



Version	Approved by	Approval date	Effective date	Next full review
4.1	Director of Governance	30 July 2020	30 July 2020	January 2023
Procedure Statement				
Purpose	This Procedure specifies the framework and processes for monitoring, review and improvement of UNSW coursework and research programs, specialisations and courses.			
Scope	The Procedure applies to all new and continuing programs leading to an award of an AQF qualification, and to specialisations and courses.			
Are Local Documents on this subject permitted?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, however Local Documents must be consistent with this University-wide Document			<input type="checkbox"/> No
Procedure Processes and Actions				

Contents

1. Overview	2
2. Program review	2
2.1. Program review terms of reference	2
2.1.1. Coursework program reviews	2
2.1.2. Higher degree research program reviews	2
2.2. Program review schedule	3
2.3. Program review process	3
2.3.1. Program review panel composition	4
2.3.2. Program review portfolio	4
2.3.3. Program review event	5
2.3.4. Program review panel report	5
2.3.5. Faculty response report	5
2.3.6. Program review outcomes	5
3. Course review	6
4. Annual monitoring	6
4.1. Annual Program monitoring	6
4.2. Annual Course monitoring	6
5. Responsibilities	7

1. Overview

The UNSW academic offerings review framework comprises:

- A program review process conducted every seven years or earlier if required
- A course review process
- An annual monitoring process for programs and courses.

Outcomes of monitoring and review are used to guide and evaluate improvements and to mitigate risks to the quality, relevance and viability of the education provided.

2. Program review

Programs will be comprehensively reviewed at least every seven years by an independent panel.

Reviews are informed by data, external benchmarking against comparable programs at Australian and international institutions, and feedback from relevant stakeholders. They provide an evidence-based evaluation of a program's quality, outcomes, risks and viability that results in recommendations for enhancement.

2.1. Program review terms of reference

2.1.1. Coursework program reviews

Reviews of coursework programs must address:

- Positioning and role of the program, external factors including accreditation and compliance, demand and indicators of viability and the appropriateness of the admission criteria
- Program design, including program learning outcomes and curriculum alignment (including assessment), curriculum relevance and currency in light of emerging developments in education and relevant disciplines and industry engagement
- Program delivery, including teaching, assessment, student support, teaching staff profile, and academic and administrative management, processes and systems
- Student experience and outcomes of the program, including equity and diversity in the student profile, trends in student satisfaction, student completion and retention rates, and graduate outcomes and satisfaction.

The Managing Faculty may approve additional terms of reference in response to specific concerns and opportunities.

2.1.2. Higher degree research program reviews

Reviews of higher degree research programs must address:

- Positioning and role of the program, compliance, demand and indicators of viability
- The appropriateness of admission requirements and standards
- The quality of the supervision provided
- Candidate support including appropriate orientation and framework support, research progress reviews, and appropriate support during thesis preparation and submission
- Provision of training and development for candidates to develop key research and transferable skills for academic and non-academic careers, including any coursework components
- The academic quality and integrity of the examination process
- Candidate experience and outcomes, including equity and diversity in candidate profile, trends in candidate satisfaction, examination outcomes, completion rates and timeliness, graduate outcomes and satisfaction
- Identifiable risks to the sustainable quality of the program, including adequacy of resources, academic and administrative management, available supervision, adequacy of facilities available to candidates.

The Managing Faculty may approve additional terms of reference in response to specific concerns and opportunities.

2.2. Program review schedule

All coursework and research programs leading to an award of an Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) qualification must be reviewed at least every seven years, commencing with the year of the first intake of students.

The Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Program Review Committee (PRC), University Academic Quality Committee (UAQC) or University Higher Degree Research Committee (UHDC), may also direct the Dean of a Faculty to undertake a program review earlier, based on program monitoring outcomes or other concerns with the program.

Each year Faculties must submit to the Program Review Committee an indicative list of coursework and research program reviews planned for the seven-year period, including external accreditation and other formal reviews. The PRC may approve, in exceptional circumstances, reviews scheduled beyond the maximum allowed period.

Faculties should consider reviewing cognate groups of programs together wherever practical, subject to approval by the Program Review Committee.

Programs planned to be disestablished, with the final intake prior to the seven-year review cycle deadline, need not be reviewed.

Where there has been a major revision or a change of program code a program should be considered the same program for review purposes if there is a substantial continuity of name, expected cohort, structure and outcomes.

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma for requests with regard to the program review schedule.

2.3. Program review process

The Managing Faculty is responsible for the conduct of the program review (including determining the terms of reference, method, panel composition and timeline) and must ensure that sufficient resources are available to complete the review.

The Managing Faculty should notify Faculties contributing to the program and invite submissions to the review.

Program reviews should be evidence-based. Review should be informed by data analysis and address feedback from relevant stakeholders and external benchmarking against a selection of comparable programs at Australian and, where relevant, international institutions (see section 2.3.2).

A program review should include a review of all majors, minors and postgraduate specialisations, teaching locations, delivery modes or partners, double degree programs and exit programs associated with the program under review.

The review of a Generalist Program or a program offered only as a double degree should be discussed with the Chair of the Program Review Committee in the calendar year prior to the scheduled review event in order to develop an alternative approach to effectively and efficiently complete the review. The Chair of the Program Review Committee may certify that the adoption of an alternative approach will meet the requirements of this procedure.

Where a program under review has an associated double degree program with a current student cohort of at least 20 EFTSL, the review will address data on the student experience and outcomes of that cohort, and the Managing Faculty will consult with the Faculty responsible for the other component of the double degree.

Where a program is externally accredited and has had that accreditation externally examined no more than 12 months prior to the scheduled review event, any findings and outcomes of that accreditation process or any material presented to the accrediting body that substantially satisfies any requirement of this procedure may be relied on in place of the requirements under this procedure.

The Faculty must discuss any such reliance first with the Chair of the Program Review Committee, and then submit a written request, together with the external accreditation report or material for approval of an alternative approach that will meet the requirements of this procedure.

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma for requests regarding reliance on accreditation, generalist programs and combined reviews of programs.

2.3.1. Program review panel composition

The Managing Faculty is responsible for nominating members of the program review panel, in consultation with relevant Heads and partner Faculties, consistent with the principles below.

Program review panel membership must, at a minimum, consist of:

- A Chair with relevant experience in university academic management and quality assurance policy and processes
- At least one member external to UNSW, such as an academic with expertise in the program's field, a representative of industry or a relevant profession
- At least one senior academic from UNSW, external to the Managing Faculty
- At least one current student/candidate or a student/candidate who has graduated within the last 12 months from the program under review
- At least four members.

Faculties can nominate additional panel members.

None of the program review panel members can have been involved in the management of the program(s) under review since the last program review. Management of a program includes the role of Program Authority, or equivalent, or a Head or equivalent of a School which contribute 24 UOC or more into the program.

The composition of the program review panel must take into consideration impartiality/objectivity, expertise in relevant field(s), and experience in academic and/or quality assurance leadership. Any variations from these composition requirements must be approved by the Program Review Committee prior to the review commencing. The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma for variation requests.

2.3.2. Program review portfolio

The program review portfolio is the set of documentation provided to the program review panel prior to the program review event. The program review portfolio will include data reports, feedback and submissions to the review, the self-evaluation report and, if applicable, any external accreditation reports and documentation.

a) Data reports

Data reports will consist of standardised program data focussed on trends, risk indicators, and relevant benchmarks.

Data reports should also be supplemented by additional relevant University and Faculty data, and outcomes of surveys and focus groups. All data should be contextualised.

Where a program has been assessed as above target risk profile in the annual program monitoring process since the last program review (see section 4.1) the outcomes of that process must be provided. Review reports from previous reviews, where applicable, should also be made available to the Review Panel.

b) Submissions to the program review

The Managing Faculty will invite submissions to the program review panel from members of the university community, academic staff, current students, alumni and other stakeholders, such as employers. The call for submissions should be made prior to preparation of the self-evaluation report.

The call for submissions should inform stakeholders that the submission will be available to those preparing the self-evaluation, and that they may request that their name be removed from the submission.

c) Self-evaluation report

The self-evaluation report is produced by the Program Authority in consultation with the Head of School and relevant Associate Dean and evaluates the program(s) in relation to the terms of reference, the data reports, feedback and program review submissions.

The self-evaluation report should also benchmark the program(s) relative to one or more appropriate institutions and UNSW programs, as appropriate, and show evidence of critical reflection on these

comparative data and on the outcomes of other internal and external benchmarking undertaken, detailing the implications for informing program development.

The self-evaluation report should include an overall evaluation of the program, including an identification of risks and current and future objectives and initiatives, with proposed courses of action to address risks and issues and enhance the program.

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma version of this report.

2.3.3. Program review event

The program review event brings the full program review panel together for a series of interviews with relevant parties, discussions and deliberations in order to fulfil its terms of reference.

The Chair of the program review panel is responsible for the program review event, including setting the agenda in consultation with the panel.

At a minimum the program review panel must seek to meet with the following stakeholders:

- The Managing Faculty's senior officers
- Program Authority and members of the teaching/supervision staff
- Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) or Dean of Graduate Research (or nominee for either role)
- Student/candidate and alumni representatives
- Employer/industry representatives.

The Chair will liaise with the program review panel to determine the interviewees and the panel should also have the opportunity to tour relevant facilities. Where a program review panel wishes to vary the minimum list of stakeholders, it should seek approval from the Chair of the Program Review Committee. Invitees should also be given the opportunity to make written submissions in addition to, or as an alternative to, any interview.

2.3.4. Program review panel report

The Chair of the program review panel will prepare the report, in consultation with the panel, and submit to the Dean (or delegate) within one month of the review event. The program review panel report must address each of the terms of reference in relation to the evidence presented in the program review portfolio (including data, stakeholder feedback, submissions and self-review) and at the program review event and provide contextualised recommendations to address risks identified in the review and enhance the quality of the program(s). Recommendations should be rated as to significance.

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma version of this report.

2.3.5. Faculty response report

The Dean, in consultation with the Associate/Deputy Dean (Education or Research Training) and the Program Authority, will review the program review panel report and initiate the preparation of a Faculty response report which addresses each of the panel's recommendations, with each recommendation either agreed to, with a comprehensive implementation strategy, or not agreed to, with reasons and an alternative strategy to address the concern raised by the Program review panel. The Faculty response report should provide timelines for completion of actions, based on the rating of recommendations, clear articulation of action owners and confirm resources.

The Faculty response report should be sent to the program review panel within two months and tabled at the following Faculty Board or Education Committee (or equivalent) meeting, together with the program review panel report.

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma version of the Faculty response report.

2.3.6. Program review outcomes

The program review panel report along with the Faculty response report and program review portfolio is submitted to the Program Review Committee following the Faculty Board or Education Committee (or equivalent) meeting. The Program Review Committee will review reports and may require the Faculty to address concerns or may refer matters raised in the program review to the University Academic Quality Committee (for coursework programs) or the University Higher Degree Research Committee (for Higher Degree Research programs) for broader discussion and follow-up.

Responsibility for implementing the outcomes of program reviews rests with the Dean (or delegate).

Within one year of the program review event Faculties will report to the Program Review Committee on the implementation of recommendations. This report should be tabled at the Faculty Board or Education Committee (or equivalent). Where recommendations have not been properly addressed, or actions not completed, the Program Review Committee may require the Faculty to report on the ongoing management and follow-up of actions and may report to the University Academic Quality Committee (for coursework programs) or the University Higher Degree Research Committee (for Higher Degree Research programs).

The Program Review Committee may authorise a pro-forma version of this report.

The Program Review Committee will report to the Academic Board on program reviews outcomes to support the Board's function in overseeing academic governance, the maintenance of academic standards, and the quality of the education/research training provided by UNSW.

3. Course review

Faculties must develop a Faculty Course Review Procedure to ensure that courses managed by the Faculty are subject to review as to course quality, outcomes, assessment, relevance, risks, viability and opportunities for enhancement.

Faculty course review processes will require evidence-based assessment of courses.

Faculty Course Review Procedures will specify a process for establishing a course review schedule and/or criteria that will trigger a course review. This process must include a requirement for the review of courses with a consistent unsatisfactory annual course monitoring risk profile (see section 4.2).

The Faculty Course Review Procedure must be approved by the Dean and the University Academic Quality Committee. Faculties will report to the UAQC on an annual basis with an overview of courses reviewed and outcomes.

The Faculty Course Review Procedure should be reviewed by the Faculty at least every 3 years. Revisions must be approved by the UAQC.

4. Annual monitoring

Annual monitoring provides a standardised approach for regular monitoring of the risk profile of the University's programs, specialisations and courses and identifies areas of concern for further investigation and remedial action where appropriate.

4.1. Annual Program monitoring

Programs accepting student enrolments and specialisations over 96 UOC (undergraduate) or 72 UOC (postgraduate coursework) with enrolled students are subject to annual monitoring and will be assigned a Program Risk Score based on the UNSW Program Risk Indicators. Faculties will access these ratings via a centrally maintained dashboard.

Where a program or specialisation is assessed as at higher risk the Associate Dean (Education/Research Training) or equivalent will submit an annual monitoring report on that program or specialisation to the University Academic Quality Committee (for coursework programs) or the University Higher Degree Research Committee (for higher degree research programs) investigating and contextualising the risk analysis. The annual monitoring report will provide an action plan to enhance quality and reduce risk and/or request a revised risk rating.

The University Academic Quality Committee and University Higher Degree Research Committee will review annual monitoring reports and follow-up with Faculties and the University as required.

The University Academic Quality Committee and University Higher Degree Research Committee will advise the Program Review Committee on programs assessed as not meeting risk standards for two consecutive years and the Program Review Committee may recommend to the Academic Board that the program be reviewed early.

4.2. Annual Course monitoring

Heads of School (or others, such as Associate Dean, where approved by the Dean) have overall responsibility for the annual monitoring of all courses offered by their School based on data from centrally produced reports. Documented benchmarks for trend data should be set by faculties, allowing courses to be assigned a risk profile based on these benchmarks.

Heads of School must ensure that where a course fails to meet Faculty benchmarks the course is revised or otherwise supported to address the issues raised by the monitoring outcome.

The Head of School, or equivalent, must report to the Faculty Board or Education Committee (or equivalent) on outcomes and follow-up actions.

Faculties will report annually to the University Academic Quality Committee on trends and major issues identified by the course monitoring process in their Faculty, along with strategies.

5. Responsibilities

The Program Review Committee and Academic Board will oversee the academic program review process in the University.

University Academic Quality Committee and University Higher Degree Committee will oversee the annual monitoring processes in the University.

Faculty Boards and Committees will oversee the academic offerings review processes and monitoring in faculties.

Deans and Associate Deans are responsible for the management of the academic offerings review framework in the Faculty, including the implementation of recommendations and follow-up.

University Planning and Performance, the Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Graduate Research School will provide University data for the monitoring and review of programs, specialisations and courses.

Accountabilities	
Responsible Officer	Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic
Contact Officer	President, Academic Board
Supporting Information	
Legislative Compliance	This Procedure supports the University's compliance with the following legislation: Australian Qualifications Framework 2013 Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act) (Cth) Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth)
Parent Document (Policy)	Academic Offerings Governance Policy
Supporting Documents	APR SharePoint Templates
Related Documents	Academic Offerings Approval Procedure (in development) Academic Offerings Nomenclature Procedure Education Quality Policy Education Quality Procedure myExperience Survey Procedure
Superseded Documents	Academic Program Review Procedure , v4.0
File Number	2019/40201
Definitions and Acronyms	
Academic Offerings Review Framework	The Academic Offerings Review Framework is the principal mechanism by which UNSW ensures that its coursework and research programs, specialisations and courses are monitored and reviewed to ensure they meet, and will continue to meet, appropriate standards for quality, relevance and viability and mitigate risks.

AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework.
Associate Dean	For the purposes of this Procedure, Associate Dean refers to Associate Dean (Education) or Associate Dean (Research Training) and Deputy Deans.
Cognate	Same or related discipline or specialisation.
Course	A planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching, normally over one teaching period in duration, that allows a student to gain knowledge, skills and understanding in relation to an agreed set of learning outcomes.
Course monitoring	A centrally supported annual process that involves monitoring of student satisfaction, grade distribution, student enrolments and withdrawals.
Course review	The review of a course. The course review process provides an evidence-based evaluation of a course's quality, outcomes, risks and viability and results in recommendations for enhancement.
Dean	The Dean of a Faculty, Rector of UNSW Canberra, Dean of Graduate Research, or Chair of Boards of Studies, as appropriate.
External Benchmarking	External benchmarking or referencing is the comparison of an aspect a of program with an external comparator(s) e.g. comparing the design of a program of study and/or student achievement of learning outcomes with that of a program from another institution. A number of approaches and techniques can be used for external benchmarking.
Generalist Program	A Program which is largely composed of specialisations, such that more than 50% of the disciplinary core is taken in majors or postgraduate specialisations and/or there are at least 6 majors or specialisations available.
Managing Faculty	Academic Unit responsible for the program or the Faculty in which this unit exists. In the case of Double Degrees, this is the unit assigned by Academic Administration. The Graduate Research School is the Managing Faculty for the PhD and Master of Philosophy and will oversee program reviews of HDR programs.
Program	An approved set of requirements, courses and/or supervised research into which a student is admitted. In some cases, this will lead to a UNSW award.
Program Authority	Position with overarching responsibility for all aspects of a program. The Program Authority may delegate responsibilities to nominated staff or administrative units within a School or Faculty. For double degree programs, one of the contributing Faculties is the Program Authority who is responsible for students enrolled in the degree. The Program Authority for each single degree program is responsible for certifying that students have satisfied requirements for their particular degree.
Program monitoring	A centrally supported annual process that involves monitoring the risk profile of the University's programs and undergraduate specialisations that are 96 UOC or greater and postgraduate coursework specialisations that are 72 UOC or greater to identify areas of concern for further investigation and remedial action where appropriate.
Program review	The comprehensive review of a program conducted every seven years or earlier. The program review process provides an evidence-based evaluation of a program's quality, outcomes, risks and viability and results in recommendations for enhancement.
UNSW Program Risk Indicators	Program risk indicators are an agreed standard by which performance data can be assessed for its level of relative risk. These indicators are approved by Academic Board and subject to regular review.

Revision History				
Version	Approved by	Approval date	Effective date	Sections modified
1.0	Acting Vice- President and Deputy Vice- Chancellor (Academic)	23 July 2012	1 August 2012	This is a new procedure
1.1	Acting Head, Governance Support	14 August 2013	14 August 2013	Section 3.1.1; 3.2; 3.3 and Appendix A. Administrative update to remove requirement for semester details and to add Program Code
2.0	Vice-President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	13 August 2014	13 August 2014	Section 3.1.1; 3.1.2 (b); 3.2; 3.3; Appendix A, B and C. New APR summary
3.0	Vice-President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	18 August 2015	18 August 2015	Full Review
3.1	Deputy Vice- Chancellor (Education)	16 March 2016	16 March 2016	Section 3.1.1, 3.1.2 (b) and (c), 3.3, Appendix A – B, Part 2 and Appendix C
4.0	President and Vice-Chancellor	5 December 2019	1 January 2020	Full review and title change
4.1	Director of Governance	30 July 2020	30 July 2020	Administrative update to supporting information