



NCSEHE

National Centre for Student
Equity in Higher Education



Curtin University

STUDENT EQUITY PERFORMANCE IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

2008 to 2015

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by Paul Koshy of the National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE) at Curtin University.

The author would like to acknowledge staff of the NCSEHE for their comments and assistance in the production of this publication and extend thanks to the Australian Government Department of Education and Training for the provision of student equity data and comments on an earlier draft. Any remaining errors or omissions are the responsibility of the author.

All analysis included here reflects the work of the author and does not necessarily reflect the views of the NCSEHE or the Australian Government Department of Education and Training.

This report may be cited as: Koshy, P. (2016). *Student Equity Performance in Australian Higher Education: 2008 to 2015*. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE), Perth: Curtin University.

Copyright ownership of this material resides with the NCSEHE.

ISBN: 978-0-9945375-3-90.

National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education

The National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE) is funded by the Australian Government Department of Education and Training, and is hosted at Curtin University. The objectives of the NCSEHE are:

- to be at the centre of public policy dialogue about equity in Higher Education; and
- to 'close the gap' between equity policy, research and practice by:
 - o supporting and informing evaluation of current equity practice with a particular focus on identifying good practice;
 - o identifying innovative approaches to equity through existing research and the development of a forward research program to fill gaps in knowledge; and
 - o translating these learnings into practical advice for decision makers and practitioners alike.

Whilst the NCSEHE's focus is equity in higher education, the work of the NCSEHE is not limited to the issue of low-SES participation; rather it focuses on equity issues as they relate to a range of marginalised and/or disadvantaged groups in Australia.

For further information on the NCSEHE, please visit ncsehe.edu.au

Introduction

This NCSEHE Briefing Note provides an update on **domestic undergraduate** student enrolment and equity outcomes from 2008 to 2015, following Koshy and Seymour (2015). In keeping with the earlier editions of this series, the briefing note focuses on undergraduate outcomes for Table A providers. It provides a guide to trends across equity groups during this period, which included substantial changes to Australian higher education, including the introduction of the demand driven system for enrolments and the Higher Education Participation and Partnerships Programme (HEPPP) to support low SES undergraduate enrolments.

The briefing note reports domestic undergraduate enrolments between 2008 and 2015 in the 38 'Table A providers' in Australian higher education and enrolments in seven equity groups:

- Low Socio-Economic Status ('low SES') students;
- Students with Disability;
- Indigenous Students;
- Women in Non-Traditional Areas (WINTA);
- Regional Students;
- Remote Students; and
- Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) students (also referred to as 'Culturally and Linguistically Diverse' or 'CALD' students).

The reported statistics for each equity group are comparable with previous releases, with the exception of WINTA enrolment shares, which were previously calculated on the basis of total university enrolment but are now reported as a share of total enrolment in the WINTA fields of education.

In addition, in the case of three indicators – low SES, regional students, and remote students – the note reports historic measures for participation for the period 2008 to 2015. The measures since 2011 are the SEIFA classification of SA1 areas for low SES status, which replaces the SEIFA postcode measure, and the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) classification for regional and remote areas which replaces the classification developed by the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA). It is envisaged that these measures will be the central focus of reporting on participation among students in these equity groups in the future. This note includes reporting of the SA1 measure for low SES status.

In each equity group, results are reported for the national system in total, by institutional groupings, by state and territory, and by regional or metropolitan status, for each year. All reporting is for domestic undergraduates in each given year. The institutional groupings (Table A only) in 2015 were as follows:

- **The Group of Eight:** Australian National University (ANU), Melbourne, Monash, Sydney, New South Wales (UNSW), Queensland (UQ), Western Australia (UWA), and Adelaide.
- **The Australian Technology Network (ATN):** Curtin University, University of Technology, Sydney (UTS), RMIT University (RMIT), Queensland University of Technology (QUT), and University of South Australia (UniSA).
- **The Innovative Research Universities (IRU):** Murdoch, Flinders, Griffith, James Cook (JCU), La Trobe, Charles Darwin University (CDU) and Newcastle. (Newcastle left the IRU in December 2014, but is still reported with IRU in 2015 here, for the purpose of comparability. Next year's report will reflect this change fully).
- **Regional Universities Network (RUN):** Southern Cross, New England (UNE), Federation, Sunshine Coast (USC), CQUniversity Australia (CQU), and Southern Queensland (USQ).

- **The Unaligned Universities (Other Table A providers):** Macquarie, Wollongong, Deakin, Charles Sturt (CSU), Tasmania, Australian Catholic University (ACU), Canberra, Edith Cowan University (ECU), Swinburne, Victoria, Western Sydney (WSU) and The Batchelor Institute (Batchelor) (Note: Batchelor and CDU entered into a collaborative partnership in 2012 which has seen CDU take delivery of most undergraduate programs.)

In addition, an analysis is reported for universities on the basis of their campus location and infrastructure:

- **Regionally Headquartered:** Institutions headquartered in the regions – USC, Southern Cross, UNE, Federation, CQU, JCU, USQ, Tasmania, CDU, and Batchelor.
- **Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses:** Institutions with one or more regional campus – Newcastle, Sydney, Wollongong, Deakin, La Trobe, Melbourne, QUT, UQ, CSU, Curtin, ECU, Murdoch, UWA, Flinders, Adelaide, UniSA, and ACU.
- **No Regional Campus:** Metropolitan institutions with no regional campus: ANU, UNSW, Griffith, Macquarie, Canberra, Swinburne, Victoria, RMIT, Monash (transferred Gippsland to Federation in January 2014), and WSU.

It should be noted that two universities – RMIT and Monash – have now moved classification from “Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses” to “No Regional Campus” from 2014 onwards.

All student data reported or derived for the purposes of this document are sourced from *Students: Selected Higher Education Statistics 2015* (Appendix 2: Equity Data), published by the Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Total Undergraduate Enrolment: 2008 to 2015

Undergraduate enrolment among Table A providers increased by 34.7% between 2008 and 2015 to 717,195 students. In effect, the undergraduate system has expanded by over one third since 2008. However, this growth was unevenly distributed across the sector, with the 'Unaligned Group' of newer universities witnessing a 57.7% expansion in places, while the Group of Eight saw lower growth of just 14.9%. Universities in the regions grew less quickly than those based in metropolitan areas (36.6% compared to 41.9% for those with "No Regional Campus"). New South Wales (27.1% growth from 2008) and Queensland (32.4%) recorded growth under the national average, while Victoria saw substantial growth of 38.9%, and Western Australia (30.0%), the Northern Territory (46.0%) and Tasmania (85.5%) saw the greatest expansion to 2015.

Table 1: Domestic Undergraduate Enrolments, Higher Education, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Growth (08-15) %
National	532,527	553,374	580,372	600,412	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	34.7%
Group of Eight ^a	148,484	152,718	157,289	159,749	163,643	168,682	171,691	170,665	14.9%
ATN	95,520	97,467	99,423	102,097	109,302	115,712	121,499	125,565	31.5%
IRU ^b	89,480	93,518	98,191	100,849	106,050	110,622	113,887	115,408	29.0%
RUN	47,782	49,716	51,627	54,072	57,295	60,188	62,884	66,977	40.2%
Unaligned Group	151,261	159,955	173,842	183,645	198,144	213,461	225,908	238,580	57.7%
Regionally Headquartered	88,873	92,109	97,115	99,752	105,739	110,879	115,458	121,368	36.6%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	309,942	320,711	333,902	345,675	363,823	381,355	338,770	344,797	29.3%
No Regional Campuses ^c	133,712	140,554	149,355	154,985	164,872	176,431	241,641	251,103	41.9%
New South Wales	170,055	177,540	185,704	191,504	198,720	205,852	210,805	216,224	27.1%
Victoria	126,444	128,467	134,030	138,037	147,157	159,394	168,338	175,660	38.9%
Queensland	104,966	109,415	114,602	118,218	124,619	130,586	134,945	138,937	32.4%
Western Australia	52,367	55,201	58,311	60,740	65,231	68,164	70,015	68,095	30.0%
South Australia	38,970	40,203	41,669	43,227	45,169	46,605	48,103	48,869	25.4%
Tasmania	12,108	12,612	13,160	13,061	14,990	16,914	19,548	22,460	85.5%
Northern Territory	4,469	4,865	5,243	5,213	5,609	5,958	6,325	6,525	46.0%
Australian Capital Territory	14,094	14,734	15,776	16,403	17,141	17,642	18,046	18,537	31.5%
Multi-State ^d	9,054	10,337	11,877	14,009	15,798	17,550	19,744	21,888	141.7%

Note: a. Please see Pages 2-3 for a discussion of these groups and the regional classifications; b. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability; c. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards. d. The Australian Catholic University is the Multi-State institution.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Student Equity Group Definitions

This report specifically focusses on the following designated groups of under-represented students, originally designated in *A Fair Chance for All* (DEET, 1990) and formally defined in the Martin Review (Martin 1994), namely:

- **Low Socio-Economic Status (SES) students:** Socio-economic status (SES) is assigned to students on the basis of the socio-economic status of the ABS statistical area (SA1) or postcode in which they reside. All SA1/postcode areas are ranked on the basis of ABS estimates of the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA) of Education and Occupation, calculated using 2006 census data. Low SES students come from the bottom 25% of Australian SA1s (with a postcode backup) in a national ranking. For historical comparability, this report defines low SES on the postcode measure, using 2006 census data, but also reports the SA1 measure, which will become the standard reporting measure for this note from next year onwards.
- **Students with Disability:** Students who self-report disability to their higher education provider, either at the time of their enrolment or during the course of their studies.
- **Indigenous Students:** Students who self-report as Indigenous to their higher education provider, either at the time of their enrolment or during the course of their studies.
- **Women in Non-Traditional Areas of Study:** Female students who are enrolled in the Natural and Physical Sciences; Information Technology; Engineering and Related Technologies; Architecture and Building; Agriculture, Environmental and Related Studies; Management and Commerce; and the narrow field of education (Economics and Econometrics).
- **Students from Regional Areas:** Regional students are defined as having a permanent home address in an SA1/postcode area that is classified as remote using historic MCEETYA classifications and the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS).
- **Students from Remote Areas:** Remote students are defined as having a permanent home address in an SA1/postcode area that is classified as remote using historic MCEETYA classifications and the ASGS.
- **Students from a Non-English Speaking Background (NESB):** A student is classified as coming from a non-English speaking background if they are a domestic student who arrived in Australia less than 10 years prior to the year in which the data were collected, and who comes from a country where a language other than English is spoken. (Also referred to as students from 'culturally and linguistically diverse' backgrounds or 'CALD students'.)

Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

For the most part, equity group enrolments have been expanding at a rate greater than overall **domestic undergraduate** enrolments since 2008. The low SES group has seen growth of 50.4% to 2015, compared with 34.7% in overall enrolments over this period. By contrast, students with disability (88.6%) and Indigenous students (72.1%) saw markedly faster rates of growth. The WINTA (21.5%) and Remote (21.5%) groups both witnessed slower growth in student numbers compared to total domestic undergraduate enrolments.

Table 2: Domestic Undergraduate Enrolments, Higher Education, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Growth (08-15) %
National	532,527	553,374	580,372	600,412	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	34.7%
Low SES	86,581	90,447	96,706	102,163	109,788	118,003	124,429	130,246	50.4%
Students with Disability	23,447	24,948	28,057	30,094	33,220	36,486	40,087	44,210	88.6%
Indigenous	6,820	7,296	7,943	8,445	9,005	9,939	10,850	11,739	72.1%
WINTA	103,120	105,438	107,959	109,936	114,382	119,105	123,544	125,241	21.5%
Regional	101,339	104,266	110,646	115,250	121,476	127,070	131,385	134,847	33.1%
Remote	5,240	5,368	5,532	5,572	5,804	6,069	6,303	6,365	21.5%
NESB	17,222	17,649	18,227	19,226	21,289	22,863	25,114	26,647	54.7%

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Low SES students continued to see an increase in their share of enrolments (using the historic postcode measure). In 2015, low SES students accounted for 18.2% of undergraduate enrolments, up from 16.3% in 2008. Students with disability (6.2%), Indigenous students (1.6%) and NESB students (3.7%) have all seen increases in their student share over this period as well. Regional (18.8%) and Remote students (0.9%) have seen declining shares of enrolment since 2008, with Regional students' share of enrolment seemingly peaking at 19.2% in 2011. The WINTA enrolment share is the female share of enrolment in 'non-traditional' fields of education (see p. 5). On this measure, there has been a modest decline in the WINTA enrolment share.

Table 3: Student Equity Enrolment Proportions, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
Low SES	16.3%	16.3%	16.7%	17.0%	17.3%	17.6%	17.9%	18.2%
Students with Disability	4.4%	4.5%	4.8%	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%
Indigenous	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%
WINTA ^a	42.2%	41.9%	41.6%	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%
Regional	19.0%	18.8%	19.1%	19.2%	19.1%	19.0%	18.9%	18.8%
Remote	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
NESB	3.2%	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%

Note: a. WINTA percentage is the female share of total enrolments in non-traditional areas.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Low SES Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

Low SES students are defined according to the socio-economic status of the area in which their permanent residence is located. This area measure is determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics' (ABS) SEIFA measure of educational and occupational advantage, calculated using census data for the *statistical area*, be it a postcode or SA1 area. All areas across Australia are ranked on the basis of their average SEIFA index score, with those containing the lowest 25% of households on this ranking being classified as low SES areas. For the sake of consistency, we report the 2006 SEIFA *postcode* measure of SES below.

Under the area definition, an 'equal share' of enrolment for low SES students in Australia is 25%. Historically, the low SES share has been lower than this, at around 16.1 to 16.4% over much of the past two decades. However, since 2009, the national share of low SES students in Table A higher education enrolments has increased above this rate, reaching 18.2% in 2015.

Underlying this result is a disparity in outcomes across the institutional groupings, in 2015 ranging from an 11.0% share for the Group of Eight to 29.9% for the RUN institutions. The Group of Eight institutions appear to have seen limited growth in their low SES enrolment shares over the past three years in comparison with other institutional groupings.

Similarly, an examination of trends among institutions on the basis of their geographical location indicates that metropolitan-based institutions have seen an increase in their share of low SES enrolments – 14.7% in 2015 compared to 12.9% in 2008 for institutions with no regional campuses – in comparison with regionally headquartered institutions (28.6% of 2015 enrolments), although clearly regional universities have generally larger numbers of disadvantaged students than their metropolitan counterparts.

Table 4a: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, By Institutional Groupings, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – Low SES	16.3%	16.3%	16.7%	17.0%	17.3%	17.6%	17.9%	18.2%
Group of Eight	9.9%	9.8%	10.0%	10.6%	10.6%	11.1%	11.0%	11.0%
ATN	14.7%	14.8%	15.3%	15.4%	16.0%	16.1%	16.4%	16.7%
IRU ^a	19.4%	19.4%	19.7%	20.1%	20.5%	21.2%	21.7%	22.0%
RUN	29.0%	29.3%	29.6%	29.8%	30.0%	29.8%	29.8%	29.9%
Unaligned Group	17.6%	17.7%	17.9%	18.1%	18.2%	18.4%	18.6%	19.7%
Regionally Headquartered	27.3%	27.6%	27.9%	28.1%	28.4%	28.4%	28.6%	28.6%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	14.6%	14.6%	14.8%	15.2%	15.6%	15.9%	16.5%	16.8%
No Regional Campus ^b	12.9%	12.9%	13.5%	13.9%	14.0%	14.7%	14.7%	14.9%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Low SES Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015 (cont'd)

The variation in low SES enrolments across institutional groups is also reflected in state rankings, and largely due to differences in low SES population share across the states on the basis of a national ranking of areas (postcodes, collection districts or SA1 areas). This can be seen in a comparison of the percentage share of each state and territories' population that is classified as living in a low SES SA1 area on the basis of a national ranking using SEIFA data from the 2006 and 2011 Census results. Estimates of low SES shares vary across jurisdictions. For instance, in 2011, using this measure, around 45.6% of Tasmania's population lived in a low SES SA1 area compared to just 0.2% in the Australian Capital Territory.

Table 4b: Low SES Population Share by State, National Ranking of SA1 Areas (2006 and 2011 census estimates).

	2006 Census	2011 Census
New South Wales	23.5%	24.6%
Victoria	19.9%	20.6%
Queensland	30.5%	29.9%
Western Australia	19.8%	22.7%
South Australia	35.7%	30.7%
Tasmania	54.1%	45.6%
Northern Territory	26.4%	23.0%
Australian Capital Territory	0.0%	0.2%

Source: ABS (2015).

Given that around 85% of Australian undergraduate students attend an institution in their home state, institutional low SES shares will in large part reflect the socio-economic conditions of their state areas, as can be seen in Table 4c (Tasmania – 31.2%; Australian Capital Territory – 5.6%).

Table 4c: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, By State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
New South Wales	16.8%	16.9%	17.4%	17.8%	17.8%	18.2%	18.1%	18.2%
Victoria	13.8%	14.0%	14.1%	14.6%	15.2%	15.7%	16.1%	16.5%
Queensland	19.4%	19.3%	19.6%	19.7%	19.9%	20.0%	20.3%	20.4%
Western Australia	11.2%	11.1%	11.2%	11.4%	12.2%	12.5%	13.1%	13.6%
South Australia	20.6%	20.8%	21.4%	22.1%	22.6%	23.4%	24.0%	24.7%
Tasmania	31.3%	31.5%	32.4%	32.8%	32.0%	31.9%	31.8%	31.2%
Northern Territory	15.5%	17.9%	19.8%	19.6%	19.3%	19.3%	18.5%	19.0%
Australian Capital Territory	4.7%	4.9%	5.6%	5.7%	5.9%	5.9%	5.7%	5.6%
Multi-State	13.0%	12.4%	12.7%	13.0%	13.3%	13.0%	12.9%	12.6%

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

The SA1 Area Measure for SES

Over the course of the past eight years, there has been an ongoing refinement of the use of the area measure for socio-economic status, culminating in the introduction of the SA1 area measure in 2012, for reporting in that year, and the announcement of the government's intention to review all equity group definitions over the next year, including the low SES measure.

The rationale for the move from postcode to SA1 area is that the smaller SA1 area reduces the incidence of misidentifying students as a consequence of focusing on their home address alone, as the larger postcode areas tend to have a broader mix of low, middle and high SES households. The use of the SA1 measure thus tends to reduce the estimate of low SES students in the system. In 2015, the SA1 identified 16% of domestic undergraduate students as low SES compared with 18.2% using the postcode measure (2006 census definition) as reported above, effectively reducing the number of low SES students by 12% or a ratio of 0.88. Table 5 shows how the use of the SA1 measure impacts on estimates of low SES enrolment shares on the basis of institutional grouping, regionality and state or territory location of the institution.

Generally, institutions with lower levels of low SES enrolment see a larger decline, with the Group of Eight seeing its estimate fall to 8.8% using the 2011 SA1 measure compared with 11.0% under the postcode measure. In general, all institutional groupings see some significant reduction in their low SES student count as a result of the shift from the postcode to the SA1 measure.

Table 5: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, By Institutional Groupings, Table A Providers, SA1 Measure, 2012-2015 and 2015 Postcode Measure

	2012 SA1	2013 SA1	2014 SA1	2015 SA1		2015 Postcode	Ratio of 2015 SA1 to Postcode
National – Low SES	15.6%	15.9%	15.8%	16.0%		18.2%	0.88
Group of Eight	8.7%	9.1%	8.9%	8.8%		11.0%	0.80
ATN	13.9%	14.0%	13.9%	14.2%		16.7%	0.85
IRU ^a	18.9%	19.3%	19.2%	19.4%		22.0%	0.88
RUN	27.6%	27.3%	26.8%	26.7%		29.9%	0.89
Unaligned Group	17.0%	17.3%	17.4%	17.5%		18.9%	0.93
Regionally Headquartered	26.4%	26.2%	26.0%	25.9%		28.6%	0.90
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	13.3%	13.6%	13.9%	14.1%		16.8%	0.84
No Regional Campus ^b	13.7%	14.4%	13.7%	13.9%		14.9%	0.93

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Students with Disability Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

The enrolment share of students with disability increased to 6.2% in 2015, rising from just 4.4% in 2008. This is commonly attributed to increasing awareness among institutions of the importance of ensuring students with disability have access and participation pathways within higher education, as well as an increase in the self-reporting of disability by students.

Institutions in regional areas and those who are unaligned in the Australian higher education system continue to report higher levels of enrolment of students with disability than is the case for metropolitan-based institutions and those attached to formal groupings. This is likely to be due to the higher rates of reported disability in regional areas (ABS 2011). There is also substantial variation among the states and territories, which may reflect the distribution of institutions across their regions, with regional universities enrolling more students with disability.

Table 6: Students with Disability Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National –Disabilities	4.4%	4.5%	4.8%	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%
Group of Eight	3.6%	3.8%	4.3%	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%	5.3%	6.0%
ATN	4.5%	4.6%	4.7%	4.7%	4.7%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%
IRU ^a	5.3%	4.9%	5.4%	5.6%	5.9%	6.2%	6.4%	6.8%
RUN	5.2%	5.4%	5.5%	5.7%	6.0%	6.8%	7.2%	7.8%
Unaligned Group	4.3%	4.7%	4.9%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	5.9%	6.1%
Regionally Headquartered	5.2%	5.4%	5.5%	5.7%	5.9%	6.5%	6.7%	7.0%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	4.5%	4.6%	5.1%	5.3%	5.5%	5.6%	6.1%	6.6%
No Regional Campus ^b	3.7%	3.7%	3.8%	4.0%	4.3%	4.4%	4.8%	5.2%
New South Wales	4.2%	4.2%	4.6%	4.7%	4.8%	5.1%	5.6%	6.2%
Victoria	3.9%	4.0%	4.3%	4.7%	5.1%	5.3%	5.6%	6.0%
Queensland	4.1%	4.0%	3.9%	3.9%	4.1%	4.4%	4.8%	5.0%
Western Australia	3.5%	4.4%	4.9%	5.3%	5.7%	5.8%	5.9%	6.2%
South Australia	7.0%	7.0%	7.6%	7.8%	7.9%	7.9%	8.2%	8.7%
Tasmania	6.7%	7.4%	8.4%	9.1%	8.7%	9.0%	8.9%	7.7%
Northern Territory	5.6%	5.4%	5.8%	6.0%	5.6%	5.5%	5.1%	4.6%
Australian Capital Territory	6.1%	6.3%	6.4%	6.5%	6.3%	6.5%	6.8%	7.5%
Multi-State	5.6%	6.3%	6.0%	5.8%	6.7%	6.6%	6.1%	5.9%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from “Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses” to “No Regional Campus” from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Indigenous Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

Indigenous students accounted for 1.6% of all domestic undergraduate enrolments in 2015, continuing a pattern of progress and consolidation that has been present since 2008. There is a relatively broad distribution of outcomes among the institutional groupings on this measure, with the Group of Eight enrolling Indigenous students at around half the rate of the national average, while the RUN institutions see Indigenous enrolments continuing to account for a larger share of their enrolments, reaching 3% in 2015, a trend also observed among all regionally headquartered institutions.

Patterns of Indigenous representation in undergraduate enrolments across the states and territories reflect underlying demographic patterns, notably in the Northern Territory, where CDU has a large Indigenous enrolment, albeit with a declining share due to its overall expansion.

Table 7: Indigenous Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – Indigenous	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%
Group of Eight	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
ATN	1.3%	1.3%	1.2%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
IRU ^a	1.8%	1.8%	2.0%	2.0%	2.2%	2.2%	2.4%	2.6%
RUN	1.7%	2.1%	2.2%	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.7%	3.0%
Unaligned Group	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%
Regionally Headquartered	2.4%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%	3.1%	3.3%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.5%
No Regional Campus ^b	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	1.0%	1.1%
New South Wales	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%
Victoria	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%
Queensland	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	2.1%	2.3%
Western Australia	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%
South Australia	1.2%	1.1%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%
Tasmania	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	2.1%
Northern Territory	12.4%	11.4%	11.3%	9.5%	7.4%	6.9%	6.6%	6.4%
Australian Capital Territory	0.8%	0.9%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
Multi-State	3.4%	2.7%	2.5%	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	1.7%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from “Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses” to “No Regional Campus” from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Women in Non-Traditional Areas (WINTA) Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

The WINTA share of enrolments pertains to a share of enrolments in those fields of education classified as 'non-traditional areas' (see p. 5 for a listing of these areas). Typically, the WINTA group's share of enrolments in these areas has been between 40 to 42% in recent years, although it has been subject to a noticeable decline since 2008. Different institutional groupings have recorded different trends on this measure, with the Group of Eight seeing a relatively steady share of this period, while the ATN, IRU and RUN institutional groupings have all seen marked declines as they expanded enrolments. There appears some divergence among the states and territories in both the level of representation of the WINTA group as well as shifts over time, with Queensland (41.3%), Western Australia (42.2%), Tasmania (44.9%) and the Northern Territory (43.3%) having higher rates of participation (along with the Multi-State ACU with 51.5% participation), but with Queensland's participation falling since 2008 (44.6% to 41.3%) while Western Australia saw a marginal increase from 41.8% to 42.2% over this period and Tasmania saw a stronger expansion from 38.7% to 44.9%.

Table 8: WINTA Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – WINTA	42.2%	41.9%	41.6%	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%
Group of Eight	40.8%	40.3%	40.4%	40.4%	40.4%	40.3%	40.2%	40.3%
ATN	39.5%	39.3%	38.9%	38.1%	37.5%	37.3%	37.0%	37.0%
IRU ^a	45.4%	45.2%	44.5%	44.5%	44.1%	43.6%	42.7%	42.0%
RUN	47.7%	47.5%	47.0%	46.1%	45.9%	45.6%	44.5%	44.3%
Unaligned Group	42.6%	42.5%	42.1%	41.7%	41.4%	40.9%	41.4%	40.7%
Regionally Headquartered	47.0%	47.0%	46.6%	46.1%	45.7%	45.7%	46.4%	45.9%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	41.5%	41.1%	41.0%	40.7%	40.4%	40.2%	40.6%	40.5%
No Regional Campus ^b	41.3%	41.2%	40.8%	40.5%	40.4%	39.6%	38.7%	38.4%
New South Wales	41.7%	41.7%	41.4%	41.0%	40.7%	40.1%	39.7%	39.4%
Victoria	41.2%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%	40.2%	40.0%	39.6%	39.4%
Queensland	44.6%	44.4%	44.0%	43.3%	42.5%	42.2%	41.5%	41.3%
Western Australia	41.8%	41.7%	41.8%	41.5%	41.8%	41.9%	42.0%	42.2%
South Australia	40.8%	39.7%	39.5%	39.0%	39.0%	38.2%	38.1%	38.0%
Tasmania	38.7%	37.7%	36.6%	36.5%	35.3%	36.7%	47.3%	44.9%
Northern Territory	50.6%	48.7%	45.7%	48.5%	46.3%	45.9%	44.0%	43.3%
Australian Capital Territory	43.9%	43.1%	42.8%	43.7%	43.1%	42.2%	42.2%	41.5%
Multi-State	44.0%	42.9%	46.7%	49.1%	49.6%	51.7%	51.6%	51.5%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Regional Students Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

Regional student enrolments represented 18.8% of total domestic undergraduate enrolments in 2015, largely in keeping with annual trends over the past eight years. Regional universities, including the RUN universities (a 50.5% regional share of enrolment) and Regionally Headquartered (46.6%) institutions continued to have substantial representation from regional students, although this has declined in recent years. By contrast, institutions with 'No Regional Campus' (8.9%) have seen an expansion in their enrolment of regional students compared to that of their overall population since 2008.

Looking at the states and territories, regional share of enrolments tend to track regional population shares, with the relatively more regionalised Queensland (21.7%), Tasmania (39.4%) and the Northern Territory (50.7%) having the largest regional student shares, compared to Western Australia (15.6%) or South Australia (15%).

Table 9: Regional Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – Regional	19.0%	18.8%	19.1%	19.2%	19.1%	19.0%	18.9%	18.8%
Group of Eight	11.4%	10.9%	11.3%	11.5%	11.2%	11.5%	11.0%	10.7%
ATN	10.5%	10.7%	11.2%	10.8%	11.1%	10.5%	10.6%	10.6%
IRU ^a	19.7%	19.3%	19.5%	20.0%	20.3%	20.3%	20.4%	20.0%
RUN	56.3%	55.5%	54.9%	54.5%	53.7%	52.5%	51.6%	50.5%
Unaligned Group	19.8%	19.7%	19.8%	19.7%	19.5%	19.4%	19.4%	19.4%
Regionally Headquartered	50.7%	50.3%	49.5%	49.2%	48.6%	47.9%	47.6%	46.6%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	14.9%	14.9%	15.3%	15.6%	15.6%	15.5%	16.2%	16.2%
No Regional Campus ^b	7.6%	7.2%	7.7%	8.0%	8.0%	8.5%	9.0%	8.9%
New South Wales	18.1%	17.8%	17.6%	17.6%	17.3%	17.3%	16.8%	16.5%
Victoria	19.1%	19.0%	19.2%	19.6%	19.5%	19.1%	19.3%	19.3%
Queensland	22.4%	22.0%	22.3%	22.5%	22.5%	22.2%	22.0%	21.7%
Western Australia	13.3%	13.2%	13.6%	13.9%	14.6%	14.8%	15.0%	15.6%
South Australia	13.3%	13.5%	14.6%	15.2%	15.2%	14.9%	15.2%	15.0%
Tasmania	41.6%	42.0%	43.0%	42.7%	41.7%	40.4%	40.1%	39.4%
Northern Territory	57.8%	55.1%	53.6%	53.6%	53.0%	52.7%	51.5%	50.7%
Australian Capital Territory	14.7%	15.2%	16.6%	16.7%	16.7%	16.3%	15.3%	14.8%
Multi-State	11.9%	11.9%	12.0%	12.1%	12.2%	11.6%	10.9%	10.7%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Remote Students Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

Remote students are by far the smallest equity group, with just 6,365 enrolments in 2015 (as per Table 2), representing 0.9% of total domestic undergraduate enrolment. The remote participation rate has been stable over the eight years since 2008, and lies marginally below levels in the period before the demand driven system (1.0% share in 2009) after taking into account the rapid expansion in the system in general.

The RUN (1.9% remote share in 2015) and IRU (1.6%) institutional groupings have higher rates of remote enrolment compared with the Group of Eight (0.5%) and ATN (0.8%), while 'Regionally Headquartered' institutions (2.5%) have a share which has been significantly higher than the national average, albeit one that has declined from 2.9% in 2008.

The Northern Territory has a substantial remote population as a share of its general population, with its university, CDU, seeing 10.8% of its students originating in remote areas.

Table 10: Remote Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – Remote	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%
Group of Eight	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
ATN	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.8%	0.8%
IRU ^a	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%
RUN	2.3%	2.2%	2.0%	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%
Unaligned Group	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Regionally Headquartered	2.9%	2.8%	2.7%	2.7%	2.6%	2.5%	2.6%	2.5%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
No Regional Campus ^b	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
New South Wales	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%	0.4%
Victoria	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Queensland	1.7%	1.6%	1.5%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.3%
Western Australia	2.0%	1.9%	1.9%	1.9%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%	1.8%
South Australia	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.5%	1.6%
Tasmania	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%
Northern Territory	13.6%	13.0%	12.4%	12.0%	10.9%	10.7%	11.0%	10.8%
Australian Capital Territory	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%
Multi-State	0.4%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.2%

Note: a. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. b. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) Student Equity Outcomes: 2008 to 2015

The enrolment share of students from a non-English speaking background (NESB) increased again in 2015 to 3.7%, having risen from a 3.2% share in 2008. The NESB equity group is unique in that institutions in the Group of Eight (4.5%) and ATN (4.9%) have higher levels of NESB enrolment than the national average and shares which have been growing over time.

Table 11: Non-English Speaking Background (NESB)^a Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2008-2015

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
National – NESB^a	3.2%	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%
Group of Eight	4.0%	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%	4.0%	4.0%	4.3%	4.5%
ATN	3.4%	3.4%	3.5%	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	4.7%	4.9%
IRU ^b	2.4%	2.3%	2.4%	2.5%	2.8%	2.9%	3.1%	3.2%
RUN	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%
Unaligned Group	3.7%	3.7%	3.5%	3.4%	3.4%	3.3%	3.4%	3.5%
Regionally Headquartered	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%	2.2%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%	3.2%	3.3%	3.2%	3.3%
No Regional Campus ^c	5.6%	5.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.8%	4.7%	5.0%	5.0%
New South Wales	4.4%	4.1%	3.8%	3.6%	3.6%	3.4%	3.7%	3.7%
Victoria	3.3%	3.4%	3.6%	3.6%	3.7%	4.0%	4.1%	4.2%
Queensland	2.0%	2.0%	2.0%	2.3%	2.6%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%
Western Australia	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%	3.0%	3.3%	3.4%	3.7%	3.9%
South Australia	2.6%	2.9%	3.2%	3.5%	4.1%	4.4%	4.5%	4.5%
Tasmania	1.4%	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	1.7%	2.0%	2.2%	3.2%
Northern Territory	2.4%	2.5%	3.1%	3.1%	3.5%	3.7%	4.1%	4.9%
Australian Capital Territory	3.1%	3.3%	3.5%	3.5%	4.0%	3.9%	4.2%	3.9%
Multi-State	3.2%	3.0%	2.5%	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.7%	3.0%

Note: a. NESB students are also often referred to as 'CALD students' – students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds; b. The University of Newcastle left the IRU at the end of 2014 but is still reported as part of the IRU for 2015 for the sake of comparability. c. RMIT and Monash have been moved from "Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses" to "No Regional Campus" from 2014 onwards.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

Summary

The rate of expansion in overall undergraduate enrolments in Australia appears to be tapering after several years of growth, with the 3.1% expansion in places to 717,195 being the slowest rate of growth over the past eight years. However, this growth comes on the back of an historic expansion in enrolments in Australian higher education, one that has seen the system add an additional 184,668 places since 2008, an increase of 34.7%. This has benefited equity student groups in particular, with most groups seeing increases in enrolment above the overall increase in system places, or in the case of Regional students, just below average (33.1%). The two exceptions are the WINTA (21.5%) and Remote (21.5%) groups who saw substantially lower levels of expansion over this time.

This differential growth across equity groups has resulted in a mix of outcomes in participation, with Low SES and Students with Disability groups seeing marked increases in representation, with smaller increases seen in Indigenous and NESB groups. WINTA, Regional and Remote student groups have seen reductions in their share of total enrolments, albeit in the context of substantial expansions in enrolments among these student groups.

Table 12: Student Equity Enrolments and Ratios, Table A Providers, 2008-2015^a

	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Growth (08-15) %
National	532,527	553,374	580,372	600,412	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	34.7%
Low SES	86,581	90,447	96,706	102,163	109,788	118,003	124,429	130,246	50.4%
Students with Disability	23,447	24,948	28,057	30,094	33,220	36,486	40,087	44,210	88.6%
Indigenous	6,820	7,296	7,943	8,445	9,005	9,939	10,850	11,739	72.1%
WINTA	103,120	105,438	107,959	109,936	114,382	119,105	123,544	125,241	21.5%
Regional	101,339	104,266	110,646	115,250	121,476	127,070	131,385	134,847	33.1%
Remote	5,240	5,368	5,532	5,572	5,804	6,069	6303	6,365	21.5%
NESB	17,222	17,649	18,227	19,226	21,289	22,863	25,114	26,647	54.7%
Equity Shares (%)									Change in Share (08 - 15) PPT
Low SES	16.3%	16.3%	16.7%	17.0%	17.3%	17.6%	17.9%	18.2%	1.9
Students with Disability	4.4%	4.5%	4.8%	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%	1.8
Indigenous	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	0.3
WINTA ^b	42.2%	41.9%	41.6%	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%	-2.0
Regional	19.0%	18.8%	19.1%	19.2%	19.1%	19.0%	18.9%	18.8%	-0.2
Remote	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	-0.1
NESB	3.2%	3.2%	3.1%	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%	0.5

Note: a. Data replicated in Tables 2 and 3 above; b. The WINTA percentage is the female share of total enrolments in non-traditional areas.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016).

References

ABS – Australian Bureau of Statistics (2011). *Disability, Australia*, 2009. Catalogue No. 4446.0. Canberra: ABS. Available at: <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Lookup/4446.0Main+Features12009?OpenDocument>

ABS (2015). *Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas*, Canberra: ABS. Available at: <http://www.abs.gov.au/websitedbs/censushome.nsf/home/seifa?opendocument&navpos=260>

Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2016). *Students: Selected Higher Education Statistics: 2015* Appendix 2 – Equity groups. Canberra: Department of Education. Available at: <https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/2015-appendix-2-equity-groups>, accessed 10 September 2016.

DEET – Department of Employment, Education and Training (1990) *A fair chance for all: national and institutional planning for equity in higher education: a discussion paper*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.

Koshy, P. and Seymour, R. (2015). *Student Equity Performance in Australian Higher Education: 2007 to 2014*. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE), Perth: Curtin University.

Martin, L. (1994). *Equity and General Performance Indicators in Higher Education*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.