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# Introduction

The 2020 Employer Satisfaction Survey (ESS) measures employer views of the attributes of recent graduates from Australian higher education institutions providing assurance about the quality of Australia’s higher education sector. The ESS is included as part of the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) survey suite. The QILT surveys are independently and centrally administered by the Social Research Centre on behalf of the Australian Government Department of Education.

The 2020 Employer Satisfaction Survey (ESS) represents the largest survey of its kind, reporting the views of 3,430 employers about the attributes of recent graduates from Australian higher education institutions including universities and non-university higher education institutions (NUHEIs). The impetus for a national survey of graduate employers is grounded in the Australian Government’s desire to improve the range and quality of higher education performance indicators in Australia. Since graduate employment is usually one of the main objectives of completing a higher education qualification, employer views of the readiness of graduates to enter the workplace forms a key component of the quality matrix. Employer views of the technical skills, generic skills and work readiness of recent graduates provide assurance about the quality of Australia’s higher education sector. The survey has been conducted annually since 2016.

The ESS has three design features. First, the ESS is the only national survey in Australia that directly links the experiences of graduates to the views of their direct supervisors. Second, the ESS is undertaken on a systematic basis by asking employed graduates who participate in the Graduate Outcome Survey (GOS) to provide contact information for their supervisor who is then invited to complete the ESS. This enables understanding of the limitations and bias associated with the survey methodology. By way of comparison, many other employer surveys are not conducted on a systematic basis and report the perceptions of executives who may have had little or no direct experience with graduates. Third, the ESS is large enough to provide comparisons by broad field of education, employment characteristics, occupation, demographic group and institution.

A major dilemma in designing employer surveys of graduates lies in constructing robust population and sample frames while seeking to garner a sufficient number of responses. The present survey uses all graduate respondents, domestic and international, to the Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS), which in turn is based on Higher Education Information Management System (HEIMS) data collection, to gather the contact details of direct supervisors. One of the advantages of measuring employer satisfaction on a systematic basis is that it enables understanding of the limitations and bias associated with the survey methodology. One disadvantage of a systematic approach to survey collection is that the ensuing methodology can make it difficult to achieve an adequate number of responses for reporting purposes. In the present survey, this manifests itself through the ongoing reluctance of graduates to pass on contact details of their direct supervisor. Further details of the methodology and pattern of responses and possible bias are presented in Appendix 1.

Nonetheless, compared with the ESS other employer surveys of Australian higher education graduates are much smaller in scale, lack transparency in methodology and rely on the views of persons who may have had little or no direct contact with graduates. For example, the 2020 QS Graduate Employability Rankings are based on the views of approximately 1,000 Australian employers while the 2018 Times Higher Education Global University Employability Ranking is based on 150 Australian responses.

The collection periods for the 2020 ESS were November 2019 to February 2020 and May to July 2020. The second collection period therefore took place while there was significant disruption to Australian workplaces as a result of measures imposed to contain the COVID-19 pandemic. This appears to have resulted in fewer graduates than usual providing contact details for their supervisors during this survey period with the result that there were fewer responses from supervisors in the second collection period in comparison with the previous year, as detailed in Table 15. The impact of this change in the pattern of responses on measures of employer satisfaction is described below.

# Results

Time series

The 2020 Employer Satisfaction Survey confirms the findings of earlier surveys that supervisors rate their graduates highly. In 2020, overall satisfaction with graduates as rated by direct supervisors was 84.7 per cent. Overall satisfaction reports the proportion of supervisors giving responses ‘Very likely to consider’ or ‘Likely to consider’ to the item, ‘Based on your experience with this graduate, how likely are you to consider hiring another graduate from the same course and institution, if you had a relevant vacancy?’ These results suggest employers are highly satisfied with the overall quality of graduates from Australia’s higher education system.

Employers were also requested to report their satisfaction with graduates across five graduate attribute domains or scales. High levels of satisfaction were recorded across these attributes:

* 93.7 per cent satisfaction with *foundation skills* – general literacy, numeracy and communication skills and the ability to investigate and integrate knowledge.
* 90.1 per cent satisfaction with *adaptive skills* – the ability to adapt and apply skills/knowledge and work independently.
* 88.1 per cent satisfaction with *collaborative skills* – teamwork and interpersonal skills.
* 93.8 per cent satisfaction with *technical skills* – application of professional and technical knowledge and standards.
* 86.8 per cent satisfaction with *employability skills* – the ability to perform and innovate in the workplace.

Table 1: Employer satisfaction, 2016 to 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Foundation – % | Foundation – CI | Adaptive – % | Adaptive – CI | Collaborative – % | Collaborative – CI | Technical – % | Technical – CI | Employability – % | Employability – CI | Overall satisfaction – % | Overall satisfaction – CI |
| 2016 | 92.0 | (91.2, 92.8) | 88.4 | (87.4, 89.4) | 84.6 | (83.5, 85.7) | 92.2 | (91.4, 93.0) | 83.8 | (82.7, 84.9) | 84.3 | (83.2, 85.4) |
| 2017 | 93.4 | (92.8, 94.0) | 90.1 | (89.3, 90.9) | 85.9 | (85.0, 86.8) | 93.3 | (92.6, 94.0) | 85.0 | (84.1, 85.9) | 83.6 | (82.7, 84.5) |
| 2018 | 93.5 | (92.9, 94.1) | 89.9 | (89.2, 90.6) | 88.7 | (87.9, 89.4) | 93.8 | (93.3, 94.4) | 86.5 | (85.7, 87.3) | 84.8 | (84.0, 85.6) |
| 2019 | 92.7 | (92.0, 93.3) | 89.3 | (88.5, 90.1) | 87.8 | (86.9, 88.5) | 92.7 | (92.0, 93.3) | 85.4 | (84.5, 86.2) | 84.0 | (83.1, 84.9) |
| 2020 | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.7 | (83.6, 85.7) |

As shown by Table 1, both overall satisfaction of employers and satisfaction with each of the graduate attribute domains increased by around 1 percentage point between 2019 and 2020. These increases in satisfaction, however, were not statistically significant as demonstrated by the presentation of confidence intervals. The change in employer satisfaction does not appear related to changes in response patterns arising from the COVID-19 pandemic. The increase in employer satisfaction was observed in both the November (pre COVID-19) and May (post COVID-19) rounds of the survey.

Study area

In 2020, employers reported highest overall satisfaction with Engineering graduates at 90.5 per cent. Supervisors also reported above average satisfaction with Agriculture and environmental studies and Education graduates, with 88.3 per cent and 87.6 per cent respectively. On the other hand, employer satisfaction, while still relatively high, appears lower for Management and commerce graduates, 82.7 per cent, Society and Culture graduates, 82.6 per cent and Creative arts graduates, 77.6 per cent.

Employer satisfaction was significantly lower for Creative arts graduates than for Engineering, Health and Education graduates, and was significantly lower for Society and culture and Management and commerce graduates than for Engineering graduates, as demonstrated by the presentation of confidence intervals in Table 2. This indicates the ESS instrument is capable of discriminating across fields of education.

Employer satisfaction with different graduate attributes varies across fields of education as shown in Table 2. For example, employers of Engineering graduates provided the highest rating of overall satisfaction in 2020, as noted above. Employers of Engineering graduates rated them above average for their Foundation skills (95.1 per cent), Collaborative skills (90.5 per cent) and Employability skills (87.4 per cent) attributes. Similarly, employers are highly satisfied with Agriculture and environmental graduates also rating them higher than average across all graduate attributes with the exception of their Employability skills. There appears more variation in overall satisfaction ranging by over 12 percentage points across fields of education. On the other hand, the variation in employer satisfaction in other graduate attributes appears much less ranging by 2 to 4 percentage points across fields of education

Table 2: Employer satisfaction by broad field of education, 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Broad field of education | Foundation – % | Foundation – CI | Adaptive – % | Adaptive – CI | Collaborative – % | Collaborative – CI | Technical – % | Technical – CI | Employability – % | Employability – CI | Overall satisfaction – % | Overall satisfaction – CI |
| Natural and Physical Sciences | 91.4 | (88.1, 93.9) | 88.9 | (85.2, 91.8) | 88.5 | (84.8, 91.4) | 93.7 | (90.6, 95.8) | 86.1 | (82.1, 89.3) | 84.3 | (80.3, 87.7) |
| Information Technology | 95.2 | (91.6, 97.4) | 90.2 | (85.6, 93.4) | 89.8 | (85.3, 93.1) | 95.7 | (92.1, 97.7) | 84.0 | (78.6, 88.2) | 87.2 | (82.4, 90.9) |
| Engineering and Related Technologies | 95.1 | (92.3, 96.9) | 87.9 | (84.2, 90.9) | 90.5 | (87.1, 93.1) | 92.9 | (89.8, 95.2) | 87.4 | (83.6, 90.5) | 90.5 | (87.1, 93.1) |
| Architecture and Building | 92.0 | (85.6, 95.7) | 87.1 | (79.8, 92.0) | 90.8 | (84.3, 94.9) | 94.1 | (88.2, 97.3) | 87.1 | (79.8, 92.0) | 82.8 | (75.1, 88.5) |
| Agriculture and Environmental Studies | 98.3 | (92.3, 100.0) | 95.0 | (87.8, 98.3) | 91.8 | (83.9, 96.2) | 98.3 | (92.3, 100.0) | 85.0 | (75.8, 91.2) | 88.3 | (79.6, 93.7) |
| Health | 94.6 | (93.0, 95.9) | 90.3 | (88.2, 92.1) | 89.2 | (87.0, 91.1) | 94.6 | (92.8, 95.9) | 85.3 | (82.8, 87.5) | 86.5 | (84.1, 88.6) |
| Education | 93.4 | (91.2, 95.1) | 91.6 | (89.2, 93.5) | 86.1 | (83.2, 88.5) | 94.5 | (92.4, 96.0) | 86.0 | (83.0, 88.5) | 87.6 | (84.8, 89.9) |
| Management and Commerce | 94.6 | (92.8, 95.9) | 90.1 | (87.8, 91.9) | 86.7 | (84.2, 88.8) | 92.9 | (91.0, 94.5) | 89.7 | (87.4, 91.6) | 82.7 | (79.9, 85.1) |
| Society and Culture | 92.8 | (91.1, 94.3) | 90.8 | (88.9, 92.4) | 88.0 | (85.8, 89.8) | 93.3 | (91.6, 94.7) | 87.9 | (85.7, 89.7) | 82.6 | (80.2, 84.8) |
| Creative Arts | 92.6 | (87.9, 95.6) | 89.4 | (84.1, 93.1) | 88.2 | (82.9, 92.1) | 95.5 | (91.4, 97.8) | 88.3 | (82.7, 92.2) | 77.6 | (71.2, 83.0) |
| **Total** | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.7 | (83.6, 85.7) |

Type of institution and course characteristics

Table 3 shows that employer satisfaction with graduates from universities (84.8 per cent) is more than 1 percentage point higher than for graduates from non-university higher education institutions (NUHEIs) (83.3 per cent) and is higher across all other graduate attributes with the exception of Employability skills. Employer satisfaction with graduates from universities is significantly higher in terms of their Adaptive skills and Collaboration skills, as shown by confidence intervals in Table 3.

Supervisors expressed significantly higher levels of overall satisfaction with graduates who studied internally, 86.3 per cent, in comparison with graduates who studied externally, 78.9 per cent, as shown by Table 3. Supervisors also rated internal graduates’ other graduate attributes significantly more highly than those of external graduates, with the exception of their Adaptive skills.

Employers appear less satisfied with postgraduate coursework graduates, 82.7 per cent, than with postgraduate research graduates, 89.6 per cent, and undergraduates, 85.4 per cent, as shown by Table 3. Supervisors rated postgraduate coursework graduates significantly lower than undergraduates for most attributes. This difference is most pronounced around Collaborative skills where employers rated postgraduate coursework graduates at 84.8 per cent compared with 90.3 per cent for undergraduates. This may be attributed to a high proportion of postgraduate coursework graduates studying externally and so not engaging as much in student centred collaborative learning activities. Similarly, employers rated postgraduate coursework graduates significantly lower than postgraduate research graduates on their Foundation skills, Collaborative skills, and Technical skills.

Table 3: Employer satisfaction by type of institution and course characteristics, 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Foundation – %** | **Foundation – CI** | **Adaptive – %** | **Adaptive – CI** | **Collaborative – %** | **Collaborative – CI** | **Technical – %** | **Technical – CI** | **Employability – %** | **Employability – CI** | **Overall satisfaction – %** | **Overall satisfaction – CI** |
| Type of institution: University | 93.9 | (93.2, 94.6) | 90.5 | (89.6, 91.4) | 88.5 | (87.5, 89.4) | 94.1 | (93.3, 94.7) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.8 | (83.7, 85.8) |
| Type of institution: NUHEI | 91.0 | (87.4, 93.7) | 84.8 | (80.6, 88.3) | 82.4 | (78.0, 86.1) | 90.6 | (87.0, 93.4) | 86.9 | (82.8, 90.2) | 83.3 | (79.0, 86.9) |
| Mode: Internal | 94.5 | (93.7, 95.2) | 90.6 | (89.6, 91.5) | 89.7 | (88.7, 90.7) | 94.7 | (93.9, 95.4) | 87.8 | (86.7, 88.8) | 86.3 | (85.1, 87.4) |
| Mode: External | 91.2 | (89.3, 92.8) | 88.5 | (86.4, 90.3) | 82.3 | (79.9, 84.5) | 90.8 | (88.9, 92.4) | 83.5 | (81.1, 85.7) | 78.9 | (76.3, 81.3) |
| Course level: Undergraduate | 94.5 | (93.5, 95.3) | 89.8 | (88.5, 90.9) | 90.3 | (89.0, 91.4) | 94.7 | (93.7, 95.5) | 87.4 | (86.0, 88.7) | 85.4 | (84.0, 86.8) |
| Course level: Postgraduate coursework | 92.2 | (90.9, 93.3) | 89.9 | (88.5, 91.2) | 84.8 | (83.1, 86.4) | 91.9 | (90.6, 93.1) | 85.5 | (83.8, 87.1) | 82.7 | (80.9, 84.3) |
| Course level: Postgraduate research | 96.4 | (94.1, 97.9) | 93.1 | (90.1, 95.3) | 89.9 | (86.5, 92.5) | 97.5 | (95.4, 98.7) | 89.6 | (86.1, 92.3) | 89.6 | (86.2, 92.3) |
| **Total** | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.7 | (83.6, 85.7) |

Demographic and labour market characteristics

Broadly speaking, employers appear equally satisfied with male and female graduates in 2020. The exception being there is a small and significant difference in employer perceptions of the Adaptive skills of male and female graduates with employers rating females 3 percentage points higher than male graduates, as shown by Table 4.

Employers rated the skills of younger graduates higher than those of older graduates aged over 30 years. Younger graduates were rated significantly better than older graduates with respect to all graduate attributes with the exception of their Adaptive skills, as shown by the confidence intervals in Table 4. For example, employers rated younger graduates’ Collaborative skills at 91.1 per cent compared with 83.6 per cent for older graduates. Younger graduates were also rated significantly higher than older graduates in terms of overall satisfaction, with graduates aged 30 years or under rating 86.3 per cent compared to graduates aged 30 years or older, 82.3 per cent.

Employers rated graduates from a non-English speaking background more highly than graduates from an English speaking background in terms of overall satisfaction and all other graduate attributes. For example, employers rated non-English speaking graduates Employability skills three percentage points higher than English-speaking graduates, 89.2 per cent and 86.5 per cent respectively, though this difference was not statistically significant.

Differences in employer ratings for Indigenous and non-Indigenous graduates are not significant and should be treated with caution due to the relatively small numbers of responses from employers of Indigenous graduates. This is also the case with employers of graduates with a reported disability.

Employers reported higher overall satisfaction with graduates working in Professional occupations, 87.6 per cent in Table 5, and this was significantly higher than employer satisfaction with graduates working in all other occupations with the exception of Technicians and trades workers. While this is consistent with higher education qualifications being more relevant for working in Professional occupations, as shown later when discussing graduate and employer views of skills relevance and utilisation, overall satisfaction with graduates in Professional occupations was rated significantly higher than graduates working in Managerial occupations, 81.8 per cent. Employers also rated graduates employed in Professional occupations significantly higher than graduates employed in Managerial occupations in terms of their Collaborative skills, 88.7 per cent and 82.1 per cent, and their Technical skills, 94.5 per cent and 90.2 per cent.

In general, employer perceptions of graduates that worked full-time were broadly similar to those of graduates that worked part-time with no significant differences between the two groups of graduates, as shown by the confidence intervals in Table 5.

Employers’ overall satisfaction with graduates who had been working for between three months and one year was significantly higher, 86.2 per cent, than for graduates who had been working for one year or more, 83.1 per cent. Also, the Collaborative skills of graduates who had been working for between three months and one year were rated significantly higher, 89.7 per cent, than those for graduates with longer work histories of one year or more, 86.0 per cent.

Table 4: Employer satisfaction by demographic characteristics, 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Foundation – % | Foundation – CI | Adaptive – % | Adaptive – CI | Collaborative – % | Collaborative – CI | Technical – % | Technical – CI | Employability – % | Employability – CI | Overall satisfaction – % | Overall satisfaction – CI |
| Gender: Male | 93.0 | (91.7, 94.0) | 88.3 | (86.7, 89.6) | 86.7 | (85.1, 88.2) | 92.7 | (91.4, 93.8) | 85.5 | (83.8, 87.0) | 85.3 | (83.6, 86.8) |
| Gender: Female | 94.4 | (93.4, 95.2) | 91.5 | (90.4, 92.5) | 89.1 | (87.8, 90.2) | 94.7 | (93.8, 95.5) | 87.8 | (86.5, 89.0) | 84.2 | (82.8, 85.5) |
| Age: 30 years or under | 94.9 | (94.0, 95.6) | 90.5 | (89.3, 91.6) | 91.1 | (90.0, 92.1) | 95.0 | (94.1, 95.8) | 88.3 | (87.0, 89.4) | 86.3 | (85.0, 87.5) |
| Age: Over 30 years | 92.0 | (90.7, 93.2) | 89.6 | (88.1, 90.9) | 83.6 | (81.9, 85.2) | 92.1 | (90.8, 93.2) | 84.8 | (83.1, 86.4) | 82.3 | (80.5, 84.0) |
| Indigenous: Indigenous | 94.4 | (83.9, 98.8) | 86.1 | (73.8, 93.4) | 88.9 | (77.0, 95.3) | 94.3 | (83.5, 98.7) | 88.2 | (75.8, 95.0) | 91.2 | (79.4, 96.9) |
| Indigenous: Not Indigenous | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.2 | (89.3, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.6 | (83.5, 85.6) |
| Home language: English | 93.6 | (92.8, 94.3) | 90.1 | (89.1, 91.0) | 87.6 | (86.6, 88.6) | 93.7 | (92.9, 94.4) | 86.5 | (85.4, 87.5) | 84.3 | (83.1, 85.4) |
| Home language: other than English | 94.4 | (92.2, 96.0) | 90.6 | (87.9, 92.7) | 91.1 | (88.5, 93.1) | 94.5 | (92.3, 96.1) | 89.2 | (86.4, 91.5) | 87.5 | (84.6, 90.0) |
| Disability: Reported disability | 94.9 | (91.7, 97.0) | 89.2 | (84.9, 92.4) | 87.7 | (83.3, 91.1) | 93.2 | (89.4, 95.7) | 87.6 | (83.1, 91.0) | 87.4 | (82.9, 90.9) |
| Disability: No disability | 93.6 | (92.9, 94.3) | 90.2 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.9 | (93.1, 94.6) | 86.8 | (85.7, 87.8) | 84.5 | (83.4, 85.5) |
| **Total** | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.7 | (83.6, 85.7) |

Table 5: Employer satisfaction by labour market characteristics, 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Foundation – % | Foundation – CI | Adaptive – % | Adaptive – CI | Collaborative – % | Collaborative – CI | Technical – % | Technical – CI | Employability – % | Employability – CI | Overall satisfaction – % | Overall satisfaction – CI |
| Occupation: Managers | 92.6 | (89.5, 94.8) | 92.1 | (89.0, 94.5) | 82.1 | (77.9, 85.6) | 90.2 | (86.7, 92.8) | 89.0 | (85.4, 91.8) | 81.8 | (77.6, 85.3) |
| Occupation: Professionals | 94.5 | (93.6, 95.3) | 90.2 | (89.0, 91.2) | 88.7 | (87.5, 89.9) | 94.5 | (93.6, 95.3) | 86.0 | (84.7, 87.3) | 87.6 | (86.3, 88.8) |
| Occupation: Technicians and trades workers | 88.8 | (83.7, 92.5) | 85.4 | (79.7, 89.7) | 86.7 | (81.3, 90.8) | 92.1 | (87.5, 95.2) | 86.0 | (80.4, 90.3) | 81.9 | (75.9, 86.7) |
| Occupation: Community and personal service workers | 91.7 | (88.5, 94.0) | 92.3 | (89.2, 94.6) | 89.8 | (86.4, 92.4) | 94.4 | (91.6, 96.3) | 88.2 | (84.6, 91.1) | 81.6 | (77.5, 85.1) |
| Occupation: Clerical and administrative workers | 93.7 | (91.2, 95.5) | 89.0 | (85.8, 91.5) | 86.7 | (83.4, 89.5) | 92.6 | (89.9, 94.6) | 88.3 | (85.1, 90.9) | 78.7 | (74.8, 82.1) |
| Occupation: Other workers | 93.8 | (90.2, 96.1) | 89.8 | (85.6, 93.0) | 89.9 | (85.8, 92.8) | 92.8 | (88.9, 95.4) | 88.7 | (84.4, 92.0) | 76.4 | (71.3, 80.9) |
| Employment status: full-time | 93.5 | (92.6, 94.3) | 89.9 | (88.8, 90.9) | 87.3 | (86.1, 88.4) | 93.8 | (92.9, 94.6) | 86.2 | (84.9, 87.3) | 85.0 | (83.8, 86.2) |
| Employment status: part-time | 94.1 | (92.7, 95.2) | 90.7 | (89.1, 92.2) | 89.8 | (88.1, 91.3) | 93.9 | (92.4, 95.1) | 88.4 | (86.6, 90.0) | 83.8 | (81.8, 85.7) |
| Duration of job with current employer: Less than 3 months | 93.7 | (90.8, 95.8) | 88.4 | (84.8, 91.3) | 89.9 | (86.4, 92.5) | 94.5 | (91.7, 96.4) | 86.4 | (82.6, 89.5) | 85.1 | (81.1, 88.3) |
| Duration of job with current employer: 3 months to < 1 year | 94.2 | (93.1, 95.1) | 89.8 | (88.4, 91.0) | 89.7 | (88.4, 91.0) | 94.0 | (92.9, 95.0) | 86.5 | (84.9, 87.9) | 86.2 | (84.7, 87.6) |
| Duration of job with current employer: 1 year or more | 93.2 | (92.1, 94.2) | 90.8 | (89.4, 91.9) | 86.0 | (84.5, 87.4) | 93.4 | (92.3, 94.4) | 87.3 | (85.8, 88.7) | 83.1 | (81.4, 84.6) |
| **Total** | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) | 93.8 | (93.1, 94.5) | 86.8 | (85.8, 87.8) | 84.7 | (83.6, 85.7) |

## Employer satisfaction by institution

This report combines results from the 2018, 2019 and 2020 Employer Satisfaction Surveys to publish results for Table A and B universities at institution level as shown in Table 6. This is consistent with the approach utilised on the QILT website where results are pooled across surveys to increase the number of responses, and confidence intervals are published to improve the robustness and validity of the data. The number of employer responses in the 2018 to 2020 surveys across institutions is shown in Appendix 3. There are over 12,530 employer responses across universities, ranging from over 907 responses for The University of Melbourne down to 58 responses for Bond University and 41 responses for the University of Divinity. The QILT reports and website do not publish results where there are fewer than 25 survey responses. For this reason, results for individual non-university higher education institution (NUHEIs) are not shown since for most NUHEIs the number of employer responses is too small.

Employer satisfaction is broadly similar across most of Australia’s Table A and B universities, with consistently high levels of satisfaction. Nonetheless, Table 6 demonstrates the ESS has the capacity to discriminate between universities, with overall satisfaction ranging from 92.9 per cent to 77.5 per cent. Employer satisfaction was rated highest for graduates from Bond University and the University of Divinity, at 92.9 per cent and 92.3 per cent respectively. Note, however, the small number of responses for Bond University and the University of Divinity means there is are wide confidence intervals associated with these estimates and as a result employer satisfaction cannot said to be significantly higher at this institution than at other institutions. Other universities rated highly by employers include the Australian Catholic University and the University of Wollongong, reporting 89.8 per cent and 89.7 per cent overall satisfaction by employers respectively.

Table 6: Employer satisfaction by institution (universities only), 2018 to 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Foundation – % | Foundation – CI | Adaptive – % | Adaptive – CI | Collaborative – % | Collaborative – CI | Technical – % | Technical – CI | Employability – % | Employability – CI | Overall satisfaction – % | Overall satisfaction – CI |
| Australian Catholic University | 93.8 | (91.1, 95.8) | 88.3 | (85.0, 91.0) | 88.9 | (85.6, 91.5) | 93.4 | (90.6, 95.4) | 86.6 | (83.0, 89.6) | 89.8 | (86.7, 92.3) |
| Bond University | 98.2 | (91.6, 100.0) | 90.7 | (81.9, 95.7) | 94.5 | (86.7, 98.2) | 100.0 | (94.4, 100.0) | 92.5 | (83.9, 96.9) | 92.9 | (84.7, 97.1) |
| Central Queensland University | 94.7 | (91.4, 96.8) | 91.3 | (87.5, 94.1) | 90.7 | (86.7, 93.6) | 95.6 | (92.6, 97.5) | 87.1 | (82.7, 90.5) | 88.5 | (84.4, 91.7) |
| Charles Darwin University | 94.1 | (89.4, 96.9) | 89.3 | (83.4, 93.3) | 92.5 | (87.4, 95.7) | 96.6 | (92.4, 98.6) | 87.5 | (81.4, 91.8) | 80.4 | (73.5, 85.8) |
| Charles Sturt University | 92.7 | (90.4, 94.5) | 91.9 | (89.6, 93.8) | 85.1 | (82.2, 87.7) | 94.1 | (91.9, 95.7) | 86.7 | (83.9, 89.2) | 81.3 | (78.1, 84.1) |
| Curtin University | 92.0 | (89.3, 94.1) | 85.7 | (82.4, 88.5) | 87.1 | (83.9, 89.7) | 91.3 | (88.5, 93.5) | 82.6 | (79.0, 85.7) | 85.8 | (82.4, 88.5) |
| Deakin University | 93.4 | (91.6, 94.9) | 91.2 | (89.1, 92.9) | 89.9 | (87.7, 91.7) | 94.0 | (92.1, 95.4) | 88.1 | (85.8, 90.1) | 84.3 | (81.7, 86.6) |
| Edith Cowan University | 95.0 | (91.8, 97.1) | 94.1 | (90.6, 96.3) | 92.5 | (88.8, 95.1) | 95.9 | (92.7, 97.7) | 88.8 | (84.6, 92.0) | 84.5 | (79.9, 88.2) |
| Federation University Australia | 93.9 | (89.7, 96.5) | 87.1 | (81.8, 91.0) | 88.0 | (82.9, 91.8) | 89.1 | (84.1, 92.7) | 87.8 | (82.7, 91.6) | 81.2 | (75.4, 85.9) |
| Flinders University | 94.5 | (91.8, 96.3) | 90.9 | (87.7, 93.4) | 88.0 | (84.5, 90.8) | 94.8 | (92.2, 96.6) | 85.0 | (81.1, 88.1) | 84.4 | (80.5, 87.6) |
| Griffith University | 90.1 | (87.4, 92.3) | 87.7 | (84.7, 90.2) | 84.6 | (81.4, 87.3) | 92.0 | (89.5, 94.0) | 83.5 | (80.1, 86.3) | 80.4 | (76.9, 83.4) |
| James Cook University | 93.7 | (90.2, 96.0) | 89.2 | (85.1, 92.3) | 89.3 | (85.2, 92.4) | 95.0 | (91.7, 97.1) | 84.9 | (80.3, 88.7) | 81.7 | (76.8, 85.8) |
| La Trobe University | 93.7 | (91.3, 95.5) | 91.0 | (88.2, 93.2) | 87.8 | (84.7, 90.3) | 94.4 | (92.1, 96.1) | 86.9 | (83.7, 89.6) | 86.3 | (83.0, 88.9) |
| Macquarie University | 94.9 | (92.3, 96.6) | 90.1 | (86.8, 92.7) | 87.8 | (84.2, 90.6) | 93.3 | (90.4, 95.4) | 90.0 | (86.6, 92.6) | 84.1 | (80.2, 87.4) |
| Monash University | 94.0 | (92.3, 95.3) | 90.3 | (88.3, 92.1) | 89.5 | (87.3, 91.3) | 94.1 | (92.4, 95.4) | 87.8 | (85.5, 89.7) | 87.4 | (85.1, 89.4) |
| Murdoch University | 90.1 | (85.1, 93.6) | 88.9 | (83.6, 92.7) | 85.3 | (79.7, 89.6) | 94.1 | (89.8, 96.8) | 85.7 | (80.0, 90.0) | 79.0 | (72.9, 84.1) |
| Queensland University of Technology | 96.0 | (93.5, 97.6) | 90.5 | (87.2, 93.1) | 88.1 | (84.5, 90.9) | 95.5 | (92.9, 97.2) | 86.6 | (82.8, 89.7) | 86.9 | (83.2, 89.9) |
| RMIT University | 91.6 | (89.2, 93.5) | 88.3 | (85.7, 90.6) | 87.4 | (84.7, 89.7) | 91.5 | (89.1, 93.4) | 84.1 | (81.1, 86.7) | 83.4 | (80.4, 86.0) |
| Southern Cross University | 92.6 | (88.4, 95.4) | 90.1 | (85.5, 93.4) | 87.3 | (82.4, 91.0) | 90.6 | (86.0, 93.8) | 87.7 | (82.7, 91.3) | 83.5 | (78.1, 87.9) |
| Swinburne University of Technology | 92.2 | (88.6, 94.7) | 90.6 | (86.7, 93.4) | 90.3 | (86.4, 93.1) | 94.3 | (91.1, 96.5) | 87.6 | (83.4, 90.9) | 87.4 | (83.2, 90.7) |
| The Australian National University | 92.4 | (88.5, 95.1) | 91.1 | (86.9, 94.0) | 89.0 | (84.5, 92.3) | 93.9 | (90.2, 96.3) | 86.2 | (81.3, 90.0) | 83.1 | (78.0, 87.2) |
| The University of Adelaide | 95.8 | (93.2, 97.5) | 92.5 | (89.3, 94.9) | 91.9 | (88.7, 94.3) | 95.3 | (92.6, 97.1) | 88.6 | (84.8, 91.5) | 83.7 | (79.6, 87.2) |
| The University of Melbourne | 94.3 | (92.8, 95.4) | 88.9 | (87.0, 90.6) | 87.6 | (85.7, 89.3) | 93.2 | (91.6, 94.4) | 84.5 | (82.3, 86.5) | 84.9 | (82.8, 86.8) |
| The University of Notre Dame Australia | 93.1 | (88.1, 96.2) | 93.0 | (88.0, 96.2) | 86.1 | (79.9, 90.6) | 91.2 | (85.6, 94.7) | 86.8 | (80.7, 91.3) | 83.9 | (77.4, 88.9) |
| The University of Queensland | 95.0 | (93.5, 96.2) | 90.1 | (88.1, 91.9) | 90.2 | (88.2, 91.9) | 94.8 | (93.2, 96.1) | 85.2 | (82.8, 87.4) | 85.7 | (83.3, 87.7) |
| The University of South Australia | 92.5 | (89.6, 94.6) | 87.8 | (84.3, 90.6) | 90.5 | (87.3, 92.9) | 94.3 | (91.7, 96.2) | 89.9 | (86.6, 92.4) | 87.0 | (83.4, 89.8) |
| The University of Sydney | 93.8 | (91.5, 95.5) | 89.8 | (87.1, 92.0) | 88.2 | (85.3, 90.6) | 93.9 | (91.7, 95.6) | 84.8 | (81.6, 87.6) | 84.5 | (81.3, 87.2) |
| The University of Western Australia | 94.4 | (90.6, 96.8) | 92.0 | (87.7, 94.9) | 89.7 | (85.1, 93.0) | 95.6 | (91.9, 97.7) | 86.7 | (81.6, 90.6) | 77.5 | (71.6, 82.5) |
| Torrens University | 88.1 | (80.9, 92.9) | 87.1 | (79.8, 92.0) | 89.5 | (82.7, 93.9) | 90.6 | (83.9, 94.8) | 83.7 | (76.1, 89.3) | 78.6 | (70.3, 85.0) |
| University of Canberra | 92.9 | (88.9, 95.6) | 86.2 | (81.2, 90.1) | 88.4 | (83.7, 91.9) | 90.4 | (85.9, 93.6) | 86.1 | (81.1, 90.0) | 83.4 | (78.2, 87.6) |
| University of Divinity | 97.4 | (88.2, 100.0) | 97.4 | (88.2, 100.0) | 87.5 | (76.2, 94.1) | 87.5 | (76.2, 94.1) | 89.7 | (78.6, 95.7) | 92.3 | (81.8, 97.4) |
| University of New England | 93.6 | (90.8, 95.6) | 90.6 | (87.5, 93.1) | 85.6 | (81.9, 88.7) | 94.3 | (91.6, 96.2) | 84.9 | (81.2, 88.1) | 79.3 | (75.2, 82.9) |
| University of New South Wales | 92.9 | (89.9, 95.1) | 91 | (87.7, 93.5) | 87.9 | (84.2, 90.9) | 94.0 | (91.0, 96.0) | 87.3 | (83.4, 90.3) | 86.5 | (82.7, 89.6) |
| University of Newcastle | 94.0 | (91.4, 95.9) | 90.6 | (87.5, 93.0) | 89.1 | (85.8, 91.6) | 94.6 | (92.1, 96.4) | 87.5 | (84.1, 90.3) | 85.5 | (81.9, 88.5) |
| University of Southern Queensland | 92.5 | (89.0, 95.0) | 87.3 | (83.0, 90.6) | 82.9 | (78.3, 86.8) | 92.0 | (88.3, 94.6) | 84.0 | (79.5, 87.8) | 85.0 | (80.5, 88.6) |
| University of Tasmania | 90.2 | (87.9, 92.1) | 88.8 | (86.4, 90.8) | 85.5 | (82.9, 87.8) | 89.4 | (87.1, 91.4) | 82.4 | (79.6, 85.0) | 82.6 | (79.8, 85.1) |
| University of Technology Sydney | 93.6 | (91.1, 95.5) | 92.2 | (89.4, 94.3) | 90.5 | (87.6, 92.8) | 95.3 | (93.0, 96.9) | 86.7 | (83.4, 89.4) | 86.7 | (83.4, 89.5) |
| University of the Sunshine Coast | 95.2 | (91.3, 97.5) | 91 | (86.2, 94.3) | 91.2 | (86.5, 94.4) | 93.7 | (89.4, 96.4) | 89.1 | (83.8, 92.8) | 83.0 | (77.3, 87.5) |
| University of Wollongong | 94.6 | (91.4, 96.6) | 89.4 | (85.5, 92.4) | 93.6 | (90.3, 95.9) | 94.1 | (90.8, 96.2) | 86.5 | (82.2, 89.9) | 89.7 | (85.9, 92.6) |
| Victoria University | 96.9 | (93.6, 98.6) | 94.9 | (91.1, 97.2) | 93.8 | (89.9, 96.4) | 95.5 | (91.9, 97.7) | 92.8 | (88.5, 95.6) | 86.9 | (81.8, 90.7) |
| Western Sydney University | 92.9 | (89.8, 95.2) | 89.2 | (85.6, 92.1) | 90.8 | (87.4, 93.4) | 94.8 | (91.9, 96.7) | 87.3 | (83.4, 90.4) | 86.5 | (82.6, 89.7) |
| **Total Universities** | **93.4** | **(93.1, 93.8)** | **90** | **(89.5, 90.4)** | **88.5** | **(88.0, 89.0)** | **93.6** | **(93.2, 93.9)** | **86.3** | **(85.7, 86.8)** | **84.6** | **(84.1, 85.2)** |

## Skills relevance and utilisation

With the rapid expansion in student enrolments in recent years, concerns have been expressed that this may be leading to an oversupply of higher education graduates. This oversupply can manifest itself in the ‘over-education’ of graduates where they may not be fully utilising their skills or qualifications in their present position. There is a considerable literature on qualification related underemployment.[[1]](#footnote-1) The Employer Satisfaction Survey provides valuable evidence on employers’ perceptions on the relevance and utilisation of higher education graduates’ skills and qualifications. It remains important to monitor these assessments over time.

Overall, graduates tend to view their qualification as less important for their current employment than do their supervisors, as shown by Table 7. Over half of the graduates, 56.7 per cent, considered their qualification to be ‘very important’ or ‘important’ to their current job. Almost one in eight graduates, 12.0 per cent, felt that it was ‘not at all important’. On the other hand, 63.3 per cent of supervisors indicated that the qualification was ‘very important’ or ‘important’ and only 7.5 per cent indicated that it was ‘not at all important’ for the graduate’s current job. Given that a little under half of the graduates had been employed for less than one year after completing their qualification, their relative lack of work experience may explain why they did not fully comprehend the extent to which their qualification is important for their job.

Health and Education qualifications were rated by graduates and supervisors as being significantly more important for their current position than most other fields of education. This is consistent with these qualifications being a requirement for employment in many instances. For example, 69.7 per cent of graduates and 78.2 per cent of supervisors thought that Health qualifications were important for current employment, as shown by Table 8. Similarly, 74.4 per cent of graduates and 77.9 per cent of supervisors thought that Education qualifications were important for current employment. Supervisors of Creative arts, Management and commerce and Information technology graduates were least likely to think that the qualification was important for current employment at 48.6 per cent, 50.7 per cent, and 51.1 per cent respectively. The largest discrepancy between the views of graduates and employers was in Architecture and building where 61.1 per cent of graduates rated their qualification as being important compared with 76.1 per cent of supervisors, a difference of 15 percentage points. Other areas where supervisors rated the qualification substantially higher than graduates was in Agriculture and environmental studies and Creative arts with gaps of 10 or more percentage points. Education had the lowest difference between graduate and employer assessments of the importance of the qualification to current work with a gap of 4 percentage points.

Graduates and supervisors of those working in Professional occupations were most likely to state that the qualification was important for the job at 68.6 per cent and 76.4 per cent respectively (Table 9). This is consistent with the ABS classification of occupations where managerial and professional jobs are defined at Skill Level 1 being commensurate with qualifications at bachelor level or higher. Graduates and supervisors working in lower skill level jobs, that is, technicians and trade workers and below, were unsurprisingly much less likely to state that the qualification was important for the job.

Graduates and their supervisors were also asked to indicate the extent to which the recent qualification prepared the graduate for their job. A high proportion of graduates and supervisors, 87.9 per cent and 94.0 per cent respectively, thought the qualification prepared the graduate well or very well for the job, as shown in Table 10. The proportion of supervisors who thought the qualification prepared the graduate for the job has remained consistently high since the employer survey was first conducted in 2016, ranging between 92 per cent and 94 per cent in rounded terms. Overall, there appears to be a strong relationship between skills and knowledge acquired by higher education graduates and the requirements of their jobs after graduation. This result strongly affirms the value of higher education qualifications in terms of preparation for work.

Table 7: Importance of qualification for current employment, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Very important | 36.7 | (35.3, 38.1) | 39.1 | (37.8, 40.5) |
| Important | 20.0 | (18.9, 21.2) | 24.2 | (23.1, 25.5) |
| Fairly important | 17.1 | (16.0, 18.2) | 16.4 | (15.4, 17.5) |
| Not that important | 14.2 | (13.2, 15.2) | 12.8 | (11.8, 13.7) |
| Not at all important | 12.0 | (11.1, 13.0) | 7.5 | (6.8, 8.3) |
| **Total** | 100.0 | (99.9, 100.0) | 100.0 | (99.9, 100.0) |

Table 8: Importance of qualification for current employment by broad field of education, 2020\*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Natural and Physical Sciences | 54.0 | (48.9, 59.0) | 58.2 | (53.3, 63.0) |
| Information Technology | 45.6 | (39.1, 52.4) | 51.1 | (45.0, 57.2) |
| Engineering and Related Technologies | 65.1 | (60.0, 70.0) | 71.1 | (66.4, 75.4) |
| Architecture and Building | 61.1 | (51.4, 70.0) | 76.1 | (67.9, 82.8) |
| Agriculture and Environmental Studies | 50.0 | (39.8, 60.2) | 60.3 | (49.9, 69.8) |
| Health | 69.7 | (66.4, 72.7) | 78.2 | (75.5, 80.7) |
| Education | 74.4 | (70.8, 77.7) | 77.9 | (74.6, 80.8) |
| Management and Commerce | 45.9 | (42.4, 49.4) | 50.7 | (47.4, 54.0) |
| Society and Culture | 49.9 | (46.8, 53.0) | 55.5 | (52.5, 58.4) |
| Creative Arts | 36.0 | (29.3, 43.3) | 48.6 | (41.8, 55.5) |
| **Total** | 56.7 | (55.2, 58.2) | 63.4 | (62.0, 64.7) |
| **Standard deviation (percentage points)** | 12.1 |  | 11.9 |  |

\*Refers to the percentage of graduates and supervisors rating the qualification as ‘very important’ or ‘important’ for current employment.

Table 9: Importance of qualification for current employment, by occupation group, 2020[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Managers | 44.4 | (39.4, 49.5) | 54.1 | (49.2, 58.9) |
| Professionals | 68.6 | (66.8, 70.3) | 76.4 | (74.9, 77.9) |
| Technicians and trades workers | 44.9 | (38.0, 51.9) | 49.3 | (42.6, 56.0) |
| Community and personal service workers | 37.3 | (32.5, 42.3) | 48.8 | (44.1, 53.6) |
| Clerical and administrative workers | 35.8 | (31.6, 40.4) | 41.2 | (37.0, 45.5) |
| Other workers | 23.2 | (18.4, 28.8) | 19.4 | (15.3, 24.1) |
| **Total** | 56.7 | (55.2, 58.2) | 63.4 | (62.0, 64.7) |
| **Standard Deviation** | 15.1 |  | 18.5 |  |

Taken in conjunction with the findings regarding the importance of the qualification, it seems to be the case that importance could be related to domain-specific skills or knowledge whereas preparedness is a broader concept, encapsulating generic skills and potentially basic employability. Alternatively, as around half of graduates whose employers responded to the survey had been employed in their current position before they completed their qualification, it is understandable that a higher education qualification could be perceived as being less important while still preparing the graduate for employment by broadening or deepening existing skills and knowledge.

In general, graduates across all fields of education were less likely than their supervisors to indicate they felt their qualification prepared them for their current job, as shown by Table 11. Architecure and building graduates, 78.3 per cent, Creative arts graduates, 81.4 per cent and Society and culture graduates, 84.3 per cent, were least likely to state that their qualification prepared them for their job. Supervisors in each of these areas were more likely to state that the course had prepared the graduate well or very well for their current employment, with Architecture and building graduate supervisors rating preparedness 16.9 percentage points higher than graduates. Supervisors of graduates from the Creative arts and Society and culture fields of education also rated preparedness higher than graduates by 7.1 percentage points and 8.2 percentage points respectively.

It should also be noted there was less variation across fields of education among supervisors stating the qualification prepared the graduate for current employment, 3.0 percentage points (see Table 11), than amongst supervisors stating the qualifaction was important for the job, 11.9 percentage points (see Table 8). This seems to support the previous observation that while higher education qualifications may not be ‘important’ in the sense they are not ‘mandatory’ or ‘required’, they nevertheless prepare graduates for employment very well.

Table 10: Extent to which qualification prepared graduate for current employment, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Very well | 43.4 | (41.9, 45.0) | 53.3 | (51.8, 54.8) |
| Well | 44.5 | (43.0, 46.0) | 40.7 | (39.3, 42.2) |
| Not well | 6.0 | (5.3, 6.8) | 3.2 | (2.7, 3.7) |
| Not at all | 6.1 | (5.4, 6.9) | 2.8 | (2.3, 3.3) |
| **Total** | 100.0 |  | 100.0 |  |

Table 11: Extent to which qualification prepared graduate well or very well for current employment, by broad field of education, 2020[[3]](#footnote-3)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Natural and Physical Sciences | 86.4 | (82.3, 89.6) | 89.2 | (85.5, 92.0) |
| Information Technology | 85.3 | (79.7, 89.6) | 93.8 | (89.8, 96.3) |
| Engineering and Related Technologies | 87.3 | (83.3, 90.5) | 95.4 | (92.7, 97.2) |
| Architecture and Building | 78.3 | (69.0, 85.3) | 95.2 | (89.6, 98.1) |
| Agriculture and Environmental Studies | 88.1 | (79.3, 93.6) | 96.6 | (89.7, 99.3) |
| Health | 92.8 | (90.8, 94.4) | 94.9 | (93.2, 96.2) |
| Education | 93.0 | (90.6, 94.8) | 97.2 | (95.6, 98.3) |
| Management and Commerce | 88.6 | (86.0, 90.7) | 95.7 | (94.0, 96.9) |
| Society and Culture | 84.3 | (81.7, 86.5) | 92.5 | (90.6, 94.0) |
| Creative Arts | 81.4 | (74.6, 86.7) | 88.5 | (82.8, 92.5) |
| **Total** | 87.9 | (86.9, 88.9) | 94.1 | (93.3, 94.7) |
| **Standard deviation (percentage points)** | 4.6 |  | 3.0 |  |

Table 12 shows that supervisors of graduates working in Managerial and Professional occupations were most likely, at 95.7 per cent and 96.1 per cent respectively, to state that the qualification had prepared the graduate well or very well for current employment. The difference in ratings of preparedness by graduates and supervisors for graduates in Professional and Technical and Trades occupations was quite low at around 4 to 5 percentage points, whereas differences for Community and personal service workers with 9.7 percentage points, and graduates in “Other” occupations with 21.8 percentage points seems to indicate that those employed in lower skill occupations were less confident in how well their course had prepared them for work compared with their immediate supervisors.

Supervisors were also offered the opportunity to provide feedback on the main ways that the qualification had prepared the graduate for employment, as shown by Table 13, and there were almost 4,800 comments in eight themes. Overall, 42.8 per cent of supervisors reported favourably on graduates’ Domain specific skills and knowledge and 35.8 per cent reported favourably on graduates’ Adaptive skills. A substantial number of comments were also made that expanded on the quantitative ratings of graduate attributes including Employability and enterprise skills, 31.4 per cent, Technical and professional skills, 30.9 per cent, and Foundation skills, 25.9 per cent. Positive feedback was also provided in relation to the graduates’ personal attributes, 12.4 per cent, Teamwork and interpersonal skills, 12.2 per cent, and Institutional and course attributes with 9.9 per cent.

There were substantially fewer comments (1172) regarding the ways in which the qualification could have better prepared the graduate for employment suggesting the majority of supervisors felt that the graduate had been well prepared for the workplace, as shown by Table 14. These observations are consistent with the generally very positive supervisor ratings of graduate preparation.

The greatest number of comments related to the ways in which graduates could have better prepared for employment were made in relation to Technical and professional skills, 32.4 per cent, Domain specific skills and knowledge, 29.6 per cent and Employability and enterprise skills, 25.1 per cent. Supervisor feedback regarding how to better prepare graduates for employment also referenced Institutional and course attributes, 9.2 per cent, Foundation skills , 8.2 per cent, Adaptive skills, 5.1 per cent and Teamwork and interpersonal skills, 3.1 per cent.

Table 12: Extent to which qualification prepared graduate well or very well for current employment, by occupation, 2020 (%)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates % | Graduates CI | Supervisors % | Supervisors CI |
| Managers | 90.5 | (86.9, 93.2) | 95.7 | (93.0, 97.4) |
| Professionals | 92.0 | (90.8, 92.9) | 96.1 | (95.3, 96.8) |
| Technicians and trades workers | 88.9 | (83.4, 92.8) | 92.1 | (87.1, 95.3) |
| Community and personal service workers | 79.6 | (74.8, 83.6) | 89.3 | (85.7, 92.1) |
| Clerical and administrative workers | 81.8 | (77.8, 85.3) | 90.8 | (87.7, 93.1) |
| Other workers | 60.0 | (53.2, 66.5) | 81.8 | (76.4, 86.2) |
| **Total** | 87.9 | (86.9, 88.9) | 94.1 | (93.3, 94.7) |
| **Standard Deviation** | 11.9 |  | 5.2 |  |

Table 13: Main ways that the qualification prepared the graduate for employment, 2020[[4]](#footnote-4)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % | CI |
| Adaptive skills | 42.8 | (41.1, 44.4) |
| Domain specific skills and knowledge | 35.8 | (34.2, 37.5) |
| Employability and enterprise skills | 31.4 | (29.9, 33.0) |
| Technical and professional skills | 30.9 | (29.3, 32.5) |
| Foundation skills | 25.9 | (24.4, 27.4) |
| Personal attributes | 12.4 | (11.3, 13.5) |
| Teamwork and interpersonal skills | 12.2 | (11.1, 13.3) |
| Institutional and course attributes | 9.9 | (9.0, 11.0) |

Table 14: Main ways that the qualification could have better prepared the graduate for employment, 2020[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | % | CI |
| Domain specific skills and knowledge | 32.4 | (30.0, 34.8) |
| Technical and professional skills | 29.6 | (27.3, 32.0) |
| Employability and enterprise skills | 25.1 | (23.0, 27.4) |
| Institutional and course attributes | 9.2 | (7.8, 10.8) |
| Foundation skills | 8.2 | (6.9, 9.7) |
| Adaptive skills | 5.1 | (4.1, 6.3) |
| Teamwork and interpersonal skills | 3.1 | (2.3, 4.2) |
| Personal attributes | n/a |  |

# Appendix 1: Methodology

## Overview

Graduates of 109 higher education institutions, including all 41 Table A and B universities, and 70 Non-University Higher Education Institutions (NUHEIs), were in scope to provide contact details for supervisors to participate in the 2020 ESS. Of these institutions, supervisors of graduates from 41 universities and 60 NUHEIs were included in the 2020 ESS sample. In all, supervisors responded with data for 41 universities and 53 NUHEIs.

The population frame for the 2020 ESS comprised 98,915 graduates, domestic and international, who responded in the 2020 GOS and indicated that they were employed. Of these, 8,048 employed graduates provided sufficient contact details to approach 7,523 supervisors, yielding a supervisor referral rate of 7.6 per cent.

This is lower than the 9.5 per cent supervisor referral rate achieved in the 2019 ESS. As in previous years, there remains a reluctance among graduates to pass on their supervisor contact details. Establishment of the QILT brand allied with efforts to promote the QILT surveys and especially the ESS among companies that are known employers of graduates may help to lift the supervisor referral rate over time.

In the 2020 ESS, a total of 3,430 valid survey responses from direct supervisors were collected across all study levels, representing a supervisor response rate of 45.5 per cent. This is lower than the 48.1 per cent supervisor response rate achieved in 2019. Further information on institutional responses is included at Appendices 3. A copy of the generic survey items (i.e. excluding any department or institution specific items) is included at Appendix 2.

The collection periods for the 2020 ESS were November 2019 to February 2020 and May to July 2020, with a minor collection taking place in February 2020 to April 2020 to accommodate institutions running a trimester academic calendar. For reporting purposes, the November and February collection period outcomes are combined.

Table 15: ESS project overview 2018 to 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project element | 2018 Nov/Feb | 2018 May | 2018 Total | 2019 Nov/Feb | 2019 May | 2019 Total | 2020 Nov/Feb | 2020 May | 2020 Total |
| Number of in-scope supervisors[[6]](#footnote-6) | 2317 | 7899 | 10216 | 2889 | 6842 | 9731 | 3235 | 4288 | 7523 |
| Number of completed surveys | 1113 | 4198 | 5311 | 1428 | 3261 | 4689 | 1430 | 2000 | 3430 |
| Supervisor response rate (%) | 48.0 | 53.1 | 51.9 | 49.4 | 47.6 | 48.1 | 44.2 | 46.6 | 45.5 |
| Data collection period | 2018 Nov/Feb | 2018 May | 2018 Total | 2019 Nov/Feb | 2019 May | 2019 Total | 2020 Nov/Feb | 2020 May | 2020 Total |
| Data collection mode | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI | Online and CATI |
| Analytic unit | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor | Supervisor |

## Sample build

The collection of supervisor details occurred each round at the end of the Graduate Outcomes Survey. All graduates in employment (but not self-employed or working in a family business) were asked to provide details (name, email and/or phone number) of their current supervisor so that the supervisor could be invited to take part in the ESS.

A number of strategies were implemented in an attempt to increase the number of graduates providing valid contact details for their supervisor, such as calls to graduates to correct inaccurate or incomplete supervisor contact information, and follow up calls to graduates who requested more information prior to agreeing to provide supervisor contact details.

There remains a reluctance among graduates to pass on their supervisor contact details. Establishment of the QILT brand allied with efforts to promote the QILT surveys and especially the ESS among companies that are known employers of graduates may help to lift the supervisor referral rate over time.

## Mode of collection and contact strategy

Online was the primary mode of collection for the ESS, with Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) a secondary mode.

If a valid email address was provided by the graduate, the supervisor would receive an email invitation to the online ESS on the following working day. If the graduate only provided a phone number for their supervisor, the supervisor was called in an attempt to complete the ESS via CATI.

The email invitation was followed by up to two reminder emails to non-responding supervisors, the first reminder sent three business days following the invitation and the second reminder sent seven business days following the first reminder email.

Where a phone number as well as an email address was provided by the graduate, non-responding supervisors after the second reminder email were channelled into the CATI workflow. For the November and February collection periods, non-responding supervisors were channelled into the CATI workflow five business days after the second reminder email, and for the May collection period, non-responding supervisors were channelled into the CATI workflow two business days after the second reminder email.

## Response bias

The tables that follow compare the course, demographic and labour market characteristics of employed graduate respondents to the GOS, with the characteristics of graduates whose supervisors responded to the ESS to detect possible bias in the ESS. That is, these tables identify the extent to which the ESS departs from being a representative survey of employers of recent graduates. Employed graduate respondents to the GOS were asked to provide contact details of their supervisors and as such represent the population frame for the ESS.

Comparison of employed graduates with supervisor responses by field of education shows that Education graduates are overrepresented by 4.1 percentage points in the survey whilst Health, Management and commerce and Creative arts are underrepresented in the ESS, as shown by Table 16.

From Table 2, supervisors of Education graduates recorded higher than average ratings while supervisors of Management and commerce and Creative arts graduates reported lower than average satisfaction ratings. Therefore, the bias in supervisor responses by field of education, all other things equal, raises reported overall satisfaction.

Table 16: Respondents by broad field of education 2020[[7]](#footnote-7)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Employed graduates: n | Employed graduates: % | Supervisors: n | Supervisors: % |
| Natural and Physical Sciences | 7803 | 7.9 | 278 | 8.1 |
| Information Technology | 5171 | 5.2 | 167 | 4.9 |
| Engineering and Related Technologies | 6017 | 6.1 | 262 | 7.6 |
| Architecture and Building | 2199 | 2.2 | 88 | 2.6 |
| Agriculture and Environmental Studies | 1463 | 1.5 | 61 | 1.8 |
| Health | 21951 | 22.2 | 659 | 19.2 |
| Education | 9463 | 9.6 | 471 | 13.7 |
| Management and Commerce | 18612 | 18.8 | 590 | 17.2 |
| Society and Culture | 20966 | 21.2 | 722 | 21.0 |
| Creative Arts | 5251 | 5.3 | 131 | 3.8 |
| **Total** | 98915 | 100.0 | 3430 | 100.0 |

There is a slightly higher level of responses from supervisors of external graduates in the ESS by 4.1 percentage points as seen in Table 17. Supervisors of external graduates report lower overall satisfaction (see Table 3) so that overrepresentation of the supervisors of external graduates would lead to a downward bias in reported overall satisfaction in the 2020 ESS.

Supervisors of postgraduate coursework and postgraduate research graduates are somewhat over-represented by 0.9 percentage points and 3.0 percentage points respectively, while undergraduate supervisors are underrepresented by 3.9 percentage points. Since employers report lower satisfaction with postgraduate coursework graduates this is anticipated to lead to a downward bias in reported employer satisfaction. This would be offset, in part, by overrepresentation of postgraduate research graduates who report higher employer satisfaction. However, the population of postgraduate research graduates is much smaller, likely resulting in smaller bias for postgraduate compared with undergraduate responses.

Table 17: Respondents by type of institution and course characteristics, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Employed graduates: n | Employed graduates: % | Supervisors: n | Supervisors: % |
| Type of institution: University | 92210 | 93.2 | 3175 | 92.6 |
| Type of institution: NUHEI | 6705 | 6.8 | 255 | 7.4 |
| Mode: Internal | 80268 | 81.1 | 2643 | 77.1 |
| Mode: External | 18455 | 18.7 | 781 | 22.8 |
| Course level: Undergraduate | 54407 | 55.0 | 1752 | 51.1 |
| Course level: Postgraduate coursework | 39208 | 39.6 | 1390 | 40.5 |
| Course level: Postgraduate research | 5300 | 5.4 | 288 | 8.4 |

Table 18 compares the demographic characteristics of employed graduate respondents to the GOS with the demographic characteristics of graduates whose supervisors actually responded to the ESS. Supervisors of male graduates are slightly overrepresented in the ESS by around 3.7 percentage points as seen in Table 18, and they report slighlty higher overall satisfaction as shown by Table 4. However, differences in employer satisfaction with male and female graduates are not significant so the overrepresentation of employers of male graduates is unlikely to materially impact on reported overall satisfaction.

Supervisors of graduates aged 30 years and over are overrepresented in the ESS by 10.9 percentage points. This is consistent with the overrepresentation of supervisors of postgraduate coursework and postgraduate research graduates as shown in Table 17. Employers of older graduates reported lower overall satisfaction as shown in Table 4, so the overrepresentation of older graduates is likely to lead to a small downward bias in reported overall satisfaction. Additionally, there is a significant difference between employers’ overall satisfaction with younger graduates (86.3 per cent) compared to older graduates (82.3 per cent).

Table 18: Respondents by demographic characteristics, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Employed graduates: n | Employed graduates: % | Supervisors: n | Supervisors: % |
| Gender: Male | 37219 | 37.6 | 1418 | 41.3 |
| Gender: Female | 61438 | 62.1 | 2003 | 58.4 |
| Age: 30 years or under | 69345 | 70.1 | 2030 | 59.2 |
| Age: Over 30 years | 29570 | 29.9 | 1400 | 40.8 |
| Indigenous: Indigenous | 1103 | 1.1 | 38 | 1.1 |
| Indigenous: Not Indigenous | 97812 | 98.9 | 3392 | 98.9 |
| Home language: English | 83883 | 84.8 | 2988 | 87.1 |
| Home language: other than English | 15032 | 15.2 | 442 | 12.9 |
| Disability: Reported disability | 4927 | 5.0 | 205 | 6.0 |
| Disability: No disability | 93796 | 94.8 | 3219 | 93.8 |
| **Total** | 98915 | 100.0 | 3430 | 100.0 |

Supervisors of graduates working in Professional occupations are overrepresented by 4.1 percentage points in the ESS. From Table 5 earlier, supervisors of graduates working in Professional occupations reported higher overall satisfaction. All other things equal, this would lead to an upward bias in the reported overall satisfaction in the 2020 ESS.

Supervisors of graduates employed full-time are overrepresented in the ESS by 5.5 percentage points. From Table 5 earlier, there was little significant difference in reported overall satisfaction among supervisors of graduates who worked either full-time or part-time. Supervisors of graduates who have worked in their current job for between three months and one year are over-represented in the 2020 ESS by 8.7 percentage points. Satisfaction with this group was higher than for those who had been employed for under three months or those who had been employed for 1 year or more (see Table 5) and so their overrepresentation may lead to an upward bias in employer satisfaction.

In summary, over-representation of responses from employers of graduates in Education courses, graduates working in Professional occupations and graduates employed between 3 months and one year, is likely to lead to an upward bias in reported employer satisfaction. On the other hand, over-representation of the supervisors of postgraduate coursework and external graduates is likely to lead to a downward bias in reported employer satisfaction.

Table 19: Respondents by labour market characteristics, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Employed graduates: n | Employed graduates: % | Supervisors: n | Supervisors: % |
| Occupation: Managers | 7053 | 7.4 | 282 | 8.3 |
| Occupation: Professionals | 54325 | 56.9 | 2069 | 61.0 |
| Occupation: Technicians and trades workers | 3248 | 3.4 | 148 | 4.4 |
| Occupation: Community and personal service workers | 10080 | 10.6 | 304 | 9.0 |
| Occupation: Clerical and administrative workers | 9442 | 9.9 | 367 | 10.8 |
| Occupation: Other workers | 11389 | 11.9 | 223 | 6.6 |
| **Occupation: Total** | 95537 | 100.0 | 3393 | 100.0 |
| Employment status: full-time | 63417 | 64.1 | 2388 | 69.6 |
| Employment status: part-time | 35498 | 35.9 | 1042 | 30.4 |
| **Employment status: Total** | 98915 | 100.0 | 3430 | 100.0 |
| Duration of job with current employer[[8]](#footnote-8): Less than 3 months | 11211 | 12.4 | 285 | 8.3 |
| Duration of job with current employer[[9]](#footnote-9): 3 months to < 1 year | 33594 | 37.1 | 1569 | 45.8 |
| Duration of job with current employer[[10]](#footnote-10): 1 year or more | 45778 | 50.5 | 1571 | 45.9 |
| **Total** | 90583 | 100.0 | 3425 | 100.0 |

## Graduate Attributes Scale – Employer (GAS-E)

The Graduate Attributes Scale – Employer (GAS-E) was developed as part of the original 2013–14 Trial of the Employer Satisfaction Survey. The project team synthesised a number of frameworks relevant to the skills of university graduates and identified a number of general attributes. The GAS-E has been designed to assess common rather than specific graduate attributes, within a limited workplace context. The items were further tested and refined during a 2015 trial of the instrument. The five graduate attribute domains identified, as noted earlier, include:

* Foundation skills
* Adaptive skills
* Collaborative skills
* Technical skills
* Employability skills.

The GAS-E forms the core of the Employer Satisfaction Survey.

Graduates responding to the GOS were asked to assess their Foundation, Adaptive and Collaborative skills. This enables assessment of the likely impact of the low graduate referral rate, one of the major continuing methodological challenges facing the current ESS, by comparing graduate self-assessment of attributes among graduates that did or did not provide supervisor contact details.

Table 20 shows that graduates who provided contact details for their supervisor rated their Foundation, Adaptive and Collaborative skills more highly than graduates who elected not to offer contact information. Even though the ratings for these groups of skills is high for both groups, it would appear that graduates who were more positive about the skills they had acquired would be more comfortable having their supervisor participate in the ESS. This could be expected to lead to upward bias in reported levels of employer satisfaction in the 2020 ESS.

For purposes of comparison, supervisor assessment of these graduate attributes is repeated in Table 20 below. While noting the potential for upward bias in reported employer satisfaction, it is worth repeating the overall high rating of graduate attributes by both categories of graduates that did or did not provide supervisor contact details and also by supervisors. While graduates not providing supervisor contact details showed lower ratings of graduate attributes, Table 20 demonstrates this was not of a substantially lower order of magnitude. Notwithstanding potential upward bias in reported employer satisfaction, results in the 2020 ESS continues to provide evidence of the likely high quality of graduates from the Australian higher education system.

Table 20: Graduate attributes of graduates who did and did not provide contact details, 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Graduates not providing supervisor details: % | Graduates not providing supervisor details: CI | Graduates providing supervisor details: % | Graduates providing supervisor  details: CI | Supervisors: % | Supervisors: CI |
| Foundation skills | 85.0 | (84.8, 85.2) | 89.5 | (88.9, 90.1) | 93.7 | (93.0, 94.4) |
| Adaptive skills | 83.6 | (83.4, 83.9) | 88.3 | (87.6, 88.9) | 90.1 | (89.2, 91.0) |
| Collaborative skills | 77.8 | (77.5, 78.0) | 80.0 | (79.2, 80.8) | 88.1 | (87.1, 89.0) |

# Appendix 2: Summary of 2020 ESQ items

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variable | Item name | Item label | Base – detail | Values |
| **Module** |  |  |  | Module A: Screening and confirmation |
| QS1 | SUPERVISOR RELATIONSHIP | First, we have a few questions about your role and <**E403**> <**E402**>’s role, so we can understand your relationship to <**E403**>.  Just to check, do you currently supervise <**E403**>?  By supervisor, we mean a person who has the authority to direct someone to do certain tasks and who has a good idea of the work that the person does in their job. | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No, but I used to be their supervisor  3. No, I have never been their supervisor  (GO TO TERM) |
| QS2 | SUPERVISOR RELATIONSHIP DURATION | And, how long have you been <**E403**>’s supervisor? | \*(IS CURRENTLY OR USED TO SUPERVISE GRADUATE IN QS1) | 1. Less than 1 month  2. At least 1 month but less than 3 months  3. At least 3 months but less than 1 year  4. 1 year or more |
| QS3 | AWARENESS OF INSTITUTION | Before today, were you aware that <**E403**> completed a qualification from <**E306C>**? | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No |
| QS4 | AWARENESS OF INSTITUTION | And, before today, were you aware that the qualification <**E403**> completed was a <**E308**>? | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No |
| QS5 | GRADUATE’S OCCUPATION | What is **<E403>**’s occupation in your business? | \*(ALL) | (VERBATIM RSEPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| QS6 | GRADUATE TASKS | What are the main tasks that they usually perform in their job? | \*(ALL) | (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| QS7 | EMPLOYER OCCUPATION | What is your occupation in your business? | \*(ALL) | (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| QS8 | EMPLOYER DUTIES | What are the main tasks that you usually perform in this job? | \*(ALL) | (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| **Module** |  |  |  | Module B: Overall graduate preparation |
| Text |  |  |  | The next set of questions asks about the skills and attributes you think are important for recent graduates to have when coming into your organisation.  Please answer them in relation to the job currently performed by <**E403**> |
| QOP1 | FORMAL REQUIREMENT | Is a <**E308**> or similar qualification a formal requirement for <**E403**> to do their job? | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No |
| QOP2 | IMPORTANCE OF QUALIFICATION | To what extent is it important for <**E403**> to have a <**E308**> or similar qualification to be able to do the job well? Is it… |  | 1. Not at all important  2. Not that important  3. Fairly important  4. Important  5. Very important |
| QOP3 | OVERALL PREPARATION | Overall, how well did <**E403**>’s <**E308**> prepare <him/her> for their job? | \*(ALL) | 1. Not at all  2. Not well  3. Well  4. Very well  5. Don’t know / unsure |
| QOP4 | OPEN (POSITIVE) | What are the MAIN ways that <**E306C**> prepared <**E403**> for employment? | \*(ALL) | 1. Don’t know/unsure (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| QOP5 | OPEN (IMPROVE) | And what are the **MAIN** ways that  <**E306C**> could have **better prepared** <**E403**> for employment? | \*(ALL) | 1. Don’t know/unsure (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| QS11 | OVERALL RATING | Based on your experience with <**E403**>, how likely are you to consider hiring another <**E308**> graduate from <**E306C**>, if you had a relevant vacancy?  Would you say… | \*(ALL) | 1. Very unlikely to consider  2. Unlikely to consider  3. Neither unlikely nor likely to consider  4. Likely to consider  5. Very likely to consider  6. Don’t know/unsure |
| **Module** |  |  |  | **Module C: Graduate attributes scale** |
| Text |  |  |  | The following questions ask about specific skills and attributes that may be important for employees to have in your organisation. |
| GAS Stem |  | For each skill or attribute, to what extent do you agree or disagree that <**E403**>’s <**E308**> from <**E306C**> prepared them for their job?  If the skill is not required by <**E403**> in their role, you can answer ‘Not applicable’. | \*(ALL) |  |
| GAS | FOUNDATION SKILLS | 1. Oral communication skills  2. Written communication skills  3. Numeracy skills  4. Ability to develop relevant knowledge  5. Ability to develop relevant skills  6. Ability to solve problems  7. Ability to integrate knowledge  8. Ability to think independently  about problems | \*(ALL) | 1. Strongly disagree  2. Disagree  3. Neither disagree nor agree  4. Agree  5. Strongly agree  9. Not applicable |
| GAS | ADAPTIVE SKILLS  AND ATTRIBUTES | 9. Broad background knowledge  10. Ability to develop innovative ideas  11. Ability to identify new opportunities  12. Ability to adapt knowledge to different contexts  13. Ability to apply skills in different contexts  14. Capacity to work independently | \*(ALL) | 1. Strongly disagree  2. Disagree  3. Neither disagree nor agree  4. Agree  5. Strongly agree  9. Not applicable |
| GAS | TEAMWORK SKILLS | 15. Working well in a team  16. Getting on well with others  in the workplace  17. Working collaboratively with colleagues to complete tasks  18. Understanding different points of view  19. Ability to interact with co-workers from different or multi-cultural backgrounds | \*(ALL) | 1. Strongly disagree  2. Disagree  3. Neither disagree nor agree  4. Agree  5. Strongly agree  9. Not applicable |
| GAS | TECHNICAL SKILLS | 20. Applying professional knowledge to job tasks  21. Using technology effectively  22. Applying technical skills in the workplace  23. Maintaining professional standards  24. Observing ethical standards  25. Using research skills to gather evidence | \*(ALL) | 1. Strongly disagree  2. Disagree  3. Neither disagree nor agree  4. Agree  5. Strongly agree  9. Not applicable |
| GAS | EMPLOYABILITY SKILLS | 26. Ability to work under pressure  27. Capacity to be flexible in the workplace  28. Ability to meet deadlines  29. Understanding the nature of your business or organisation  30. Demonstrating leadership skills  31. Demonstrating management skills  32. Taking responsibility for personal professional development  33. Demonstrating initiative in the workplace | \*(ALL) | 1. Strongly disagree  2. Disagree  3. Neither disagree nor agree  4. Agree  5. Strongly agree  9. Not applicable |
| **Module** |  |  |  | **Module E: Institution specific issues** |
| **Module** |  |  |  | **Module F: Close** |
| Text |  |  |  | Thank you for your assistance with this survey. We would like to provide some feedback to participants about the outcomes of the study. We anticipate finishing the study in mid-2020. |
| C3 | SURVEY FEEDBACK | Would you like to be notified when the national data is released on the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) website? We will also provide a one page summary of the outcomes of the study. | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No |
| C4 | ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | Would you like your organisation to be acknowledged on the QILT website for supporting this important research? If you are unsure please select yes, as you will be able to opt out of this during our follow up with you. | \*(ALL) | 1. Yes  2. No |
| C2 | SUPERVISOR EMAIL (CONFIRM) | Can we confirm the best email address to contact you on? | \*(EMPLOYERS WHO WOULD LIKE TO BE CONTACTED REGARDING RESEARCH SUMMARIES OR WISH TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED ON THE QILT WEBSITE) | 1. My email address is <**supemail**>  2. The best email address to contact me on is: <VERBATIM RSEPONSE TEXT BOX> |
| C5 | FOLLOW UP | So that we can properly acknowledge your business on the QILT website, can you please confirm your business name as you would like it to appear on the site? | \*(EMPLOYERS WHO WANT TO BE ACKNOWLEDGED ON THE QILT WEBSITE) | 1. My business name is: (VERBATIM RESPONSE TEXT BOX) |
| Text | END |  |  | Thank you for your time today and support in ensuring that graduates are well equipped to meet the needs of organisations like yours. If you would like further information about the ESS, including previous year’s results you can go to [www.qilt.edu.au/ess](http://www.qilt.edu.au/ess) |
|  | (TERMINATED – NOT SUPERVISOR OF GRADUATE) | Thank you for your willingness to complete the Employer Satisfaction Survey (ESS). You have indicated that you are not the supervisor of <E403>. If you incorrectly selected this option or your workplace still wishes to take part with another supervisory person please call The Social Research Centre’s helpdesk on 1800 023 040. You can also email us at [ess@srcentre.com.au](mailto:ess@srcentre.com.au). | \*IF (QS1=3) |  |

# Appendix 3: Institutional participation

The tables below show institutions that participated in the Graduate Outcomes Survey with one or more responses in the Employer Satisfaction Survey.

Table 21: University participation 2018 to 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institution | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | Total |
| Australian Catholic University | 114 | 110 | 97 | 321 |
| Bond University | 19 | 21 | 16 | 56 |
| Central Queensland University | 85 | 82 | 49 | 216 |
| Charles Darwin University | 58 | 42 | 23 | 123 |
| Charles Sturt University | 238 | 140 | 97 | 475 |
| Curtin University | 155 | 120 | 103 | 378 |
| Deakin University | 267 | 223 | 142 | 632 |
| Edith Cowan University | 91 | 68 | 54 | 213 |
| Federation University Australia | 72 | 46 | 40 | 158 |
| Flinders University | 152 | 110 | 39 | 301 |
| Griffith University | 170 | 141 | 111 | 422 |
| James Cook University | 76 | 76 | 59 | 211 |
| La Trobe University | 136 | 148 | 101 | 385 |
| Macquarie University | 116 | 113 | 75 | 304 |
| Monash University | 268 | 235 | 188 | 691 |
| Murdoch University | 73 | 36 | 38 | 147 |
| Queensland University of Technology | 110 | 80 | 95 | 285 |
| RMIT University | 200 | 189 | 106 | 495 |
| Southern Cross University | 56 | 65 | 48 | 169 |
| Swinburne University of Technology | 84 | 80 | 63 | 227 |
| The Australian National University | 63 | 47 | 80 | 190 |
| The University of Adelaide | 111 | 91 | 67 | 269 |
| The University of Melbourne | 329 | 321 | 257 | 907 |
| The University of Notre Dame Australia | 44 | 43 | 34 | 121 |
| The University of Queensland | 333 | 204 | 174 | 711 |
| The University of South Australia | 113 | 119 | 83 | 315 |
| The University of Sydney | 171 | 143 | 120 | 434 |
| The University of Western Australia | 91 | 49 | 25 | 165 |
| Torrens University | 23 | 34 | 33 | 90 |
| University of Canberra | 60 | 73 | 45 | 178 |
| University of Divinity | 15 | 20 | 6 | 41 |
| University of New England | 125 | 108 | 78 | 311 |
| University of New South Wales | 128 | 75 | 75 | 278 |
| University of Newcastle | 135 | 134 | 63 | 332 |
| University of Southern Queensland | 40 | 114 | 71 | 225 |
| University of Tasmania | 200 | 236 | 151 | 587 |
| University of Technology Sydney | 136 | 136 | 88 | 360 |
| University of the Sunshine Coast | 70 | 50 | 33 | 153 |
| University of Wollongong | 125 | 77 | 27 | 229 |
| Victoria University | 49 | 61 | 59 | 169 |
| Western Sydney University | 92 | 111 | 62 | 265 |

Table 22: NUHEI participation 2018 to 2020

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** | **Total** |
| Academy of Information Technology | 4 | 3 | 1 | 8 |
| ACAP and NCPS | 6 | 16 | 11 | 33 |
| Adelaide Central School of Art |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| Adelaide College of Divinity | 4 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| Alphacrucis College | 8 | 7 | 5 | 20 |
| Australian Academy of Music and Performing Arts |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Australian College of Christian Studies |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Australian College of Nursing |  | 9 | 12 | 21 |
| Australian College of Theology Limited | 25 | 7 | 15 | 47 |
| Australian Institute of Business Pty Ltd | 37 | 63 | 25 | 125 |
| Australian Institute of Management Education & Training |  | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| Australian Institute of Professional Counsellors | 1 |  | 2 | 3 |
| Avondale University College | 13 | 13 | 9 | 35 |
| BBI - The Australian Institute of Theological Education |  |  | 3 | 3 |
| Box Hill Institute | 2 | 1 | 4 | 7 |
| Canberra Institute of Technology |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Chisholm Institute |  | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Christian Heritage College | 12 | 8 | 3 | 23 |
| Collarts (Australian College of the Arts) | 3 | 4 |  | 7 |
| Eastern College Australia | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| Endeavour College of Natural Health | 10 | 6 | 2 | 18 |
| Excelsia College | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |
| Health Education & Training Institute | 5 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| Holmes Institute | 11 | 11 | 8 | 30 |
| Holmesglen Institute | 4 | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| INSEARCH | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| International College of Hotel Management | 3 | 5 | 1 | 9 |
| International College of Management, Sydney | 3 | 4 | 6 | 13 |
| Kaplan Business School | 8 | 10 | 15 | 33 |
| Kaplan Higher Education Pty Ltd | 10 | 8 | 7 | 25 |
| King's Own Institute | 13 | 7 | 6 | 26 |
| LCI Melbourne | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |
| Le Cordon Bleu Australia | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 |
| Leo Cussen Centre for Law |  | 2 | 5 | 7 |
| Macleay College | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| Marcus Oldham College | 8 | 8 | 1 | 17 |
| Melbourne Institute of Technology | 7 | 6 | 6 | 19 |
| Melbourne Polytechnic | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| Moore Theological College | 23 | 7 | 9 | 39 |
| Morling College |  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| National Art School | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| North Metropolitan TAFE | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Perth Bible College | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| Photography Studies College (Melbourne) |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| SP Jain School of Management |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Stott's College |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| SAE Institute | 12 | 9 | 5 | 26 |
| Sydney College of Divinity | 7 | 8 | 6 | 21 |
| Tabor College of Higher Education | 8 | 6 | 6 | 20 |
| TAFE NSW | 5 | 5 | 2 | 12 |
| TAFE Queensland | 1 | 4 | 1 | 6 |
| TAFE South Australia |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| The Australian College of Physical Education | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| The Australian Institute of Music | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| The Cairnmillar Institute | 2 | 2 |  | 4 |
| The College of Law Limited | 26 | 35 | 33 | 94 |
| The MIECAT Institute | 2 |  | 2 | 4 |
| Think Education | 5 | 3 | 2 | 10 |
| VIT (Victorian Institute of Technology) |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Wentworth Institute of Higher Education |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Whitehouse Institute of Design, Australia |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| William Angliss Institute | 2 | 1 |  | 3 |

1. For example, see Mavromaras, K., McGuinness, S., & O’Leary, N. (2009). Job mismatches and labour market outcomes, 1–26. Retrieved from http://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/50157 on the match between graduates and their jobs [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Refers to the percentage of graduates and supervisors rating the qualification as ‘very important’ or ‘important’ for current employment. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. n/a indicates suppression due to the number of responses being less than 25. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Does not add to 100 per cent. Supervisors were able to provide more than one comment. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Does not add to 100 per cent. Supervisors were able to provide more than one comment. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Excludes opt outs, disqualified and out of scope surveys [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Total includes a small number of responses in Food, Hospitality and Personal Services. Note that total figures by broad field of education shown elsewhere in this report include Food, Hospitality and Personal Services. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Graduates refers to duration of job with current employer while data for supervisors refers to duration of job with current supervisor. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Graduates refers to duration of job with current employer while data for supervisors refers to duration of job with current supervisor. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Graduates refers to duration of job with current employer while data for supervisors refers to duration of job with current supervisor. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)