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Retention

- The never ending issue of retention of students upon enrolment
- Is retention a greater issue for private providers compared with universities?

Selection in a private HEP

- What is the reputation of private providers in the higher education sector in Australia?
- Accept anyone and everyone regardless of ability or aptitude?
- What about entry into an accredited course with necessary standards of quality of selection and of delivery?
- What results from the role of TEQSA in the establishment of standards of selection of students enrolled in the course?
- How does one ensure adequate retention rates through the course to satisfy receipt of a quality rating either by TEQSA or in the Good Universities Guide?

Selection in a private HEP

- Australian College of Applied Psychology a provider of higher education for thirty years
- Member of the Navitas group, a high quality educational establishment, listed in the top 100 companies in the ASX
- Psychological Sciences program accredited by the Australian Psychology Accreditation Council in 2010 to deliver a three year undergraduate program commencing in 2011.
- Cannot afford a poor reputation for quality and retention in a business sense

Selection into Bachelor of Psychological Science

Two modes of entry into Bachelor of Psychological Science

- School Leaver: based upon minimum entry ATAR score of 65
- Mature Age and School Leaver with ATAR < 65:

  - Two stage process;
    - Submission of 500 word statement about what they believed the study of psychology to entail and why they wished to do psychology
    - Telephone interview
Psychology Selection

- Decision was taken to use the provision of a 500 word statement
- Increase awareness of students of the nature of an accredited psychology course
- Quantify this process to enable validation of the process against later performance of students
- Enable the possible eventual development of selection cut-offs to allow the exclusion of applicants on clear criteria
- A particular benefit of this pilot scheme was that no student could be rejected on the basis of the data obtained. We have a full sample in the unit of all students who have applied, with their performance outcomes, and not only those who may have been selected according to the set criteria.

Selection

Initial statements rated on 4 scales

Clarity: Ability to make clear understanding of the knowledge skills needed for completion of a Psychology degree and the nature of psychological science taught in the degree
Goals: Depiction of the goals towards which the degree will lead
Differentiation: Ability to distinguish between training in psychology and related fields such as counselling
Fluency/literacy: Evidence of writing ability and clarity of expression.

Rated independently by two raters on the four x three point scales;
Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Good/Excellent

Selection

Three questions posed to each candidate initially;
- Please summarise your previously submitted statement and perhaps expand upon it if you wish;
  - Included as a possible check on possibility that the statement had been written by someone other than the student
- "Psychology requires the development of skills in the acquisition of evidence upon which to make decisions and actions, including statistical techniques. Do you think that you will be able and equipped to develop skills in this area?
  - Included to alert the student to the fact that a large proportion of the degree curriculum is concerned with data analysis and this may be incongruent with expectations of the student as to what constitutes psychological science.
- What are your goals after completion of the three year sequence?
  - Designed to alert student to the long process to become a registered psychologist

Selection

- Each candidate rated on five point scales on answers to each of the three questions plus a rating on Clarity of Responses
  - Very poor poor neutral good excellent
Data analysis: Reliability

- Internal consistency of ratings of statements
- Item/total correlations for both raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater #1/#2</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60/.76</td>
<td>.81/.84</td>
<td>.58/.59</td>
<td>.82/.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74/.77</td>
<td>.67/.59</td>
<td>.89/.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60/.53</td>
<td>.90/.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82/.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis: Reliability

- Internal consistency of ratings of interview responses
- Item/total correlations for both raters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rater #1/#2</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.65/.67</td>
<td>.55/.70</td>
<td>.63/.82</td>
<td>.82/.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.60/.65</td>
<td>.74/.71</td>
<td>.86/.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.68/.75</td>
<td>.81/.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90/.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inter-Rater Consistency

- Mean Ratings of Statements $r = .77$
- Mean Ratings of interviews $r = .75$

Do these tools have any predictive value?

Measures of Performance

- Non-enrolment in the course: Difference between enquiry and eventual enrolment
- Early withdrawal from a unit
  - Coded according to whether they completed both assignments (due by week 6) or withdrew before completion of both
- Performance on the first and second assignment
  - A measure of early performance in a unit
- Examination Performance
  - Measure of performance on a multiple choice examination
  - Measure of performance in non-Psychology elective units

Enrolment versus non-Enrolment in Course

- Candidates who did not pursue their enquiry about the course into an enrolment in the first year units after interviews were rated significantly more poorly on both the statements and the interview performance than those who did enrol.
Predictions of early withdrawal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement Ratings</th>
<th>Interview Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation with Withdrawal</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prediction of Performance on Assignments

Prediction of Psychology Exam Performance

Prediction of Non Psychology Exam Performance

Psychology and non Psychology Performance

Summary

- Ratings of both statements and interviews can be reliably achieved
- Ratings predict non-transfer of enquiry into enrolment
- Interview ratings that indicate likely poor performance predict early withdrawal from the unit
- Ratings predict performance
  - Interview ratings predict performance in the assignments and examinations
  - Measures predict performance in non-psychology elective units
  - Statements and interviews are specific to psychology but performance generalises to non-psychology performance
Commentary

- Reliability and predictive validity can be achieved
- Ratings of statements and of interview performance make separate predictions of eventual performance
- Data may be used to help advise students and to help them choose alternate programs of study
- Data enables students who may be especially at risk to be identified and to be provided with learning support
- Process provides a version of a passive selection device with differential student translation from enquiry into enrolment predicted by statement and interview performance

Financial consequences

- 25% of students in initial enrolment in first year psychology fail (mainly due to failure to complete all assignments)
- Interview results in 25% of inquiries not translated into enrolments
- Interviews predict 10% of enrolments not to be completed
- Interviews predict the majority of students not likely to proceed
- Potential loss of revenue of approximately 75-100 modules per annum
- Saving of reputation, costs of provision of learning support and staff time to enhance student experience of successful students