



NCSEHE

National Centre for Student
Equity in Higher Education



Curtin University

EQUITY STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

2011-2016

Acknowledgements

This briefing note 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 referees for their 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. (2017). *Equity Student Participation in Australian Higher Education: 2011 to 2016*. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education (NCSEHE), Perth: Curtin University.

Copyright ownership of this material resides with the NCSEHE.

ISBN: 978-0-6480700-4-7

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
- to assist in 'closing the loop' between equity policy, research and practice by:
 - supporting and informing evaluation of current equity practice with a particular focus on identifying good practice
 - identifying innovative approaches to equity through existing research and the development of a forward research program to fill gaps in knowledge
 - 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 equity student** participation from 2011 to 2016. It focuses on trends among domestic undergraduate enrolments in Table A provider institutions across the following equity groups:

- Low socioeconomic status (low SES) students
- Students with disability
- Indigenous students
- Women in Non-Traditional Areas (WINTA)
- Regional students
- Remote students
- Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) students, also referred to as 'Culturally and Linguistically Diverse' (CALD) students.

All student data reported or derived for the purposes of this document are sourced from *Students: Selected Higher Education Statistics 2016* (Appendix 2: Equity Data), published by the Australian Government Department of Education and Training (DET) (2017).

Reporting New Equity Definitions for Low SES, Regional and Remote Students

This briefing note uses 2011 as a base year of comparison for higher education equity student participation.

This reflects its focus on the official indicators for low SES students at the Statistical Area 1 (SA1) level, rather than for postcodes (as in previous issues), and regional and remote status using the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS) from the 2011 Census, instead of the Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) definitions derived from the 2006 Census. Data for both the SA1 and ASGS regional and remote measures are only available from 2011 and this is the first year for which we have six years of figures for these measures.

The use of the SA1 measure for low SES, instead of the postcode measure, reduces the reported enrolment number and enrolment share for this equity group. For instance, in 2015, using the 2006 Census postcode measure, there were 130,246 low SES students among Australia's 717,195 domestic undergraduates, accounting for 18.2% of enrolment (see Koshy, 2016). However, using the SA1 measure for the same year, this figure falls to 115,021, equal to 16.0% of the domestic undergraduate enrolment — as reported in this issue. Conversely, the use of the ASGS measure for regional and remote student identification increases their counts compared with the previous MCEETYA measure. For instance, in Koshy (2016), Regional students numbered 134,847 (an 18.9% share) in 2015 using MCEETYA, compared with 148,472 (a 20.7% share) using the ASGS here. This is particularly noticeable in Tasmania, where regional students totalled 8,850 in 2015—39.4% of a total enrolment of 22,460—under MCEETYA compared to 16,222 (72.2% of enrolment) using the ASGS, largely due to the reclassification of Hobart as a regional centre in the ASGS, with similar redefinitions applying elsewhere, such as Townsville in Queensland.

As a result of this change, the enrolment figure for low SES and regional and remote status in this briefing note are not directly comparable with earlier issues which reported postcode (low SES) and MCEETYA (regional and remote students) indicators (e.g. Koshy, 2016). For this reason we only report the SA1 and ASGS estimates, with readers directed to previous briefing notes or official collections (DET, 2017) for data under the older definitions.

In the case of these three equity groups, we also report newly developed indicators from DET. Historically, the low SES and locational (regional and remote) groups were identified on the basis of a student's *current* home address, that is, their postal address in the reporting year. This year, DET has developed a series of indicators for low SES, regional and remote student numbers which are based on their *first address*.

The *first address* measures characterise a student's status using their address at the commencement of study, as developed in Cardak et al. (2017). Thus, the *first address* better describes a student's 'background' over the course of their undergraduate academic career irrespective of any change in their location during their studies. We include the new *first address* indicators by way of comparison for the years for which they have been calculated (2014 to 2016).

Changes to Institutional Groupings

For each equity group measure, results are reported for the national system (Table A providers only), by institutional groupings, by state and territory, and by regional or metropolitan status, for each year. At the end of 2017, the institutional groupings are as follows:

- **The Group of Eight:** Australian National University (ANU); The University of Melbourne; Monash University; The University of Sydney; University of New South Wales (UNSW); The University of Queensland (UQ); The University of Western Australia (UWA); and The University of 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 University; Flinders University; Griffith University; James Cook University (JCU); La Trobe University; Charles Darwin University (CDU); and Western Sydney University (WSU). (As observed below, WSU joined the IRU in October 2017 and is excluded from the IRU subtotals in this note).
- **Regional Universities Network (RUN):** Southern Cross University; University of New England (UNE); Federation University; University of the Sunshine Coast (USC); CQUniversity (CQU); and University of Southern Queensland (USQ).
- **The Unaligned Universities:** (Other Table A providers) — Macquarie University; University of Newcastle (UON); University of Wollongong; Deakin University; Charles Sturt University (CSU); University of Tasmania (UTAS); Australian Catholic University (ACU); University of Canberra; Edith Cowan University (ECU); Swinburne University; and Victoria University.

The significant change to these groupings in recent years has occurred in the IRU, with the exit of UON in 2015 and inclusion of WSU from October 2017. For the sake of comparability, both UON and WSU are excluded from the calculations for the IRU over the entire period (2011–16), with all observed trends over the period relating to the collective performance of the other IRU members listed above. WSU will be included as part of the IRU in future briefing notes.

An analysis is also 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, CSU, JCU, USQ, UTAS and CDU.
- **Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses:** Institutions with one or more regional campus — UON, Sydney, Wollongong, Deakin, La Trobe, Melbourne, QUT, UQ, Curtin, ECU, Murdoch, UWA, Flinders, Adelaide, UniSA, and ACU.
- **No Regional Campus:** Metropolitan institutions with no regional campus: ANU, UNSW, UTS, Griffith, Macquarie, Canberra, Swinburne, Victoria, RMIT, Monash, and WSU.

There have been two changes to the No Regional Campus grouping that have been recognised in the two most recent briefing notes (starting with Koshy, 2016), with Monash and RMIT classified as having no regional campuses. This classification of these groupings is reported consistently over 2011 to 2016.

The changes discussed above in relation to low SES, regional and remote student status and institutional groupings reduce the direct comparability of this briefing note with previous issues, but provide the basis for a consistent view of the performance of institutions in current groupings since 2011.

Total Undergraduate Enrolments: 2011 to 2016

Undergraduate enrolments among Table A providers increased by 21.8% between 2011 and 2016 to 730,797 students, an increase of 130,642 undergraduate places. This is equal to 65.9% of the 198,270 new places created since 2008, albeit with growth slowing over the past two years. In keeping with recent trends, this growth has occurred among newer universities, with the Unaligned Group seeing a 31.3% expansion in places. In comparison, the Group of Eight saw lower growth of just 6.1%, following a decline in student numbers over the last two years. Universities in the regions grew less quickly than those based in metropolitan areas, but the gap in their rate of growth is narrowing, with growth between 2011 and 2016 of 25.2%, compared to 27.4% among No Regional Campus institutions. In terms of enrolments in universities in each state, institutions in New South Wales (13.7%) and Queensland (19.4%) continue to record growth under the national average, in comparison with those in Victoria (30.9%), Northern Territory (34.7%) and Tasmania (87.5%).

Table 1: Domestic Undergraduate Enrolments, Higher Education, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Growth (11-16) %
National^a	600,155	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	730,797	21.8%
Group of Eight	159,749	163,643	168,682	171,691	170,665	169,566	6.1%
ATN	102,097	109,302	115,712	121,499	125,565	129,629	27.0%
IRU	81,337	85,881	89,778	92,917	94,637	95,921	17.9%
RUN	54,072	57,295	60,188	62,884	66,977	69,189	28.0%
Unaligned Group	202,900	218,313	234,305	246,878	259,351	266,492	31.3%
Regionally Headquartered	99,495	105,739	110,879	115,458	121,368	124,549	25.2%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	298,765	314,182	327,884	338,798	344,797	350,781	17.4%
No Regional Campuses	201,895	214,513	229,902	241,641	251,103	257,279	27.4%
New South Wales	191,504	198,720	205,852	210,805	216,224	217,653	13.7%
Victoria	138,037	147,157	159,394	168,338	175,660	180,684	30.9%
Queensland	118,218	124,619	130,586	134,945	138,937	141,109	19.4%
Western Australia	60,740	65,231	68,164	70,015	68,095	68,140	12.2%
South Australia	43,227	45,169	46,605	48,103	48,869	49,419	14.3%
Tasmania	13,061	14,990	16,914	19,548	22,460	24,483	87.5%
Northern Territory	4,956	5,609	5,958	6,325	6,525	6,674	34.7%
Australian Capital Territory	16,403	17,141	17,642	18,046	18,537	19,272	17.5%
Multi-State ^b	14,009	15,798	17,550	19,744	21,888	23,363	66.8%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. b. The Australian Catholic University is the sole multi-state institution.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Equity Student Group Definitions

This report specifically focuses on the following designated groups of underrepresented students, originally designated in *A Fair Chance for All* (DEET, 1990) and formally defined in *Equity and General Performance Indicators in Higher Education* ("the Martin Review") (Martin 1994), namely:

- **Low socioeconomic status (low SES) students:** Socioeconomic status (SES) is assigned to students on the basis of the socioeconomic status of the ABS SA1 area in which they reside. All SA1 areas are ranked on the basis of ABS estimates of the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA) — Index of Education and Occupation (IEO), calculated using 2011 Census data. Low SES students come from the bottom 25% of Australian SA1s in a national ranking. Commencing with this issue of the briefing note, we will only report the SA1 measure, for which data exist from 2011
- **Students with disability:** Students who self-report disability to their higher education provider, usually via a formal enrolment declaration.
- **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 area that is classified as remote using the Australian Statistical Geography Standard (ASGS). Commencing with this issue of the Briefing Note, we will only report the ASGS measure, for which data exist from 2011
- **Students from remote areas:** Remote students are defined as having a permanent home address in an SA1 area that is classified as remote using the ASGS. Commencing with this issue of the *Briefing Note*, we will only report the ASGS measure, for which data exist from 2011
- **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 Participation: 2011 to 2016

Since the introduction of the demand-driven system (DDS) over 2010–12, equity groups have seen divergent rates of growth in domestic undergraduate enrolments compared to that of the overall system. The low SES (28.8%), students with disability (57.4%), Indigenous (54.6%) and NESB (41.1%) groups have seen higher than overall growth, while the regional (18.6%), remote (20.6%) and WINTA (15.5%) groups have seen lower rates of expansion.

Table 2: Domestic Undergraduate Enrolments, Higher Education, Table A Providers, 2011–16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Growth (11-16) %
National	600,155	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	730,797	21.8%
Low SES ^a	91,342	99,035	106,375	110,211	115,021	117,689	28.8%
Students with Disability	30,052	33,220	36,486	40,087	44,210	47,291	57.4%
Indigenous	8,233	9,060	9,939	10,850	11,739	12,727	54.6%
WINTA	109,923	114,382	119,105	123,544	125,223	126,913	15.5%
Regional ^a	127,440	134,247	139,966	144,504	148,472	151,098	18.6%
Remote ^a	4,918	5,289	5,556	5,744	5,827	5,930	20.6%
NESB	19,226	21,289	22,863	25,114	26,647	27,125	41.1%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

All equity groups saw either limited growth or stability in terms of their share of overall enrolment in 2016. Low SES students, as defined using the SA1 area measure, continue to see increases in their share of overall enrolment in the DDS era, rising from 15.2% in 2011 to 16.1% in 2016. A similar trend can be seen for Indigenous (1.4% in 2011 to 1.7% in 2016) and NESB students (3.2% to 3.7%) over this period, as well as students with disability who have seen an increase. Remote (stable), WINTA (decline) and regional (declines) undershot overall growth in student numbers and saw similar trends in enrolment shares.

Table 3: Student Equity Enrolment Proportions, Table A Providers, 2011–16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Low SES ^a	15.2%	15.6%	15.9%	15.8%	16.0%	16.1%
Students with Disability	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%	6.5%
Indigenous	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%
WINTA ^b	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%	40.2%
Regional ^a	21.2%	21.2%	20.9%	20.8%	20.7%	20.7%
Remote ^a	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
NESB	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%

Note: a. As per Table 2 Note, low SES, regional and remote definitions in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. b. Female share of total enrolment in non-traditional areas.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Low SES Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

Low SES students are defined according to the socioeconomic status of the SEIFA area in which their *current* permanent residence is located. This area measure is determined using 2011 Census data for every Statistical Area 1 (SA1) in Australia. All SA1s are ranked on the basis of their SEIFA index score, with those containing the bottom 25% of population on this ranking being classified as belonging to the 'low SES' quartile.

Parity in higher education participation would see low SES students register a 25% share of domestic undergraduate enrolment. However, low SES students have always seen considerably lower rates of enrolment, although their representation has been increasing in recent years. Within the Table A Provider universities, there is an historic disparity in low SES enrolment rates. The Group of Eight has traditionally seen lower levels of low SES enrolment at less than 9% of their total enrolment, while newer universities in the ATN (14.1%) and IRU (18.4%) and RUN (26.9%) generally see higher rates of low SES enrolment.

A similar disparity can be seen in terms of the location of institutions where Regionally Headquartered universities have considerably higher levels of Low SES enrolment (25.7%), indeed rates above parity, compared with Metropolitan Institutions with Regional Campuses (14.3%) and No Regional Campus (13.9%). It is interesting to note that in the DDS era there has been some evidence for convergence across these institutions, with Regionally Headquartered institutions seeing declining shares of enrolment (26.3% in 2011 to 25.7% in 2016) and metropolitan institutions witnessing increases.

Table 4a: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, By Institutional Groupings, Table A Providers, 2011–16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – Low SES^a	15.2%	15.6%	15.9%	15.8%	16.0%	16.1%
Group of Eight	8.6%	8.7%	9.1%	8.9%	8.8%	8.8%
ATN	13.4%	13.9%	14.0%	13.9%	14.2%	14.1%
IRU	17.3%	17.8%	18.2%	18.1%	18.4%	18.4%
RUN	27.6%	27.6%	27.3%	26.8%	26.7%	26.9%
Unaligned Group	17.3%	17.6%	17.9%	18.0%	18.1%	18.1%
Regionally Headquartered	26.3%	26.4%	26.2%	26.0%	25.9%	25.7%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	13.1%	13.6%	13.9%	13.9%	14.1%	14.3%
No Regional Campus	12.9%	13.3%	13.8%	13.7%	13.9%	13.9%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Low SES enrolment shares vary by state and territory considerably. This is in large part due to the nature of the national ranking SA1 areas using SEIFA data from the Census (2011 being the most recent for which data are available) which results in a wide distribution in the size of low SES populations, ranging from 0.2% in the Australian Capital Territory to 45.6% in Tasmania.

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

	2011 Census
New South Wales	24.6%
Victoria	20.6%
Queensland	29.9%
Western Australia	22.7%
South Australia	30.7%
Tasmania	45.6%
Northern Territory	23.0%
Australian Capital Territory	0.2%

Source: ABS (2015).

As the vast majority of Australian undergraduate students attend an institution in their home state, institutional low SES shares will in large part reflect the size of the low SES population in their jurisdiction, as can be seen in Table 4c where low SES enrolment shares tend to track state and territory population shares.

Table 4c: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, All Institutions in State or Territory, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
New South Wales	16.2%	16.6%	17.0%	16.9%	17.0%	17.0%
Victoria	13.1%	13.6%	14.1%	14.1%	14.3%	14.4%
Queensland	17.6%	17.7%	17.7%	17.3%	17.5%	17.6%
Western Australia	11.7%	12.2%	12.5%	12.6%	13.1%	13.3%
South Australia	17.4%	17.9%	18.8%	19.0%	19.4%	19.8%
Tasmania	25.5%	25.1%	25.2%	25.7%	25.4%	24.6%
Northern Territory	18.1%	18.5%	18.1%	17.4%	17.5%	17.9%
Australian Capital Territory	5.3%	5.7%	5.6%	5.5%	5.3%	5.1%
Multi-State	12.6%	12.9%	12.3%	12.0%	12.1%	12.2%

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Assigning SES on the Basis of First Address

Australia's official measure of low SES status is based on *current* address, that is, the address a student is listed as residing at the time of reporting. An alternative measure developed by DET, and first raised in Cardak et al. (2017), uses a student's *first address*, that is, the address listed at the time of their enrolment, as the SA1 area indicating their SES and locational status. The rationale for this is that students in regional and remote areas, which are often low SES SA1 areas, move to urban addresses in middle or high SES SA1 areas for the commencement of their studies and are thereby 're-classified' over the duration of their studies. Table 5 demonstrates the effect this has on low SES estimates, with the national estimate using the *first address* in 2016 (shown in the fourth column) at 17.3% compared with 16.1% using the standard measure of the current address, with notable increases in the Group of Eight (9.8% versus 8.8%) and Queensland (20% versus 17.6%).

Table 5: Low SES Enrolment Proportion, SA1 Measure – First Address, 2014–16; and 2016 SA1 Measure – Current Address

SA1 – First Address	2014	2015	2016	2016 Current Address ^b	2016: Ratio of First to Current Address
National – Low SES^a	17.7%	17.5%	17.3%	16.1%	1.07
Group of Eight	10.6%	10.2%	9.8%	8.8%	1.11
ATN	16.1%	15.8%	15.4%	14.1%	1.09
IRU	20.8%	20.5%	20.2%	18.4%	1.10
RUN	31.0%	30.0%	29.3%	26.9%	1.09
Unaligned Group	19.0%	18.9%	18.7%	18.1%	1.04
Regionally Headquartered	29.2%	28.3%	27.5%	25.7%	1.07
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	16.3%	16.0%	15.7%	14.3%	1.10
No Regional Campus	14.3%	14.4%	14.4%	13.9%	1.04
New South Wales	18.3%	18.0%	17.8%	17.0%	1.04
Victoria	14.8%	14.9%	15.0%	14.4%	1.04
Queensland	21.1%	20.4%	20.0%	17.6%	1.14
Western Australia	14.5%	14.7%	14.5%	13.3%	1.09
South Australia	22.9%	22.4%	21.9%	19.8%	1.11
Tasmania	29.3%	27.6%	26.2%	24.6%	1.07
Northern Territory	18.3%	18.1%	17.6%	17.9%	0.99
Australian Capital Territory	6.3%	6.1%	5.9%	5.1%	1.16
Multi-State	12.5%	12.5%	12.4%	12.2%	1.02

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. b. Estimates using the *current address* are sourced from Table 4a and 4c above.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Students with Disability Participation: 2011 to 2016

Disability is self-reported in Australian higher education equity collections. The last decade has seen a continued increase in the proportion of domestic undergraduates reporting disability, rising from 5.0% in 2011 to 6.5% in 2016. This persistent increase is in part attributable to increasing awareness among institutions of the importance of ensuring students with disability have access and participation pathways, increasing participation, as well as an increase in self-reporting of disability by students.

Regional universities continue to report the highest levels of enrolment of students with disability, with considerable variation observed across the states and territories, notably in South Australia (9.4%), Tasmania (7.7%) and the Australian Capital Territory (7.9%).

Table 6: Students with Disability Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – Disability^a	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%	6.5%
Group of Eight	4.4%	4.5%	4.7%	5.3%	6.0%	6.3%
ATN	4.7%	4.7%	4.6%	4.7%	4.9%	5.2%
IRU	5.6%	6.0%	6.2%	6.5%	6.8%	7.2%
RUN	5.7%	6.0%	6.8%	7.2%	7.8%	8.2%
Unaligned Group	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.0%	6.2%	6.5%
Regionally Headquartered	5.6%	5.9%	6.5%	6.7%	7.0%	7.3%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	5.4%	5.7%	5.8%	6.1%	6.6%	6.9%
No Regional Campus	4.1%	4.3%	4.5%	4.8%	5.2%	5.4%
New South Wales	4.7%	4.8%	5.1%	5.6%	6.2%	6.6%
Victoria	4.7%	5.1%	5.3%	5.6%	6.0%	6.3%
Queensland	3.9%	4.1%	4.4%	4.8%	5.0%	5.2%
Western Australia	5.3%	5.7%	5.8%	5.9%	6.2%	6.4%
South Australia	7.8%	7.9%	7.9%	8.2%	8.7%	9.4%
Tasmania	9.1%	8.7%	9.0%	8.9%	7.7%	7.7%
Northern Territory	5.5%	5.6%	5.5%	5.1%	4.6%	4.8%
Australian Capital Territory	6.5%	6.3%	6.5%	6.8%	7.5%	7.9%
Multi-State	5.8%	6.7%	6.6%	6.1%	5.9%	5.9%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Indigenous Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

Indigenous students accounted for 1.7% of all domestic undergraduate enrolments in 2016, rising from 1.4% in 2011. Regional universities tend to have higher rates of Indigenous enrolment, as seen in the enrolment shares for the RUN institutions (3.1%) and among regionally headquartered institutions (3.5%).

Patterns of Indigenous representation in undergraduate enrolments across the states and territories reflect underlying demographic patterns, ranging from 0.9% in Victoria to 6.3% in the Northern Territory.

Table 7: Indigenous Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – Indigenous^a	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%
Group of Eight	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%
ATN	1.3%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
IRU	1.9%	2.1%	2.1%	2.3%	2.4%	2.6%
RUN	2.3%	2.3%	2.5%	2.7%	3.0%	3.1%
Unaligned Group	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%
Regionally Headquartered	2.5%	2.8%	2.9%	3.1%	3.3%	3.5%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%
No Regional Campus	0.9%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.1%	1.2%
New South Wales	1.5%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%
Victoria	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%
Queensland	1.8%	1.9%	2.0%	2.1%	2.3%	2.6%
Western Australia	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%
South Australia	1.3%	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.4%	1.4%
Tasmania	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%	1.8%	2.1%	2.3%
Northern Territory	4.8%	7.4%	6.9%	6.6%	6.4%	6.3%
Australian Capital Territory	1.3%	1.3%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%	1.6%
Multi-State	2.4%	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	1.7%	1.8%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Women in Non-Traditional Areas (WINTA) Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

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 41% in recent years, levelling off in 2016 at 40.2% of enrolments, with differences below the national level reflecting institutional differences in program offerings at the state and territory, and institutional levels.

Institutions in the IRU and RUN groups have significantly higher shares than the national average — at 44.8% and 44.1% respectively, with Regionally Headquartered institutions recording an enrolment share of 45.0%. This pattern is observed among the states and territories with jurisdictions with large regional populations such as Queensland (41.1%), and the Northern Territory (44.8%) having higher than average rates of female participation in non-traditional areas. Australia's multi-state university, the Australian Catholic University, has majority female enrolment in non-traditional areas.

Table 8: WINTA Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – WINTA^{a,b}	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%	40.2%
Group of Eight	40.4%	40.4%	40.3%	40.2%	40.3%	40.9%
ATN	38.1%	37.5%	37.3%	37.0%	37.0%	36.9%
IRU	47.6%	47.3%	46.5%	45.5%	44.8%	44.8%
RUN	46.1%	45.9%	45.6%	44.5%	44.3%	44.1%
Unaligned Group	40.8%	40.5%	40.1%	40.5%	39.8%	39.2%
Regionally Headquartered	46.1%	45.7%	45.7%	46.4%	45.9%	45.0%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	41.2%	40.9%	40.8%	40.6%	40.5%	40.7%
No Regional Campus	39.9%	39.7%	39.1%	38.7%	38.3%	38.5%
New South Wales	41.0%	40.7%	40.1%	39.7%	39.4%	39.4%
Victoria	40.2%	40.2%	40.0%	39.6%	39.4%	39.4%
Queensland	43.3%	42.5%	42.2%	41.5%	41.3%	41.1%
Western Australia	41.5%	41.8%	41.9%	42.0%	42.2%	42.1%
South Australia	39.0%	39.0%	38.2%	38.1%	38.0%	38.6%
Tasmania	36.5%	35.3%	36.7%	47.3%	44.9%	39.8%
Northern Territory	48.5%	46.3%	45.9%	44.0%	43.3%	44.8%
Australian Capital Territory	43.7%	43.1%	42.2%	42.2%	41.5%	41.5%
Multi-State	49.1%	49.6%	51.7%	51.6%	51.5%	52.8%

Note: a. WINTA enrolment share is per cent of total enrolments in WINTA disciplines. b. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Regional Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

In 2016 around 20.7% of domestic undergraduate students in Australia were from regional areas, on the basis of their *current* address and SA1 classification. The more moderate rates of growth in regional student enrolment means that their share of overall enrolments has remained relatively static over the past three years after an initial decline in the early years of the DDS. Regional enrolment shares are higher among universities in regional areas, including the RUN universities (a 51.4% regional share of enrolment) and Regionally Headquartered universities (60.2%).

Regional share of enrolments tend to track regional population shares within states and territories, with the relatively more regionalised Queensland (27.6%), Tasmania (67.3%) and the Northern Territory (52.6%) having the largest regional student shares of total enrolment.

Table 9: Regional Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011–16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – Regional^a	21.2%	21.2%	20.9%	20.8%	20.7%	20.7%
Group of Eight	11.3%	11.0%	11.3%	10.9%	10.5%	10.3%
ATN	9.4%	9.6%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.1%
IRU	29.5%	29.7%	29.4%	29.3%	28.9%	28.9%
RUN	55.5%	54.7%	53.3%	52.4%	51.3%	51.4%
Unaligned Group	22.6%	22.4%	22.2%	22.2%	22.1%	22.0%
Regionally Headquartered	64.0%	63.4%	62.5%	62.1%	61.0%	60.2%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	15.3%	15.3%	15.3%	15.2%	15.3%	15.4%
No Regional Campus	8.9%	8.9%	9.0%	8.7%	8.6%	8.6%
New South Wales	19.1%	18.7%	18.7%	18.1%	17.8%	17.5%
Victoria	19.1%	18.9%	18.6%	18.8%	18.7%	19.0%
Queensland	28.5%	28.4%	28.0%	27.6%	27.5%	27.6%
Western Australia	10.0%	10.4%	10.4%	10.4%	10.8%	11.1%
South Australia	14.3%	14.4%	14.1%	14.3%	14.2%	14.3%
Tasmania	87.9%	84.8%	80.4%	77.1%	72.2%	67.3%
Northern Territory	54.9%	53.6%	53.0%	51.7%	51.4%	52.6%
Australian Capital Territory	17.8%	17.8%	17.4%	16.5%	15.9%	15.2%
Multi-State	11.0%	11.1%	10.4%	9.7%	9.5%	9.4%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Assigning Regional Status on the Basis of First Address

The use of *current* or *first address* location to determine locational status affects estimates of this equity group's enrolment shares in much the same way it does for low SES and remote students. Generally, the use of *first address* increases the number and enrolment shares of regional students (21.9% in 2016 versus 20.7% using the *current address*) as they are assigned this status at the point of enrolment rather than in the current year of estimation when they may have subsequently moved. This is particularly noticeable in the regional shares of metropolitan institutions in the Group of Eight and the ATN and in heavily urbanised states such as Western Australia and South Australia. By contrast, enrolment shares in regionally headquartered universities and states and territories with larger regional populations such as Tasmania and the Northern Territory see marginal decreases under the *first address* measure.

Table 10: Regional Enrolment Proportion, SA1 Measure – First Address, 2014–16; and 2016 SA1 Measure – Current Address

First Address	2014	2015	2016	2016 Current Address ^b	2016: Ratio of First to Current Address
National – Regional^a	22.0%	21.9%	21.9%	20.7%	1.06
Group of Eight	12.2%	11.9%	11.7%	10.3%	1.13
ATN	11.1%	11.0%	11.1%	9.1%	1.21
IRU	30.6%	30.3%	30.3%	28.9%	1.05
RUN	52.4%	51.5%	51.9%	51.4%	1.01
Unaligned Group	23.1%	23.0%	22.8%	22.0%	1.04
Regionally Headquartered	60.9%	59.9%	59.1%	60.2%	0.98
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	17.2%	17.3%	17.4%	15.4%	1.12
No Regional Campus	10.0%	9.9%	9.9%	8.6%	1.15
New South Wales	18.9%	18.5%	18.2%	17.5%	1.04
Victoria	19.7%	19.6%	19.8%	19.0%	1.05
Queensland	29.8%	29.8%	30.1%	27.6%	1.09
Western Australia	11.9%	12.3%	12.3%	11.1%	1.11
South Australia	16.0%	16.0%	15.9%	14.3%	1.12
Tasmania	75.5%	71.1%	66.2%	67.3%	0.98
Northern Territory	49.2%	48.6%	49.5%	52.6%	0.94
Australian Capital Territory	19.1%	18.6%	18.0%	15.2%	1.19
Multi-State	11.2%	11.1%	11.2%	9.4%	1.19

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. b. Estimates using the *current address* are sourced from Table 9.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Remote Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

Remote students accounted for 0.81% of total domestic undergraduate enrolment in 2016. This share has been relatively stable since 2011, reflecting a growth rate in remote enrolments which has tracked that seen in the overall system during this period.

Remote participation shares tend to be higher in the IRU (1.82%) and RUN (1.5%) institutional groups and lower among Group of Eight (0.48%) and ATN (0.70%) institutions. State and territory population bases affect institutional enrolment shares. For instance, the Northern Territory has a substantial remote population and as a result, CDU has a 10.26% remote share of population.

Table 11: Remote Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011–16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – Remote^a	0.82%	0.83%	0.83%	0.83%	0.81%	0.81%
Group of Eight	0.47%	0.49%	0.53%	0.50%	0.49%	0.48%
ATN	0.85%	0.84%	0.80%	0.73%	0.72%	0.70%
IRU	1.77%	1.84%	1.84%	1.87%	1.83%	1.82%
RUN	1.55%	1.53%	1.53%	1.55%	1.52%	1.50%
Unaligned Group	0.51%	0.51%	0.50%	0.52%	0.52%	0.53%
Regionally Headquartered	2.29%	2.30%	2.26%	2.33%	2.27%	2.26%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	0.80%	0.81%	0.81%	0.78%	0.75%	0.75%
No Regional Campus	0.13%	0.14%	0.18%	0.17%	0.19%	0.19%
New South Wales	0.42%	0.42%	0.40%	0.40%	0.40%	0.42%
Victoria	0.18%	0.20%	0.23%	0.25%	0.26%	0.28%
Queensland	1.25%	1.24%	1.25%	1.24%	1.18%	1.14%
Western Australia	1.79%	1.80%	1.75%	1.73%	1.69%	1.74%
South Australia	1.42%	1.51%	1.53%	1.42%	1.47%	1.44%
Tasmania	0.93%	0.77%	0.84%	0.93%	1.10%	1.05%
Northern Territory	9.87%	10.11%	10.07%	10.29%	10.33%	10.26%
Australian Capital Territory	0.24%	0.19%	0.22%	0.22%	0.23%	0.24%
Multi-State	0.27%	0.24%	0.25%	0.20%	0.21%	0.15%

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Assigning Remote Status on the Basis of First Address

The use of *first address* to assign remote status to students results in a similar pattern of changes to estimates for regional students. The national remote share rises from 0.81% under the *current address* measure to 0.91% in 2016. This change is concentrated among metropolitan universities and institutional groupings with a strong metropolitan presence, such as those in the Group of Eight (0.55% from 0.48%) and ATN (0.87% from 0.70%). In addition, institutions in South Australia (1.78% from 1.44%), the Australian Capital Territory (0.30% from 0.24%) and the multi-state institution, the Australian Catholic University (0.21% from 0.15%) see substantial increases in their remote share of enrolments.

Table 12: Remote Enrolment Proportion, SA1 Measure – First Address, 2014–16; and 2016 SA1 Measure – Current Address

First Address	2014	2015	2016	2016 Current Address ^b	2016: Ratio of First to Current Address
National – Remote^a	0.90%	0.91%	0.91%	0.81%	1.12
Group of Eight	0.56%	0.56%	0.55%	0.48%	1.14
ATN	0.90%	0.90%	0.87%	0.70%	1.25
IRU	2.02%	2.02%	2.04%	1.82%	1.12
RUN	1.60%	1.61%	1.60%	1.50%	1.06
Unaligned Group	0.54%	0.55%	0.58%	0.53%	1.09
Regionally Headquartered	2.39%	2.38%	2.36%	2.26%	1.05
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	0.90%	0.89%	0.90%	0.75%	1.19
No Regional Campus ^b	0.19%	0.22%	0.23%	0.19%	1.18
New South Wales	0.42%	0.42%	0.44%	0.42%	1.05
Victoria	0.26%	0.27%	0.30%	0.28%	1.09
Queensland	1.35%	1.36%	1.33%	1.14%	1.17
Western Australia	1.97%	1.92%	2.00%	1.74%	1.14
South Australia	1.70%	1.78%	1.78%	1.44%	1.24
Tasmania	0.99%	1.14%	1.14%	1.05%	1.09
Northern Territory	9.99%	10.10%	9.92%	10.26%	0.97
Australian Capital Territory	0.29%	0.30%	0.30%	0.24%	1.26
Multi-State	0.24%	0.26%	0.21%	0.15%	1.44

Note: a. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. b. Estimates using the *current address* are sourced from Table 11.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Non-English Speaking Background (NESB) Student Participation: 2011 to 2016

The enrolment share of students from a non-English speaking background (NESB) remained steady at 3.7% in 2016. The NESB group is unique among equity groups in that institutions in the Group of Eight (4.4%) and ATN (4.9%) have higher levels of NESB enrolment than the national average. Patterns across the states and territories reflect their NESB population shares.

Table 13: Non-English Speaking Background (NESB)^a Enrolment Proportion, By Groupings and State and Territory, Table A Providers, 2011-16

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
National – NESB^{a,b}	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%
Group of Eight	3.7%	4.0%	4.0%	4.3%	4.5%	4.4%
ATN	3.7%	4.0%	4.3%	4.7%	4.9%	4.9%
IRU	2.8%	3.2%	3.4%	3.5%	3.6%	3.6%
RUN	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%	1.3%	1.4%	1.2%
Unaligned Group	3.2%	3.1%	3.1%	3.2%	3.3%	3.3%
Regionally Headquartered	1.5%	1.7%	1.7%	1.9%	2.2%	2.3%
Metro Institutions with Regional Campuses	2.7%	2.9%	3.0%	3.2%	3.3%	3.3%
No Regional Campus	4.8%	4.8%	4.8%	5.0%	5.0%	4.9%
New South Wales	3.6%	3.6%	3.4%	3.7%	3.7%	3.7%
Victoria	3.6%	3.7%	4.0%	4.1%	4.2%	4.1%
Queensland	2.3%	2.6%	2.6%	2.8%	2.8%	2.9%
Western Australia	3.0%	3.3%	3.4%	3.7%	3.9%	4.0%
South Australia	3.5%	4.1%	4.4%	4.5%	4.5%	4.3%
Tasmania	1.4%	1.7%	2.0%	2.2%	3.2%	4.1%
Northern Territory	3.2%	3.5%	3.7%	4.1%	4.9%	5.0%
Australian Capital Territory	3.5%	4.0%	3.9%	4.2%	3.9%	3.6%
Multi-State	2.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.7%	3.0%	3.0%

Note: a. NESB students are also often referred to as 'CALD students' – students from culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) backgrounds. b. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

Summary

In 2016, there were 730,797 domestic undergraduate students enrolled in Table A provider institutions in Australia. This represents an increase in enrolments of 21.8% since 2011. This expansion has been accompanied by increased equity student group participation, with all groups except WINTA (15.5%), remote (20.5%) and regional (18.6%) students seeing increases in enrolment above the overall increase in system places.

As a consequence, equity groups such as with low SES (16.1% of enrolment in 2016) and students with disability (6.5%) have seen increases in their level of representation, with smaller increases seen in Indigenous and NESB groups, while WINTA and regional student participation has seen a marginal reduction and remote participation has remained static.

The use of *first address* to define locational disadvantage for low SES, regional and remote students results in significant increases in the rate of participation among students in these groups.

Table 14: Student Equity Enrolments and Enrolment Shares, Table A Providers, 2011–16^a

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	Growth (11-16) %
National^b	600,155	634,434	668,665	695,869	717,195	730,797	21.8%
Low SES	91,342	99,035	106,375	110,211	115,021	117,689	28.8%
Students with Disability	30,052	33,220	36,486	40,087	44,210	47,291	57.4%
Indigenous	8,233	9,060	9,939	10,850	11,739	12,727	54.6%
WINTA	109,923	114,382	119,105	123,544	125,223	126,913	15.5%
Regional	127,440	134,247	139,966	144,504	148,472	151,098	18.6%
Remote	4,918	5,289	5,556	5,744	5,827	5,930	20.6%
NESB	19,226	21,289	22,863	25,114	26,647	27,125	41.1%
Equity Shares (%)							Change in Share (11–16) PPT
Low SES	15.2%	15.6%	15.9%	15.8%	16.0%	16.1%	0.9
Students with Disability	5.0%	5.2%	5.5%	5.8%	6.2%	6.5%	1.5
Indigenous	1.4%	1.4%	1.5%	1.6%	1.6%	1.7%	0.3
WINTA ^c	41.3%	41.0%	40.7%	40.5%	40.2%	40.2%	-1.1
Regional	21.2%	21.2%	20.9%	20.8%	20.7%	20.7%	-0.5
Remote	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0
NESB	3.2%	3.4%	3.4%	3.6%	3.7%	3.7%	0.5

Note: a. Data replicated in Tables 2 and 3. b. Please see the *Introduction* for how measure of low SES, regional and remote equity groups and institutional groupings in this briefing note differ from those in earlier issues. c. The WINTA percentage is the female share of total enrolments in non-traditional areas.

Source: Australian Government Department of Education and Training (2017).

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.

Cardak, B., Brett, M., Bowden, M., Vecci, J., Barry, P., Bahtsevanoglou, J., & Mcallister, R. (2017). *Regional Student Participation and Migration: Analysis of factors influencing regional student participation and internal migration in Australian higher education*. National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education, Perth: Curtin University.

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. (2016). *Student Equity Performance in Australian Higher Education: 2007 to 2015*. 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.