

# THE QUALITY OF PROPERTY EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA

GRAEME NEWELL  
University of Western Sydney

## ABSTRACT

*Using the Graduate Careers Council of Australia (GCCA) student surveys, the quality of property education in Australia is assessed over 1994-2001. Analyses are presented for the seven property universities in Australia regarding good teaching and overall satisfaction, as well as the property discipline benchmarked against the property-related disciplines of accounting, building, business, economics, law and planning. High levels of student satisfaction are evident, although some concerns are raised over the teaching quality. Both teaching quality and overall satisfaction have improved in recent years. The ongoing implications for property education in Australia are also critically assessed.*

**Keywords:** Property education, GCCA surveys, benchmarking, teaching quality, student satisfaction.

## INTRODUCTION

Property education in Australia has received coverage over the last 35 years in the professional property journals (eg: Australian Property Journal, Property Australia). While initially focussed on valuation education, this was subsequently extended to cover the broader property education areas such as course curriculum developments (eg: Newell and Eves, 2000), property education and property careers (eg: Avdiev, 2000), the education needs of property professionals (eg: Boyd, 2000), the history of property education (Avdiev, 1994, 1995) and property education paradigms (eg: Fischer, 2000).

However, the critical analysis of property education issues has only received limited coverage in the academic property journals in the region. In the Pacific Rim Property Research Journal (PRPRJ), only issues relating to property education paradigms (Yu, 2000) and international curriculum developments (Webb, 1997) have been discussed.

Internationally, the publication of the Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education in 1998 has seen a significant increase in the attention given to the critical assessment of property education issues. This has seen a range of specific property education issues addressed, including the property education body of knowledge

(Black and Rabianski, 2003), student assessment (Manning, 2002), problem-based learning (Anderson et al., 2000) and strategies for property academics to add value (Manning and Roulac, 2001).

Except for Manning (2002), all of the above property education research has been driven from a property academic perspective, without a fuller appreciation of the student perspective to the quality of property education. In an increasingly competitive university environment, assessing the quality of the property education experience for property graduates is also an important property education consideration for the purposes of evaluating performance, monitoring change and benchmarking performance. This has seen numerous studies on the use of student input and the quality of the education experience reported in other disciplines (eg: Cherry and Dave, 1997; Cohen, 1980; Haddad, 1999; McKone, 1999; Wagner, 1999). Typically, this has involved exit surveys by individual universities for internal quality control purposes, exit surveys by accrediting groups and exit surveys by professional management groups.

In Australia, the Graduate Careers Council of Australia (GCCA) surveys over 150,000 university graduates annually, using a 24-item Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) to assess the quality of teaching, the clarity of goals and standards, appropriate workloads, appropriate assessment, generic skills and overall satisfaction.

Importantly, equivalent assessments of property education in the US and UK are not as extensive. The US News and World Report regularly prepares rankings of US real estate schools and their programs. Typically, these rankings are based on Deans' opinions as well as opinions of industry professionals, which contain a high degree of subjectivity and generally do not correlate with the more objective measures of educational performance. While the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) conduct outcome assessments of graduate courses in US business schools seeking AACSB accreditation (Cherry and Dave, 1997), they are not as comprehensive nor as nationally-based as those conducted by the GCCA in Australia. Less extensive and less frequent assessments of the quality of higher education in the UK are conducted by The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) for The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE, [www.qaa.ac.uk](http://www.qaa.ac.uk)).

The purpose of this paper is to analyse the GCCA surveys for property graduates from the seven "property" universities<sup>1</sup> in Australia over 1994-2001. In particular,

---

<sup>1</sup> The seven property universities are Curtin University, Queensland University of Technology (QUT), Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology (RMIT), University of Queensland (UQ), University of South Australia (USA), University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) and University of Western Sydney (UWS). Other universities are not available over this full time period (eg: University of Melbourne) or concentrate on post-graduate property programs (eg: University of NSW).

the issues of whether the standard of property education in Australia has improved in recent years and how the standard of property education compares to other related disciplines will be assessed.

## **GRADUATE CAREERS COUNCIL OF AUSTRALIA CEQ SURVEYS**

The Graduate Careers Council of Australia (GCCA) is the leading authority on the supply of and demand for new graduates in Australia ([www.gradlink.edu.au](http://www.gradlink.edu.au)). With over 30 years experience, the GCCA is a not-for-profit registered company, with representation from employers, universities and government.

To assess the students' view on the quality of their university education experience, the Graduate Careers Council of Australia (GCCA) has conducted the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) on an annual basis since 1993. Conducted jointly by the Australian universities and the GCCA, this survey is administered to all graduating students approximately four months after completing their studies; typically, this is in March-April each year.

The purpose of the GCCA CEQ is to obtain details of the graduates' perceptions of the quality of the courses undertaken in Australia. The GCCA survey has been standardised and a national report is provided, with the results classified according to over 80 discipline areas. The federal government via the Department of Education, Service and Training directly funds the assessment process. The scope and comprehensiveness of the GCCA CEQ procedure sees it as unique to Australia; particularly compared to the equivalent student satisfaction survey systems found in the US and UK (GCCA, 2001).

The GCCA CEQ<sup>2</sup> has 24-items to assess:

- good teaching: 6 sub-items
- clear goals and standards: 4 sub-items
- appropriate workload: 4 sub-items
- appropriate assessment: 3 sub-items
- generic skills: 6 sub-items
- overall satisfaction: 1 sub-item,

---

<sup>2</sup> The GCCA CEQ 2001 represents those students graduating in 2001; hence these students finished their studies in 2000. Typically, the lead-time between student GCCA survey completion and dissemination of survey results is 8-9 months.

**Table 1: GCCA Course Experience Questionnaire: 2001**

---

**GOOD TEACHING SCALE**

- The teaching staff of this course motivated me to do my best work
- The staff put a lot of time into commenting on my work
- The staff made a real effort to understand difficulties I might be having with my work
- The teaching staff normally gave me helpful feedback on how I was going
- My lecturers were extremely good at explaining things
- The teaching staff worked hard to make their subjects interesting

**CLEAR GOALS AND STANDARDS**

- It was always easy to know the standard of work expected
- I usually had a clear idea of where I was going and what was expected of me in this course
- It was often hard to discover what was expected of me in this course
- The staff made it clear right from the start what they expected from students

**APPROPRIATE WORKLOAD SCALE**

- The work load was too heavy
- I was generally given enough time to understand the things I had to learn
- There was a lot of pressure on me to do well in this course
- The sheer volume of work to get through in this course meant it couldn't all be thoroughly comprehended

**APPROPRIATE ASSESSMENT SCALE**

- To do well in this course, all you really need is a good memory
- The staff seemed more interested in testing what I had memorised than what I had understood
- Too many staff asked me questions just about facts

**GENERIC SKILLS SCALE**

- The course developed my problem-solving skills
- The course sharpened my analytical skills
- The course helped me develop my ability to work as a team member
- As a result of my course, I feel confident about tackling unfamiliar problems
- The course improved my skills in written communication
- My course helped me to develop the ability to plan my own work

**OVERALL SATISFACTION INDEX**

- Indicate your overall level of satisfaction with your course
-

with full details of each of these six categories shown in Table 1. Each question is scored on a 5-point Likert scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”, scored as -100, -50, 0, 50, 100 respectively. The CEQ has been a rigorously tested survey instrument since 1989, confirming the validity and usefulness of the CEQ as a performance indicator of the students’ perceived quality of the university education experience (GCCA, 2001).

Over the period of this paper (1994-2001), over one million graduates were surveyed. In 2000, the GCCA CEQ survey response rate was 58.0%, resulting in 90,585 completed surveys of the 156,273 surveys distributed. 50,455 (or 61%) of the completed surveys were for bachelor degrees. Response rates from the seven Australian “property” universities were QUT (72.2%), USA (59.6%), RMIT (57.6%), UTS (54.4%), UWS (51.6%), UQ (51.0%) and Curtin (50.3%), further representing the comprehensive nature of these GCCA survey results for the property discipline.

For each of the above six CEQ categories, average results are presented for each course, as well as national averages presented for each discipline area, including property, accounting, building, business, economics, law and planning. Similarly, percentages in each of the “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” categories are presented for each course. In the general discipline areas, cross-tabulations are also presented by age, sex, level of qualification and field of study. The property degrees are classified under the “valuation and real estate” discipline area.

For 1994-2001, over 1,500 property graduates responded to this GCCA CEQ survey, with 140-200 property graduates responding each year. On average, each year saw 191 property graduates responding, comprising Curtin (20 graduates), QUT (27), RMIT (38), UQ (20), USA (24), UTS (24) and UWS (38). In each case, sufficient property graduates responded each year to ensure a reliable indicator of teaching quality and overall satisfaction for each of the above universities. Equivalent numbers responding in 2001 in the related disciplines were accounting (3,346 graduates), building (121), business (1,830), law (990), economics (798) and planning (147), further reinforcing the reliability of the responses for these related disciplines.

Further details concerning the GCCA CEQ procedures are given in GCCA (2001). For this study, GCCA CEQ results for the seven Australian “property” universities were analysed over 1994-2001. All necessary annual survey results were obtained from the GCCA CEQ website:

[www.avcc.edu.au/students/gradlink/gcca/index.htm](http://www.avcc.edu.au/students/gradlink/gcca/index.htm),

with separate downloads available for each annual GCCA CEQ survey results. The use of the standardised GCCA CEQ survey methodology enables an effective

comparison across universities, as well as effective benchmarking against other related disciplines over 1994-2001.

While the six CEQ categories are available, only the two major CEQ categories of “good teaching” and “overall satisfaction” are presented in this paper. These two categories were considered to be the more important categories to assess, with the other four categories being more generic and less important in the overall property education context of this paper.

For convenience of analysis in this paper, the 5-point Likert scale of -100, -50, 0, 50, 100 was converted to a scale of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 respectively. Average scores are calculated for each year over 1994-2001, as well as sub-period analyses done for 1994-2001, 1994-97, 1998-2001 and 2000-01 to assess the changes that have occurred in more recent years. A time-weighted analysis over 1994-2001 which proportionately weights each of the more recent years is also presented.

Averages scores (and corresponding ranks) are given for each property degree for each year. Emphasis is placed on identifying broad property education trends over time, rather than the detailed testing of statistically significant differences between average scores each year.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **“Good teaching” results**

Table 2 presents the average scores and corresponding ranks (within years) over 1994-2001 for the various property degrees for the “good teaching” category of the GCCA CEQ survey. The national property results over 1994-2001 and the equivalent national results for accounting, building, business, economics, law and planning are also presented.

The national property average has consistently been in the range of 2.80-3.05, having shown a general trend of improving good teaching results over this 8-year period. This national property average over 1994-2001 of 2.91 (out of 5) shows some degree of student concern over the quality of teaching in property degrees in Australia. Importantly, the national property average per year was consistently below the national averages for good teaching in the various related disciplines. In particular, the related discipline of building matched or out-performed property in every year over 1994-2001 for “good-teaching”, with an average score of 3.01 compared to 2.91 for property over this eight-year period.

**Table 2: Analysis of GCCA CEQ “good teaching” results: 1994-2001\***

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	1994-2001
Curtin	2.54(6)	2.91(3)	2.98(2)	3.04(1)	3.14(1)	3.80(1)	3.22(1)	3.61(1)	3.16(1)
QUT	3.00(5)	3.03(2)	3.10(1)	3.02(2)	2.99(3)	2.98(3)	3.21(3)	3.28(2)	3.08(2)
RMIT	3.13(1)	3.04(1)	2.94(3)	2.89(4)	2.83(6)	2.97(4)	3.20(4)	2.86(6)	2.98(4)
UQ	3.08(3)	2.89(4)	2.84(4)	2.92(3)	3.09(2)	2.87(5)	3.22(1)	2.98(4)	2.99(3)
USA	2.23(7)	2.65(6)	2.58(7)	2.39(7)	2.60(7)	2.75(7)	2.55(7)	2.79(7)	2.57(7)
UTS	3.12(2)	2.39(7)	2.78(5)	2.74(5)	2.94(4)	2.87(6)	2.97(5)	2.92(5)	2.84(6)
UWS	3.01(4)	2.82(5)	2.64(6)	2.61(6)	2.89(5)	3.05(2)	2.96(6)	3.14(3)	2.89(5)
National “property” average	2.85	2.81	2.84	2.80	2.92	3.01	2.97	3.05	2.91
<b>Related areas</b>									
Accounting	2.88	2.86	2.86	2.92	2.97	3.00	3.02	3.02	2.94
Building	2.87	2.99	2.98	2.88	2.98	3.01	3.26	3.10	3.01
Business	2.97	2.89	3.00	3.06	3.14	3.18	3.21	2.97	3.05
Economics	2.84	2.86	2.88	2.93	3.04	3.09	3.05	3.06	2.97
Law	2.77	2.80	3.06	2.83	3.04	3.09	3.53	3.06	3.02
Planning	2.93	2.85	3.10	2.95	3.09	3.04	3.14	3.17	3.03

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.  
Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

While students generally did not rate teaching as highly as overall satisfaction across most disciplines surveyed by GCCA, typically, property and the related areas did not have high average scores for good teaching over 1994-2001. This is in contrast to the higher average scores for good teaching generally seen in the humanities/arts areas. Part of this difference, when property and the related disciplines are compared to the humanities/arts disciplines, relates to student expectations. In particular, the more focused and career-orientation nature of property students in their discipline area is likely to bring with it higher expectations regarding teaching quality and a desire for stronger linkages to their property career expectations. The more structured format and presentation style via lectures and tutorials of most property subjects is also in contrast to the generally more flexible workshop-format typically seen with humanities/arts subjects.

Amongst the seven property universities, Curtin University was clearly seen to be the best performed property university in the good teaching category. Curtin was ranked first in each of the last five years, with an average score of 3.16 over 1994-2001 and an average score of 3.36 over 1997-2001. Curtin also showed a consistent trend of improved “good teaching” over this eight-year period. The only other property university to achieve an average good teaching score above 3.0 over 1994-2001 was QUT, with QUT being consistently ranked in the top 3 for good teaching in each of the last seven years. QUT also exhibited a consistent trend of improved teaching ratings, particularly over the last four years. The other five property universities moved in and out of the top 3 across the eight years of this GCCA survey.

To obtain a measure of the changing dynamics of the graduates’ assessment of the teaching quality for the property degree programs over 1994-2001, Table 3 presents the “good teaching” results over specific time periods, as well as the time-weighted average which prioritises good teaching performance in more recent years. At a national level, there was evidence of improved property teaching quality over more recent years, with this also evident for building and planning. The improved teaching quality in more recent years is particularly evident for Curtin and QUT.

Table 4 presents the percentage of students who were satisfied (either responding “agree” or “strongly agree”) with the standard of teaching over 1998-2001.<sup>3</sup> Similar trends are evident to those seen in Table 2, with a consistent trend of increased levels of student satisfaction with property teaching at a national level over this four-year period. In particular, the students’ views on the calibre of the good teaching at Curtin is further reinforced, both in Curtin being ranked first in each of

---

<sup>3</sup> Percentages in the various categories are only available from GCCA for 1998-2001, not for the full-period of this study of 1994-2001.



**Table 3: Impact of time period on GCCA CEQ “good teaching” results\***

	1994-2001	1994-97	1998-2001	2000-01	Time - weighted average
Curtin	3.16(1)	2.87(4)	3.44(1)	3.42(1)	3.32(1)
QUT	3.08(2)	3.04(1)	3.12(2)	3.25(2)	3.11(2)
RMIT	2.98(4)	3.00(2)	2.97(5)	3.03(5)	2.97(4)
UQ	2.99(3)	2.93(3)	3.04(3)	3.10(3)	3.00(3)
USA	2.57(7)	2.46(7)	2.67(7)	2.67(7)	2.63(7)
UTS	2.84(6)	2.76(6)	2.93(6)	2.95(6)	2.87(6)
UWS	2.89(5)	2.77(5)	3.01(4)	3.05(4)	2.93(5)
National “property” average	2.91	2.83	2.99	3.01	2.95
<b>Related areas</b>					
Accounting	2.94	2.88	3.00	3.02	2.97
Building	3.01	2.93	3.09	3.18	3.05
Business	3.05	2.98	3.13	3.09	3.08
Economics	2.97	2.88	3.06	3.06	3.01
Law	3.02	2.87	3.18	3.30	3.11
Planning	3.03	2.96	3.11	3.16	3.08

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.  
Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

the four years, and in the gap between Curtin (48.0% satisfied) and its nearest competitor, QUT (34.7% satisfied). Similarly, the average percentage for Curtin over this 4-year period exceeded the national average for all other related disciplines, including building. QUT has also shown consistently increasing levels of student satisfaction with teaching in the last three years.

### “Overall satisfaction” results

Table 5 presents the average scores and corresponding ranks (within years) over 1994-2001 for the various property degrees for the “overall satisfaction” category of the GCCA CEQ survey. The national property results over 1994-2001 and the equivalent national results for the six related areas are also shown.

Overall satisfaction results were, in each case, higher than the good teaching results, at both a national and individual property course level. This is likely to reflect the strong property industry focus evident in most Australian property degrees, as well

as the high employment rates for property graduates and students completing these GCCA surveys after they have obtained employment in the property industry.

**Table 4: Percentage of students “satisfied” with standard of teaching: 1998-2001\***

	1998 (%)	1999 (%)	2000 (%)	2001 (%)	1998-2001 (%)
Curtin	37.5(1)	61.5(1)	40.3(1)	52.7(1)	48.0(1)
QUT	32.3(3)	23.2(6)	38.9(2)	44.2(2)	34.7(2)
RMIT	29.6(4)	31.8(3)	37.5(3)	31.6(5)	32.6(4)
UQ	34.6(2)	28.0(4)	36.1(4)	33.3(3)	33.0(3)
USA	16.7(7)	27.8(5)	18.5(7)	22.6(7)	21.4(7)
UTS	27.8(5)	23.1(7)	30.4(6)	28.5(6)	27.5(6)
UWS	20.2(6)	33.9(2)	32.1(5)	32.2(4)	29.6(5)
National “property” average	29.2	31.5	31.5	33.9	31.5
<b>Related areas</b>					
Accounting	29.0	30.7	31.9	31.8	30.9
Building	32.6	35.0	44.8	36.8	37.3
Business	37.3	39.2	40.9	29.7	36.8
Economics	33.9	36.2	35.0	35.2	35.1
Law	34.4	35.2	54.1	36.3	40.0
Planning	36.2	35.1	40.2	39.1	37.7

\*: Percentage is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.  
Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

The national property average was consistently in the range of 3.39-3.72, having steadily increased over this 8-year period. Similarly, the national property average of 3.51 (out of 5) over 1994-2001 shows general high levels of overall student satisfaction with property degrees in Australia.

However, the national property average per year was generally below the national averages for most of the related disciplines. In particular, building out-performed property in six of the eight years over 1994-2001, with an average score of 3.61 compared to 3.51 for property over this eight-year period.

**Table 5: Analysis of GCCA CEQ “overall satisfaction” results: 1994-2001\***

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	1994-2001
Curtin	3.08(6)	3.07(6)	3.56(2)	3.65(1)	3.46(4)	4.15(1)	3.67(3)	3.36(7)	3.50(5)
QUT	3.71(3)	3.85(2)	3.54(3)	3.50(2)	3.47(3)	3.68(4)	3.33(6)	4.04(1)	3.64(2)
RMIT	3.74(2)	3.37(5)	3.50(5)	3.42(3)	3.34(7)	3.68(3)	3.71(1)	3.59(5)	3.54(3)
UQ	3.58(4)	3.50(4)	3.54(3)	3.29(6)	3.38(5)	3.55(6)	3.50(5)	3.78(2)	3.52(4)
USA	2.75(7)	3.55(3)	3.36(6)	3.16(7)	3.35(6)	3.57(5)	3.14(7)	3.64(4)	3.32(7)
UTS	3.40(5)	2.81(7)	3.08(7)	3.42(4)	3.50(2)	3.39(7)	3.71(2)	3.58(6)	3.36(6)
UWS	3.80(1)	3.90(1)	3.68(1)	3.32(5)	3.73(1)	3.86(2)	3.64(4)	3.70(3)	3.70(1)
National “property” average	3.43	3.40	3.48	3.39	3.46	3.72	3.53	3.68	3.51
<b>Related areas</b>									
Accounting	3.66	3.64	3.64	3.68	3.69	3.70	3.72	3.70	3.68
Building	3.37	3.57	3.64	3.45	3.53	3.56	3.95	3.84	3.61
Business	3.49	3.64	3.68	3.70	3.75	3.78	3.78	3.68	3.69
Economics	3.48	3.53	3.60	3.57	3.65	3.69	3.71	3.66	3.61
Law	3.57	3.55	3.52	3.47	3.67	3.80	4.09	3.62	3.66
Planning	3.28	3.25	3.44	3.15	3.35	3.37	3.46	3.46	3.35

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.

Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

Amongst the seven property universities, UWS was seen to be the best performed property university in the overall satisfaction area, with an average score of 3.70 over 1994-2001, being ranked first in four of the eight years. QUT was ranked second for overall satisfaction over 1994-2001, further consolidating its second place in the good teaching area (as discussed in previous section). On a year-to-year basis, more variability was seen amongst the rankings for the seven property universities in terms of overall satisfaction compared to the previous results concerning good teaching.

To obtain a measure of the changing dynamics of the graduates' assessment of their overall satisfaction for the property degree programs over 1994-2001, Table 6 presents the overall satisfaction over specific time periods, as well as the time-weighted averages which prioritise overall satisfaction in more recent years. At a national level, higher levels of overall satisfaction for property were evident in more recent years, with this level having been consistent over 2000-01. Increasing levels of overall satisfaction in more recent years were also evident for building and planning. Highest levels of overall satisfaction were evident for UWS and QUT, with increasing levels of overall satisfaction in more recent years for RMIT, UQ and UTS.

**Table 6: Impact of time period on GCCA CEQ "overall satisfaction" results\***

	1994-2001	1994-97	1998-2001	2000-01	Time - weighted average
Curtin	3.50(5)	3.34(5)	3.66(2)	3.52(6)	3.59(3)
QUT	3.64(2)	3.65(2)	3.63(3)	3.69(1)	3.64(2)
RMIT	3.54(3)	3.51(3)	3.58(4)	3.65(3)	3.56(4)
UQ	3.52(4)	3.48(4)	3.55(5)	3.64(5)	3.54(5)
USA	3.32(7)	3.21(6)	3.43(7)	3.39(7)	3.38(7)
UTS	3.36(6)	3.18(7)	3.55(6)	3.65(4)	3.46(6)
UWS	3.70(1)	3.68(1)	3.73(1)	3.67(2)	3.69(1)
National "property" average	3.51	3.43	3.60	3.61	3.56
<b>Related areas</b>					
Accounting	3.68	3.66	3.70	3.71	3.69
Building	3.61	3.51	3.72	3.90	3.68
Business	3.69	3.63	3.75	3.73	3.72
Economics	3.61	3.55	3.68	3.69	3.65
Law	3.66	3.53	3.80	3.86	3.72
Planning	3.35	3.28	3.41	3.46	3.38

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.  
Source: Author's compilation from GCCA (2001)

Table 7 presents the percentage of students who were satisfied (either responding “agree” or “strongly agree”) with their overall property course over 1998-2001. Slightly different ranks are seen here compared to Table 5, reflecting more diversity in student opinion concerning overall satisfaction over 1998-2001. Importantly, an average of 60.0% of students were satisfied with their overall property course over 1998-2001, nearly double that seen to be satisfied with the teaching standard (31.5%) in their overall property degree. This trend of a higher percentage of students satisfied with their overall course was evident for each of the seven property degrees.

**Table 7: Percentage of students “satisfied” with overall course: 1998-2001\***

	1998 (%)	1999 (%)	2000 (%)	2001 (%)	1998-2001 (%)
Curtin	50.0(6)	92.3(1)	66.6(2)	54.6(6)	65.9(1)
QUT	46.8(7)	64.2(4)	53.4(5)	82.6(2)	61.8(5)
RMIT	54.5(4)	68.2(2)	66.7(1)	62.1(4)	62.9(3)
UQ	69.2(1)	54.5(6)	50.0(6)	88.9(1)	65.7(2)
USA	53.0(5)	57.2(5)	39.3(7)	64.2(3)	53.4(7)
UTS	58.3(3)	52.2(7)	64.7(4)	51.5(7)	56.7(6)
UWS	63.6(2)	65.0(3)	65.9(3)	56.6(5)	62.8(4)
National “property” average	54.5	63.6	58.9	63.1	60.0
<b>Related areas</b>					
Accounting	65.4	65.6	67.0	66.4	66.1
Building	58.2	60.9	71.2	71.1	65.4
Business	69.1	69.5	70.0	65.4	68.5
Economics	63.5	63.8	65.7	63.7	64.2
Law	63.3	70.2	78.2	60.9	68.2
Planning	51.7	54.7	53.1	58.5	54.5

\*: Percentage is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.

Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

Overall, the correlation between good teaching and overall satisfaction for the property discipline over 1994-2001 was 0.92 and reinforces the strong linkage between quality teaching and overall student satisfaction. This property discipline correlation was comparable to that seen for accounting (0.97), building (0.96) and economics (0.92) and above that seen for planning (0.85), business (0.75) and law (0.52). The respective correlations between good teaching and overall satisfaction for the seven property universities were Curtin (0.72), QUT (0.23), RMIT (0.63), UQ (-0.03), USA (0.96), UTS (0.80) and UWS (0.55).

## “Added value” of property education

To reinforce the relationship between good teaching and overall satisfaction, the “overall satisfaction:good teaching” ratio was determined for property and the related disciplines, with the results shown in Table 8. Ratios above 1.0 reflect added value, with the “overall satisfaction” rating exceeding the “good teaching” rating. This ratio also gives a measure of the “added value” of property education relative to the related disciplines.

**Table 8: “Overall satisfaction: good teaching” ratio analysis: 1994-2001\***

	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	1994-2001
Curtin	1.21(4)	1.05(7)	1.19(4)	1.20(4)	1.10(6)	1.09(7)	1.14(5)	0.93(7)	1.11(7)
QUT	1.24(2)	1.27(3)	1.14(6)	1.16(6)	1.16(5)	1.23(5)	1.04(7)	1.23(4)	1.18(5)
RMIT	1.19(5)	1.11(6)	1.19(5)	1.18(5)	1.18(3)	1.24(3)	1.16(4)	1.26(2)	1.19(3)
UQ	1.16(6)	1.21(4)	1.25(3)	1.13(7)	1.09(7)	1.24(4)	1.09(6)	1.27(1)	1.18(6)
USA	1.23(3)	1.34(2)	1.30(2)	1.32(1)	1.29(2)	1.30(1)	1.23(2)	1.30(3)	1.29(1)
UTS	1.09(7)	1.18(5)	1.11(7)	1.25(3)	1.19(4)	1.18(6)	1.25(1)	1.23(5)	1.18(4)
UWS	1.26(1)	1.38(1)	1.39(1)	1.27(2)	1.29(1)	1.27(2)	1.23(3)	1.18(6)	1.28(2)
National “property” average	1.20	1.21	1.22	1.21	1.18	1.22	1.19	1.21	1.21
<i>Related areas</i>									
Accounting	1.27	1.27	1.27	1.26	1.24	1.23	1.23	1.23	1.25
Building	1.17	1.19	1.22	1.20	1.18	1.18	1.21	1.24	1.20
Business	1.18	1.26	1.23	1.21	1.19	1.19	1.18	1.24	1.21
Economics	1.23	1.23	1.25	1.22	1.20	1.19	1.22	1.20	1.22
Law	1.29	1.27	1.15	1.23	1.21	1.23	1.16	1.18	1.21
Planning	1.12	1.14	1.11	1.07	1.08	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.11

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.

Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

Property has shown consistently high levels of added value over this eight-year period, with this average level of 1.21 being comparable to the levels of added value for building (1.20) and the business disciplines. Only planning (1.11) was seen to deliver lower levels of added value. Whilst there was some variability on a year-to-year basis, all seven property universities delivered added value over this eight-year period, with this most evident for USA and UWS.

**Table 9: Impact of time period on “overall satisfaction: good teaching” ratio analysis\***

	1994-2001	1994-97	1998-2001	2000-01	Time - weighted average
Curtin	1.11(7)	1.16(6)	1.06(7)	1.03(7)	1.08(7)
QUT	1.18(5)	1.20(3)	1.16(6)	1.14(6)	1.17(6)
RMIT	1.19(3)	1.17(5)	1.21(4)	1.20(3)	1.20(4)
UQ	1.18(6)	1.19(4)	1.17(5)	1.17(5)	1.18(5)
USA	1.29(1)	1.30(2)	1.28(1)	1.27(1)	1.29(1)
UTS	1.18(4)	1.15(7)	1.21(3)	1.24(2)	1.21(3)
UWS	1.28(2)	1.33(1)	1.24(2)	1.20(4)	1.26(2)
National “property” average	1.21	1.21	1.20	1.20	1.21
<b>Related areas</b>					
Accounting	1.25	1.27	1.23	1.23	1.24
Building	1.20	1.20	1.21	1.23	1.21
Business	1.21	1.22	1.20	1.21	1.21
Economics	1.22	1.23	1.20	1.21	1.22
Law	1.21	1.23	1.19	1.17	1.20
Planning	1.11	1.11	1.10	1.09	1.10

\*: Average result is followed by rank (in brackets) within property degrees within each year.  
Source: Author’s compilation from GCCA (2001)

Table 9 presents this added value ratio analysis over specific time periods and on a time-weighted basis. The level of added value for property was consistent over these various time periods, with this also being the case for the six related discipline areas. Slightly increasing levels of added value in recent years were seen for UTS.

## PROPERTY EDUCATION IMPLICATIONS

While the various property industry accreditation organisations such as the Australian Property Institute (API) and the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) require evaluations of student satisfaction as part of their regular accreditation processes, these GCCA CEQ survey results are more comprehensive and have provided some important insights into student perceptions of the quality of property education in Australia in recent years.

Key findings from these GCCA CEQ surveys over 1994-2001 are:

- improved quality of teaching in property programs in recent years
- Curtin and QUT had the highest ratings for quality of teaching
- quality of teaching in property programs was slightly below that seen in related disciplines, including building
- higher levels of overall satisfaction in property programs in recent years
- UWS and QUT had the highest ratings for overall satisfaction
- overall satisfaction with property programs was rated more highly than teaching quality
- property programs have delivered consistently high levels of added value over this eight-year period
- the level of added value by the property programs is comparable to that delivered by building and the other business disciplines.

The lack of equivalent studies in the US and UK to the Australian GCCA CEQ surveys does not allow international benchmarks for best practice in property education to be readily established.

These improved GCCA CEQ results for teaching quality and overall satisfaction in recent years for the property degrees in Australia have highlighted the significant recent efforts of Australian universities to make productivity improvements in both teaching and research. At a general university level, this has been achieved by increasing academic standards, addressing quality control issues and putting more resources into help with teaching methods, including flexible learning, use of the internet and access to on-line journal and library resources.

Specifically, in the property programs in Australian universities, these improved results for teaching quality and overall satisfaction in recent years reflect the implementation of a range of significant initiatives, including:

- regular subject evaluations by property staff groups to ensure up-to-date content, references and suitable assessment strategies
- regular student evaluations of subject delivery and teaching effectiveness
- active role by course advisory committees, including leading property professionals
- accreditation committee feedback (eg: API)
- external examiner feedback (eg: RICS)
- increased awareness of national and international best practice (eg: curriculum content, texts) via PRRES and the other regional real estate societies
- access to up-to-date property education developments via the Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education



- increased property industry involvement via scholarships, prizes and guest lectures
- active support of work experience within property degrees; eg: API's Property Internship Program with UWS
- acceptance and recognition of quality teaching being a key ingredient in promotion of property academics.

While other measures of the quality of property education are also available, these GCCA CEQ survey results of property graduates provide an essential component in the ongoing assessment of the quality of property education in Australia. With these GCCA CEQ survey results showing evidence of improvement in teaching quality and overall satisfaction in property education in recent years, it will be important to continue to monitor the quality of property education to ensure the stature of property education in Australian is further enhanced.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, R. et al. 2000. Problem-based learning in real estate education. *Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education* 3(1): 35-41.

Avdiev, R. 1994. Educating the land economist: a break with the past. *The Valuer and Land Economist* 33(4): 287-290.

Avdiev, R. 1995. Educating the land economist: preparing for the future. *The Valuer and Land Economist* 33(6): 461-464.

Avdiev, R. 2000. Golden apple or poisoned chalice: the influence of education on careers. *Australian Property Journal* 36(4): 270-272.

Black, R. and J. Rabianski. 2003. Defining the real estate body of knowledge: a survey approach. *Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education* 6 (1): 33-54.

Boyd, T. 2000. CPD: change the product. *Australian Property Journal* 36(4): 279-282.

Cherry, R. and D. Dave. 1997. An application of outcomes assessments to measure effectiveness of graduate courses in a US business school. *International Journal of Management* 14(4): 646-653.

Cohen, P. 1980. Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: a meta analysis of findings. *Research in Higher Education* 13(4): 447-457.

- Fischer, D. 2000. Is the valuation paradigm a paradigm. *Australian Property Journal* 36(4): 292-299.
- Graduate Careers Council of Australia. 2001. *The Course Experience Questionnaire*. GCCA (miscellaneous copies): Canberra.
- Haddad, K. 1999. Using the balanced scorecard for improving finance education. *Financial Practice and Education* 9(1): 92-102.
- Manning, C. 2002. Improving real estate and other business courses through targeted student assessment. *Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education* 5(1): 27-43.
- Manning, C. and S. Roulac. 2001. Where can real estate faculty add the most value at universities in the future? *Journal of Real Estate Practice and Education* 4(1): 17-40.
- McKone, K. 1999. Analysis of student feedback improves instructor effectiveness. *Journal of Management Education* 23(4): 396-415.
- Newell, G. and C. Eves. 2000. Recent developments in property education in Australia. *Australian Property Journal* 36(4): 275-278.
- Wagner, Z. 1999. Using student journals for course evaluation. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 24(3): 261-273.
- Webb, J. 1997. A global view of real estate education and research. *Australian Land Economics Review* 3(2): 3-10.
- Yu, S.M. 2001. New paradigms in real estate education. *Pacific Rim Property Research Journal* 7(2): 79-88.