



Faculty of Business

### **Work Integrated Learning (WIL) Benchmarking Project**

The WIL Benchmarking project at UTAS aligns with national and international trends in higher education towards developing benchmarking partnerships, identifying areas of good practice and areas for improvement in WIL. Beginning with comparisons between the Faculty of Business, Corporate Internship Program and tertiary WIL business programs nationally, we anticipate identifying where, how and why we have been successful, and where, how and why improvements can be made. It is hoped lessons learnt from undertaking the benchmarking exercise, can be applied to other areas of WIL throughout UTAS and to tertiary education providers of WIL, nationally.

One of the goals of the new UTAS Strategic Plan for Learning and Teaching (2012-2014) is to develop and maintain quality partnerships. Objective 3 under this goal states: 'Partner with industry and wider community to ensure provision of quality Work Integrated Learning (WIL) placement opportunities.' WIL refers to teaching and learning activities that integrate theoretical learning with application in the workplace. One of the strategies to achieve this objective is to engage with local, national and international communities to build and maintain the relationships that optimise successful WIL.

**It is anticipated that *all* participants in the UTAS WIL benchmarking project will benefit from the findings by identifying areas of good practice and areas for improvement within their respective WIL programs.**

The Tertiary Education and Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), replacing the Australian Quality Universities Agency (AUQA), is also interested in identifying benchmarking activity and outcomes universities have achieved for quality improvement purposes.

Focusing on WIL in Business academic disciplines, the UTAS WIL benchmarking project aims to:

1. compare processes and procedures associated with the Faculty of Business Corporate Internship Program with selected WIL programs in Business disciplines across Australian universities;
2. identify areas of good practice and areas for improvement at UTAS; and,
3. share knowledge and experience of benchmarking WIL nationally with participating institutions and, subject to their permission, with ACEN (Australian Collaborative Education Network).

## Proposed Timeline for Project and Action Plan

<b>Scoping Phase</b> - write up scoping statement, performance indicators and measures, develop survey instrument (questionnaire).	August – October 2011
<b>Self Review Phase</b> - send out benchmarking questionnaire via the Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) and to individual institutions inviting Business WIL programs to participate.	November – December 2011
<b>Peer Review Phase</b> - Collation and comparison of results. Results will be collated and reported back to the relevant Faculty/UL&TC. Participating universities will be sent a final report of the results from the benchmarking questionnaire and, with their permission, findings shared with ACEN.	December 2011 – February 2012
<b>Development of Action Plan</b> - An action plan will be developed based on the recommendations of the final report.	March – April 2012

### Methodology

The project will occur in three stages. The first stage is to ascertain where synergies occur between WIL programs offered by other Australian universities and the Faculty of Business Corporate Internship Program at UTAS. Universities willing to cooperate with us in undertaking the project will be asked to respond to a questionnaire which will comprise the second stage of the project. The second stage of the project will involve the Faculty of Business at UTAS working with select institutions to determine processes and procedures that contribute to effective alignment of practice-based experiences with educational requirements and outcomes. A questionnaire developed for this purpose is included in this document. For the Faculty of Business at UTAS, it is important we recognise the processes, procedures, curriculum and pedagogic practices used in other educational institutions to organise and integrate WIL experiences. Comparative analysis of the above will provide a benchmark from which to determine the effectiveness of the teaching and learning experience offered by the Faculty of Business Corporate Internship Program. The third and final stage of the project will culminate in a report on the findings to be forwarded to each of the participating institutions, and with their permission, to ACEN - for sharing with members, either via the ACEN website or at a presentation at the 2012 ACEN conference.

### Benchmarking Format

The *format* for the benchmarking project – scoping statement, performance indicator, good practice statement, performance measures – is derived from the Australasian Council on Open, Distance and E-Learning (ACODE) Benchmarking Framework (2007).

### Scoping Statement

The scoping statement describes what is considered in the benchmarking as well as clarifying, as necessary, what lies outside the scope (ACODE, 2007, p.5). The scope of this project is defined below:

*The scope of this project will cover work integrated learning (WIL) programs from admission through to completion of the program in selected business faculties within Australian universities. The project includes: planning and policy processes for work integrated learning; sourcing WIL opportunities; quality assurance; risk mitigation; assessment; mentoring and supervision processes; student selection,*

*progression, retention and completion; career planning and feedback. It also includes processes for determination of the WIL activities students will be engaged in.*

*The 2011 project will focus on:*

- *Work integrated (WIL) programs in Business faculties in Australian universities at the undergraduate level.*

The project does not include postgraduate programs. It does not include an investigation of financial management processes of WIL programs. Data will be collated from the results obtained from a self-review process based on the following sets of information:

### **Performance Indicators**

The project has a set of performance indicators which will be measured and compared:

- community engagement/business partnerships
- strategic and policy framework
- selection and admission processes
- risk mitigation
- learning outcomes
- supervision arrangements
- assessment processes and practices
- career development (personal and professional development)
- student feedback data
- business feedback data

### **Good Practice Statements**

Good practice statements set out the agreed levels of achievement (standards), against which performance is assessed (ACODE, 2007, p.6).

### **Performance Measures**

Performance measures identify actions which lead to the achievement of good practice in key performance areas (ACODE, 2007, p.6). Project partners will undertake an assessment of their own WIL program's performance against a set of measures as detailed below. The self-review process will include making a rating against each measure. To facilitate the self-review process, **questions** are provided under each measure to clarify their scope and provide guidance for the self-review person/teams. These questions are designed to elicit specific information to enable processes and practices across participating institutions to be compared.

The **ratings** for the performance measures are between Level 4 and Level 1, with Level 4 being the most evident of quality outcomes and Level 1 showing the least amount of evidence in quality.

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| <b>Level 4</b> | <b>Yes</b> Effective strategies are implemented successfully across the faculty  |
| <b>Level 3</b> | <b>Yes, but ...</b> Good strategies in place, some limitations or some further work needed   |
| <b>Level 2</b> | <b>No, but ...</b> This area hasn't yet been effectively addressed, but some significant work is being done across the faculty or institution        |
| <b>Level 1</b> | <b>No</b> No effective strategies e.g. not addressed, addressed only in isolated pockets, notionally addressed but major barriers to implementation. |

The **rationale** provides key reasons for the performance rating. In the self review process, the rationale is considered significant in determining areas of good practice and areas for improvement.

**Evidence** relates to the data which supports the rating and rationale under each performance indicator. There needs to be a clear correlation between the rating and the evidence provided. A high rating cannot be supported with a lack of evidence. Examples of data have been provided for each performance indicator and measure.

**Triangulation** The results of the benchmarking project will also be triangulated against data from the Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE).

*It is expected that the persons(s) involved in coordination/facilitation of an institution's WIL program will provide a response to each of the survey questions below, to the best of their knowledge. Please note: good practice statements and performance measures in the questionnaire have been identified by the Faculty of Business, UTAS, as key performance indicators in WIL and are directly applicable to the Faculty of Business Corporate Internship Program, for this reason there may not be a direct correlation with other business-related WIL programs.*

## UTAS WIL Benchmarking Questionnaire

### START

The survey consists of a series of questions based on the WIL practitioner's assessment of their program or series of WIL activities. As indicated by the Good Practice Statement, please assign a Rating or response as indicated against each Performance Measure, including the Rationale and Evidence to support your rating or response.

**1. Good Practice Statement:** WIL policies and procedures are developed, implemented and reviewed within a well-structured governance framework with reference to good practice within the sector. WIL programs have defined terms of reference and delegations of authority covering, *inter alia*, selection of students and appropriate WIL activities, oversight of supervision, minimum academic standards for students prior to and during placement (if placed in within a business organisation), codes of practice for WIL providers and students, assessment of student coursework and placement tasks, ethics, plagiarism, grievances and appeals. There is a clear line of reporting to, and effective oversight by, the Discipline/Faculty in which the WIL program is offered.

**1.1. Performance Measure: There are university-wide policies and procedures in place for WIL and these are clearly communicated. Consider and address:**

a) **Does the university have institution-wide strategies in place for WIL?** (Please indicate a rating by selecting and highlighting your choice below)

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**b) Are clear policies and procedures in place for WIL at:**

- a. the institutional level?
- b. faculty level?
- c. school/discipline level? (Please highlight your selection/s)

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**c) The policies and procedures identified above are communicated clearly to staff and students.** (Please indicate a rating by selecting and highlighting your choice below)

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**1.2. Performance Measure: Policies and/or procedures are reviewed on a regular basis.**

**Consider and address:**

**a) Are processes in place to regularly review WIL policies and/or procedures? (Please indicate rating by selecting and highlighting your choice below)**

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

b) How often are reviews of WIL policies and/or procedures conducted? (Please select and highlight your choice below)

1. Annually
2. Every 2-5 years
3. Every 5-10 years
4. Never

c) Do university WIL practitioners use feedback from the community, peers, students and other sources (e.g., conferences) to share good practice and improve policies and/or procedures?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

**2. Good Practice Statement:** WIL students and business partners are provided with transparent selection processes and information about the expectations of participation in the WIL program. Criteria for selection/participation are clearly communicated to students and business partners and, both are provided with support in the selection/participation process. Selection/participation processes are well-communicated and transparent within the Faculty/School/Discipline offering the WIL program. Regular feedback on selection and admission procedures is used to evaluate and improve these processes.

**2.1. Performance Measure: Selection and admission processes are transparent and clearly communicated. Consider and address:**

a) Transparent selection and admission processes are in place and systematically applied to WIL programs.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

b) Key selection criteria for students and business participation in WIL are identified and systematically applied.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) Selection and admission processes are clearly communicated to students.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

d) Selection and admission processes are clearly communicated to prospective business partners.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

e) Students and business partners are provided with relevant information which makes transparent, the expectations of WIL.

1. No
2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**2.2. Performance Measure: Selection and admission processes are reviewed and improved.  
Consider and address:**

a) Is the selection process for students systematically monitored and evaluated?

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

b) Is the selection process for business participation systematically monitored and evaluated?

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) Is feedback on the selection processes gathered and acted upon to effect improvements?

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

**3. Good Practice Statement:** Learning outcomes for WIL programs are well-defined and clearly communicated to students and business partners. Program structure (e.g., ratio of assessed practical placement tasks to academic coursework expectations) is effective in achieving desired learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are aligned to the graduate attributes of the institution and meet AQF requirements.

**3.1. Performance Measure: Learning outcomes are clearly communicated. Consider and Address:**

a) Core WIL learning outcomes are clearly articulated and communicated to students and business partners.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

**3.2. Performance Measure: Learning outcomes are aligned to graduate attributes. Consider and address:**

a) Learning outcomes are aligned to the institution's graduate attributes.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

b) There are processes to ensure students participating in the WIL program are made aware of the connection to graduate attributes.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) The learning outcomes of the WIL program compare with the learning outcomes as defined for AQF Level 7.

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

### 3.3. Performance Measure: Learning outcomes are comparable across the faculty/school.

Consider and address:

a) There are processes in place to ensure comparability of learning outcomes of WIL programs across different discipline areas, sites and models of delivery.

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**4. Good Practice Statement:** WIL students are provided with quality supervision which includes regular, timely advice and feedback on work-placement tasks and related academic assignments. Supervisory arrangements are well developed and include, inter alia, a supervisory register and, guidance to business partners and students on supervision expectations. Processes are in place to ensure supervision is appropriate and effective for the duration of the WIL experience and that supervisors have the capacity to support WIL students.

#### 4.1. Performance Measure: WIL students are provided with effective supervision. Consider and address:

a) Are mechanisms in place to ensure appropriate supervisory arrangements? (e.g., policy provisions, formal agreements)

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

b) Do students receive constructive feedback from their supervisor on work-in-progress in a timely manner?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) Do students have ready access to confidential grievance and appeal processes if they are dissatisfied with their supervision?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

d) Are students monitored and supported by the academy during their WIL experience/placement?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

e) Is there a process in place to monitor 'at risk' students?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

#### 4.2. Performance Measure: WIL supervisors are well-supported by the academy. Consider and address:

a) Processes are in place to support business partners/university WIL practitioners in their capacity as WIL advisors.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

b) Supervision expectations and processes are clearly communicated to supervisors and evaluated by the school/faculty.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

c) Processes are in place facilitating opportunities for supervisors to improve their practices.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

d) Opportunities are provided for supervisors to share good supervisory practices.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

e) Good supervisory practices are recognised and rewarded by the academy.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

**5. Good Practice Statement:** Assessment practices and processes are well-defined and clearly communicated. Assessment practices are comparable across the institution/faculty/school/discipline. Students and business partners are supported during the assessment process. Assessment outcomes are open to review.

**5.1. Performance Measure: Assessment practices are fair and transparent. Consider and address:**

a) Assessment requirements are clearly communicated to students.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

b) There is a moderation process for determining assessment outcomes.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) There is a clear process for making appeals against assessment outcomes.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**5.2. Performance Measure: Assessment practices and processes take place in a timely manner, are linked to other learning or career programs and have a range of different items. Consider and address:**

a) Is assessment strategically timed (i.e., at what point in the WIL experience are they assessed)?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

b) Is assessment tied to career planning or other learning (e.g., academic) programs?

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

c) Appropriate assessment instruments and methods are used to assess the learning outcomes for WIL students.

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

d) Assessment is linked to desired WIL learning outcomes.

1. No

2. No, but...

3. Yes, but...

4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

-

e) Do supervisors in the workplace undertake assessment of WIL students? If so, what forms of assessment are these? If no, why not?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

**6. Good Practice Statement:** WIL students are provided with effective academic and career development support. The WIL program includes targeted activities designed to enhance successful learning and career development outcomes for WIL students. Students receive academic and career support during their WIL experience. The WIL program includes workshops/seminars on academic and corporate cultural expectations.

**6.1. Performance Measure: Students have access to academic and career development support. Consider and address:**

a) Is targeted career development support provided to address the career needs of, and promote career opportunities for WIL students?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

b) Do career services and faculties/disciplines collaborate to provide support for WIL students?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

•

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

•

c) Is data collected on WIL student career destinations post WIL?

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

**7. Good Practice Statement:** Student and business partner feedback is monitored and used to improve the overall student experience and WIL program. Student progression is monitored. Student and business partner satisfaction levels are monitored and recorded. The data obtained is used to improve the student experience and learning outcomes. The WIL program has well-articulated processes for collecting, analysing and using feedback data from all participants (e.g., students, academics, business partners) to improve and enhance the overall quality of the overall WIL experience. Students and stakeholders are regularly updated and asked to provide feedback on the quality of their WIL experience.

**7.1. Performance Measure: Mechanisms are in place for obtaining feedback and improving the WIL experience. Consider and address:**

a) Mechanisms are in place to obtain feedback on the WIL student/business partner experience.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

b) Mechanisms are in place to evaluate and use feedback to improve the overall quality of the WIL experience.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

-

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

c) WIL students and relevant stakeholders are informed about improvements made as a result of their feedback.

1. No
2. No, but...
3. Yes, but...
4. Yes

Use dot points for the **Rationale** that supports this rating (i.e., identify practices).

- 

Use dot points for **Evidence** that supports this rating (i.e., provide name and web reference, data sources).

- 

## END OF QUESTIONNAIRE

You are most welcome to include additional helpful information after completing the questionnaire.

Enter Title/Role of person completing Questionnaire below (e.g., WIL Coordinator, lecturer):

Title/Role: .....

*Thank you for taking the time to complete the questionnaire, your input is very much appreciated. Responses will be kept strictly confidential. Results from analysis of collated responses, will be shared with survey participants and, subject to agreement by all participants, released to ACEN for wider dissemination.*

**Please save your response as a PDF and either:**

**Email to [Ingrid.Apsitis@utas.edu.au](mailto:Ingrid.Apsitis@utas.edu.au) or**

**Post to:**

**Ingrid Apsitis**

**Director – Corporate Internship Program**

**Faculty of Business, UTAS**

**Locked Bag 1317**

**Launceston Tasmania 7250**

**Tel: 03 6324 3278**