, University of Groningen (NL)
Dr Julia Gonzalez, University of Deusto (ES)
Dr Ann Katherine Isaacs, Università degli Studi di Pisa (IT)
Dr Constantin Spiridonidis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (EL)
Dr Jeremy Cox, Royal College of Music, London (UK)

Australian Learning and Teaching Discipline Scholars

Professor Susan Savage, Discipline Scholar Architecture, QUT
Professor Ian Cameron, Discipline Scholar Engineering, University of Queensland
Professor Amanda Henderson, Discipline Scholar Health Medicine and Veterinary Science

Guests

Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, Vice-Chancellor QUT and Chair Universities Australia
Professor Martin Betts, Executive Dean Faculty of Built Environment and Engineering QUT,
Chair Australian Deans of Built Environment and Design, Councillor Australian Council of
Engineering Deans
Professor Michael Lavarch (tbc), Executive Dean Faculty of Law, QUT. Chair Australian
Council of Law Deans
Professor Suzi Vaughan, DVC Learning and Teaching, QUT (tbc)
Professor Stephen Towers, Dean of Studies, QUT (tbc)
Queensland Conservatorium of Music (Professor Huib Schippers, Director Queensland
Conservatorium; Dr Don Lebler, Deputy Director – Learning and Teaching, Queensland
Conservatorium and Professor Paul Draper, Deputy Director – Research, Queensland
Conservatorium)(tbc)
Assistant Deans Teaching and Learning, QUT (Professor Lyn Simpson, Business; Associate
Professor Melinda Shirley, Law; Professor Sylvia Edwards, Science and Technology,
Professor Robyn Nash, Health; Professor Nan Bahr, Education; Associate Professor
Christina Hong-Joe, Creative Industries)(tbc)

² U214 can be accessed from the QUT Main Drive which is an extension of George St, Brisbane. Proceed past Parliament House on the corner of Alice and George Streets and through the main gates of QUT. U Block is the third building on the right. Proceed up the main stair through the entry hall and turn left. U214 is on the left.

Agenda

1000 Convene, welcome and introductions

1015 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars, QUT's Assistant Deans Teaching and Learning and Professors Suzi Vaughan and Stephen Towers (QUT Office of Teaching Quality)

1100 Business Discipline "Assurance of Learning". Professor Lyn Simpson (Lyn will describe the QUT Business School's systematic implementation of course learning outcomes).

1200 Professor Peter Coaldrake AO, QUT Vice-Chancellor and Chair Universities Australia (session includes lunch), Professor Michael Lavarch? (Law Deans)

1330 Professor Martin Betts (Chair ADBED, Councillor ACED), Professor Ian Cameron (Joint Discipline Scholar Engineering ICT), Professor Michael Lavarch? (Law Deans)

1430 Discussion with Australian Discipline Scholars – Prof Amanda Henderson, Prof Sue Savage, Prof Ian Cameron, and Professor Huib Schippers (Director Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc), Dr Don Lebler (Deputy Director –Learning and Teaching, Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc) and Professor Paul Draper (Deputy Director – Research Queensland Conservatorium)(tbc)

1630 Close

ANNEX 4

AGENDA TUNING AUSTRALIA PROJECT - VISIT OF EU DELEGATION TO AUSTRALIA Large Meeting Room, Ground Floor, DEEWR, 50 Marcus Clarke Street, Civic Friday 18 February 2011

1000-1010	Welcome	Di Weddell Manager International Strategy Branch
1010-1030	Tuning Pilot project overview / progress questions/discussion	Robert Wagenaar EU Coordinator
1030-1100	Australian Qualifications Framework questions/discussion	Catherine Vandermark Manager Quality Branch
1100-1115	Morning tea	International Group
1110-1130	Quality standards questions/discussion	Lisa Schofield Branch Manager TEQSA Branch
1130-1200	Next steps for the Tuning Pilot project	Group discussion

EU Attendees	Robert Wagenaar Julia Gonzalez Ann Katherine Isaacs Constantine Spiridonidis Jeremy Coz Lynne Hunter	EU Coordinator, University of Groningen (Netherlands) University of Deusto, Spain Universita degli Studi di Pisa, Italy Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece Chief Executive of the European Association of Conservatoirs, Utrecht, Netherlands Delegation of the EU to Australia and New Zealand
DEEWR attendees	Jan Rees, Jeremy Hodes Claire Atkinson Heather Gregory Sylvia Schmidt Steve Nerlich Richard Wade	Director, Qualifications Framework Section Assistant Director, Qualifications Framework Section Director, Quality Assurance Unit Assistant Director, Quality Assurance Unit Assistant Director, Quality Assurance Unit Director, Research, Evaluation and Europe Section Assistant Director (A/g), Research, Evaluation and Europe Section
ALTC	Professor Christine Ewan	ALTC representative