

In 2011, the pilot of the [University Experience Survey](#) (UES) was conducted by the Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER). The UES was jointly developed by [ACER](#), the Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) and the Griffith Institute for Higher Education (GIHE) for the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). The pilot was conducted to develop the survey instrument and methods.

Three broad concepts are measured by the UES:

Learner Engagement: the extent that students engage with their studies

Teaching and Support: students' judgements on the quality of provision

Educational Development: student self-reports on learning and skill development

The UES was administered during August and September to 148,197 first and later year undergraduate students currently enrolled in one of 24 Australian Table A universities and representing 405,742 undergraduate students.

- The overall response rate of 13.2 per cent yielded more than enough data for the purposes of the UES pilot.
- The institutional response rates varied from 6.0 per cent to 21.3 per cent.
- A greater proportion of first year students that were sampled participated in the survey (20.3%) compared with later year students (13.1%).
- As is typically the case, Female students were somewhat more likely to participate in the survey (15.0%) than male students (10.7%).

Each participating institute was supplied with a specific report of their survey outcomes – with the results of other institutions de-identified.

A fully de-identified report of the UES development and pilot was also published.

<http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Policy/Pages/UniversityExperienceSurvey.aspx>

It must be stressed that the purpose of the 2011 UES pilot was not to generate baseline data or even generate large response yields from each institution. But it does give grounds for contemplation. The government has now committed to further development of the UES and indeed the CEQ.

Computing and Information Systems “Contemplation”

The table over page shows where various fields of education (FoEs) ranked out of the 44 FoEs used in the survey for the cohorts and the broad concepts surveyed. Averaging the rankings, Computing and Information Systems marginally did better than only two others, namely, Accounting which ranked slightly worse across the first year cohort and Engineering – other which was the “leftover” engineering, 5 other engineering fields of education performed better. Generally it was the more business related FoEs that ranked as low as Computing and Information Systems. Computing and Information Systems probably showed the most consistently poor ranking across final year cohort.

	Learner Engagement		Teaching and Support		Educational Development			
	first	final	first	final	first	final	total	average
Biological Sciences	15	15	7	9	4	12	62	10
Natural & Physical Sciences	28	27	15	11	31	17	129	22
Engineering - Civil	7	6	43	20	41	25	142	24
Engineering - Process & Resources	26	10	26	35	20	40	157	26
Mathematics	38	29	9	16	44	27	163	27
Engineering - Electrical & Electronic	18	9	39	42	36	38	182	30
Business Management	30	31	28	32	30	33	184	31
Engineering - Mechanical	11	26	42	43	28	36	186	31
Engineering - Aerospace	16	20	37	38	38	41	190	32
Economics	25	23	44	33	42	31	198	33
Management & Commerce - Other	36	36	30	30	40	35	207	35
Computing & Information Systems	24	38	34	41	33	44	214	36
Accounting	29	34	38	36	43	43	223	37
Engineering - Other	40	42	40	44	37	42	245	41