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Procedure Statement

Purpose
This Procedure specifies the governance and administrative framework and processes for the establishment, revision and disestablishment of academic offerings leading to an AQF qualification to ensure their quality, viability and relevance.

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? ☒ Yes, however Local Documents must be consistent with this University-wide Document. ☐ No

Procedure Processes and Actions
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1. Governance and administrative framework

1.1. Academic governance of academic offerings

1.1.1 Academic Board and University governance committees

The Academic Board is the principal academic body of the University and is responsible for overseeing academic governance and the maintenance of academic standards.

The Academic Board Programs Committee (ABPC) and the University Higher Degree Research Committee (UHDRC) are responsible for considering and recommending to the Academic Board academic proposals related to their terms of reference.

For information on the terms of reference for Academic Board and University governance committees refer to the University of New South Wales Rules on the Governance website at: https://www.gs.unsw.edu.au/UniversityofNewSouthWalesRules.pdf.

1.1.2 Academic Program Advisory Group (APAG)

The Academic Program Advisory Group (APAG) reviews academic proposals and alerts University governance committees to issues of significance including those relating to compliance, implementation and operational matters.

APAG assists academic proposal proponents in identifying gaps and other information requirements in advance of consideration by University governance committees.

For information on the terms of reference for APAG refer to Appendix [also add url for TOR to be hosted on governance site.].

1.1.3 Faculty governance

Faculty Boards or delegated Committees are responsible for recommending academic offerings to ABPC and UHDRC and for approving academic offerings as described in sections 2, 3, and 4.

Where a Faculty Board delegates authority to a subordinate committee, the delegation must be formally recorded with Governance so that it can be reflected in committee documentation systems. The delegation must be consistently applied without exception.

Approval via circulation should be used in exceptional circumstances only on a case-by-case basis, and with the approval of the Chair of ABPC or UHDRC.


1.1.4 Associate Dean (Education/Research) or equivalent

The Associate Dean (Education/Research) or equivalent has responsibility for academic oversight of revisions to programs, specialisations and courses that do not require formal committee review. These roles must be formally recorded by Governance for each faculty.

1.2. Management oversight of academic offerings

The Dean and the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Dean/Associate Dean, Head of School and Faculty Executive Director have responsibilities for operational considerations associated with academic offerings in addition to specific approvals provided for in this procedure.

The Academic Programs Business Group (APBG) advises the Academic Board on all Business Cases associated with new Program proposals. The APBG makes recommendations to the Board on commercial and business-related aspects of academic program proposals, such as student demand, graduate demand, resource implications, impact on existing programs and courses, and risk. The Business Case may also address other drivers for the proposal, such as equity or strategic considerations.

For information on the terms of reference for the APBG refer to [add url for TOR to be hosted on governance site.]
1.3. Approval components

Establishment, revision or disestablishment of an academic offering requires the completion and approval in the University academic information system of an academic proposal, and in some cases an authority to proceed (ATP) and/or a business case.

- **An authority to proceed** (ATP) allows the relevant authority to determine whether a new academic offering has sufficient merit to proceed to the next approval stage. It typically requires a summary of the academic offering, positioning in relation to other academic offerings, evidence of likely demand, initial estimates of resource implications and information about third-party arrangements and identification of interested UNSW stakeholders.

- The **academic proposal** provides the academic case for the establishment, revision or disestablishment of an academic offering and is a key element of UNSW’s quality assurance process for programs of study that lead to a higher education qualification. It provides information required to comply with the Higher Education Standards Framework, Australian Qualifications Framework and UNSW policies and procedures. Establishment proposals are used to create an academic offering, revision proposals are used to change an existing academic offering and disestablishment proposals are to suspend or close an academic offering. Academic proposals should be progressed in a timely fashion to ensure their continued currency and relevance.

- The **business case** allows the university to understand the commercial and operational implications of an academic offering and considers factors such as competitive advantage, commercial viability and resourcing. It is typically developed in consultation with relevant units such as Faculty leadership, External Relations, and Finance, as needed.

Approval components may require consultation with impacted parties to be undertaken and issues addressed before they are approved (refer to section 5.1).

2. Establishment of new academic offerings

2.1. Establishment of a new program

New programs require an ATP, an establishment proposal and a business case (with some exceptions, listed in section 2.1.4 below).

2.1.1 ATP approval workflow for a new program

The approval workflow for an ATP for a new program is:

1. Endorsement by Dean (or nominee) of the relevant Faculty. Where the Dean’s nominee is the author of the application, the Dean cannot delegate authority.
2. Approval by the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

Associate Deans (or equivalent) of all Faculties will be notified when an ATP for a new program is approved.

An establishment proposal and business case may be submitted for approval only once the ATP for the related program has received final approval. When an ATP has been approved, an academic proposal and business case (where required) must be submitted within one year.

2.1.2 Establishment proposal approval workflow for a program

The approval workflow for an establishment proposal for new programs is:

1. Recommendation for approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.
2. Review by APAG. This must be completed before the establishment proposal can proceed to ABPC or UHDRC.
3. Recommendation for approval by the relevant University academic committee. The Business Case must be considered by the APBG before the establishment proposal can proceed to the ABPC or UHDRC.
4. Approval by the Academic Board.

All approvals for academic components that make up a program (i.e. specialisations and/or courses) should proceed simultaneously so that all related academic offerings are endorsed prior to or concurrently with final approval by Academic Board.
Where a program establishment proposal is assessed as having a higher than typical level of risk, whether academic, operational or financial, the Academic Board may require that the program be reviewed under the Academic Program Review Procedure, within a set number of years, as a condition of approval.

The establishment proposal for a double degree will include information relating to supplementary rules where required (typically where programs involve cognate disciplines) and address timetabling of courses to ensure that students can complete in the published duration. Typically, all other academic attributes are predetermined by the constituent programs.

2.1.3 Business case approval workflow for a new program

The approval workflow for a business case for new programs is:

1. Endorsement by the Faculty Executive Director.

2. Consideration and recommendation by the Academic Program Business Group (APBG). Where a program is being proposed for equity or strategic reasons, and commercial viability cannot be demonstrated, the APBG may refer the business case to the relevant DVC for advice to inform their recommendation.

3. Noting by ABPC or UHDRC in considering the establishment proposal. Establishment proposals with a business case that has a recommendation not to approve will be routinely starred at ABPC or UHDRC.

4. Noting by Academic Board in considering the establishment proposal. Establishment proposals with a business case that has a recommendation not to approve will be routinely starred at Academic Board.

2.1.4 Approval workflow exceptions

Exceptions to the processes set out in 2.1.1 to 2.1.3 are:

- Where a new program is required to be established for administrative purposes, the requirement for an ATP may be waived by the Head of Academic Administration, Student Services and Systems for coursework programs and the Director, Graduate Research School for Higher degree research programs. A Business Case for these programs is not required.

- An exemption from a Business Case may be granted at the discretion of the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

- New double degree programs comprising existing programs do not require a Business Case. However, the viability of the combination must be addressed as part of the ATP.

2.2. Establishment of a new specialisation (excluding minors)

All new specialisations, with the exception of minors, require an ATP, an establishment proposal and a business case.

2.2.1 ATP approval workflows for new specialisations (excluding minors)

The approval workflow for an ATP for a new specialisation, excluding minors, is:

1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee) where the specialisation is owned by a School.

2. Approval by the Dean of the Faculty that owns the specialisation.

2.2.2 Establishment proposal approval workflows for a new specialisation (excluding minors)

The approval workflow for an establishment proposal for a new specialisation (excluding minors) is:

1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee) where the specialisation is owned by a School.

2. Recommendation for approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.

3. Review by APAG. This must be completed before the establishment proposal can proceed to ABPC or UHDRC.

4. Recommendation for approval by the relevant University academic committee. The Business Case for a specialisation of 96 UOC or more must be considered by the APBG before the establishment proposal can proceed to the ABPC or UHDRC.

5. Approval by the Academic Board.

Where a new major, honours or postgraduate specialisation is being added to an existing program or programs, the establishment proposal and approval must specify the relevant programs. A corresponding program revision proposal is not required.
Where an existing specialisation (excluding minors) is being added to an existing program or programs, a program revision proposal approved by Academic Board is required and must follow the process set out in section 3.

2.2.3 Business case approval workflows for new specialisations (excluding minors)
The approval workflow for a business case for a new specialisations, excluding minors, is:
1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee) where the specialisation is owned by a School
2. Approval by the Dean of the Faculty that owns the specialisation.
3. Review and recommendation by APBG, for specialisations of 96 UOC or more

2.3. Establishment of a new minor
All new minors require an ATP and an establishment proposal.

2.3.1 ATP approval workflow for a new minor
The approval workflow for an ATP for a new minor is:
1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee) where the specialisation is owned by a School.
2. Approval by the Dean of the Faculty that owns the minor.

2.3.2 Establishment proposal approval workflow for a new minor
The approval workflow for an establishment proposal for a new minor is:
1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee) where the specialisation is owned by a School.
2. Approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.

Where a new minor is being added to an existing program within the same Faculty that owns the minor, a corresponding program revision is not required. The establishment proposal and approval must specify the relevant programs.

Where an existing minor is being added to an existing program, or a new minor is being added to an existing program outside the Faculty that owns the minor, a program revision proposal approved by the Faculty Board that owns the program is required and must follow the process set out in section 3.

2.4. Establishment of a new course
All new courses require an ATP and an establishment proposal.

2.4.1 ATP approval workflow for a new course
The ATP for a new course requires information on staffing needs, likely student numbers, curriculum-fit (including whether the course is core or elective and linkages to other programs or specialisations), and facilities and resources.

The approval workflow for an ATP for a new course is:
1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee)
2. Approval by the relevant Dean with notification of the approval to the Faculty Executive Director.

2.4.2 Establishment proposal approval workflow for a new course
The establishment proposal for a new course requires the following information:
- A description of the course
- The course learning outcomes and the relationship to program and specialisation learning outcomes
- high-level assessment structure and indication of any mandatory attendance and participation requirements
- delivery mode/s (e.g. face-to-face) and / or format/s (e.g. intensive)
- inherent requirements and prerequisites.

Information in the course outline and the course content must be consistent with the approved establishment proposal

The approval workflow for an establishment proposal for a new course is:
1. Endorsement by the Head of School (or nominee)
2. Endorsement by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.
2.5. Establishment of a new non-AQF course or credential

Proposals for the establishment of a micro-course or shorter form credential with no specific relationship with current AQF qualifications (including short courses, micro-credentials, digital badges, whether based on existing courses or not, and courses designed for specific professional markets such as finance and information technology courses) require different levels of approval depending on the nature of the course or credential and the potential for use as a component of an AQF qualification.

Proposals for the establishment of non-AQF course or credential, including the division of existing courses into sub-components (such as “badges”), are approved with an establishment proposal by the Faculty Board or delegated academic committee, in the following circumstances:

• where successful completion of the proposed non-AQF course or credential is intended to allow admission, credit or exemption towards a UNSW program of study, and/or

• where the proposed non-AQF course or credential contains at least one day (at least six hours) of course work and is assessed by at least one hour of examinations or student assessment activity.

An Authority to Proceed and Business Case is not required for non-AQF proposals.

The establishment proposal must be made in the university academic information system and will detail:

• The learning outcomes, and the relationship to existing course or program learning outcomes and/or admission requirements, where it is envisaged that the credential could be used for credit or admission

• The volume of learning in equivalent units of credit

• Assessment structure

• Likely costs and income with evidence of endorsement of these from the Faculty Executive Director.

For all other non-AQF proposals, a Head of School or delegate must approve the courseware and assessments prior to the issuing of a micro-credential, with notification to the Associate Dean (Education).

All non-AQF courses and credentials must be clearly distinguished from AQF awards and qualifications and the university approved templates must be used when issuing certification to students.

3. Revisions to academic offerings

Revisions to academic offerings require different levels of approval depending on the type of academic offering (program, specialisation, or course) and the nature of the change. The intention is to streamline approval processes for lower risk changes, while ensuring robust quality assurance and consultation around more sensitive and impactful changes. Only revisions categorised as Level 4 and above require approval by Academic Board.

Revisions to all academic offerings except those classified as Level 1 revisions, require an academic proposal to be completed in the academic information management system. Supporting information on the rationale for the change, transitional arrangements, resource implications and evidence of consultation may be required.

For efficiency, a consolidated approval process may be used for revisions that apply broadly to a Faculty’s programs at the discretion of the Head of Academic Administration, Student Services and Systems (for coursework programs) or the Director, Graduate Research School (for Higher degree research programs). For example, if a Faculty proposes to change the English language requirement for all their programs this may be actioned as a single approval (e.g. via a memo to the committees) and then updated in all the relevant records upon approval (liaise with Academic Administration for this).

Some revisions must be actioned via establishment of a new academic offering rather than by changing attributes of an existing offering. This is usually because of constraints applied by the government in reporting specifications. Refer to section 3.5.

3.1. Level 1 revisions

Revisions categorised as Level 1 are financial and / or operational in nature and do not have any academic implications, i.e. organisational ownership changes, and changes relating to the management of admission applications.

The Faculty Executive Director approves Level 1 revisions for:

• Courses

• Minors.
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or Dean of Graduate Research approve Level 1 revisions for:

- Majors
- Postgraduate Specialisations
- Programs

### 3.2. Level 2 revisions

Revisions categorised as Level 2 are deemed to be academic in nature, but of low risk and with localised applicability, not typically requiring broad Faculty or institutional consultation, i.e. course assessment structure, career outcomes and pathways, field of education.

Level 2 revisions require a revision proposal to be approved by the Associate Dean (Education), or equivalent, and noting by the relevant Faculty Committee. The Associate Dean (Education) may delegate their authority to approve revisions, and this delegation is applicable to all approvals within their authority.

### 3.3. Level 3 revisions

Revisions categorised as Level 3 are deemed to be academic in nature, and of sufficient sensitivity to be subject to broad Faculty consultation, i.e. course name changes, course delivery changes, and changes to academic rules in minors that may have a potential impact on learning outcomes.

Level 3 revisions require a revision proposal to be approved by the relevant Faculty Committee.

Where an existing minor is offered in programs outside the owning Faculty, evidence of consultation and support for the proposed change by the other Faculty or Faculties must be provided.

### 3.4. Level 4 and 5 revisions

Level 4 revisions are only applicable to specialisations (excluding minors) and programs.

Revisions categorised as Level 4 are academic in nature, potentially highly impactful, and requiring of broad institutional consultation.

The approval workflow for a Level 4 revision is:

1. Recommendation for approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.
2. Review by APAG. This must be completed before a revision proposal can proceed to the relevant university academic committee.
3. Recommendation for approval by the relevant university academic committee.
4. Approval by Academic Board.

Level 5 revisions are only applicable to programs. These involve a substantial set of changes to a program which change the focus of the program, such as simultaneous changes to learning outcomes, structure and target market.

Level 5 revisions follow the same endorsement and approval workflow steps as Level 4 revisions but should only be approved following completion of an Academic Program Review for the program.

### 3.5. Changes that require establishment of a new academic offering

#### 3.5.1 Programs

The following attributes of an existing program cannot be changed with a revision proposal. A new program must be created via an establishment proposal:

- Award Title
- Program Code
- Career
- AQF level
- Size of disciplinary core

Where a new academic offering is required to be created to accommodate a change which is essentially a revision, an exemption from the ATP approval process may be approved by the Head of Academic Administration.

When changing the delivery location or mode for a program, staff are advised to contact Academic Administration for advice. Depending on the change, this may require a business case to be approved by the Academic Programs Business Group as part of a revision proposal or may be best managed as a new academic offering.
3.5.2 Specialisations
The following attributes of an existing specialisation cannot be changed with a revision proposal. A new specialisation must be created via an establishment proposal:
- Formal name
- Career
- Specialisation type.

3.5.3 Courses
Changes to units of credit of courses cannot be changed with a revision proposal. A new course must be created via an establishment proposal.

4. Disestablishing an academic offering

4.1. Programs
Programs can be disestablished for academic, strategic or administrative reasons.
Disestablishment of an academic offering involves one or more of the following processes:
- Suspension
- Closure
- Inactivation

Suspension is the process to be followed when a program will not be offered to new applicants for a specified period, to evaluate whether it should continue to be offered. A program may be in a status of suspension for a maximum of three years. After this the program must either be re-opened, or it will be considered to be in Teach Out.

Closure is the process to be followed when a program will be permanently closed to new applicants. It is not necessary that this is preceded by a process of suspension. A program that has been closed will be in the status of Teach Out and cannot be reopened. Academic Administration may administratively close a program where it has been superseded by an equivalent new offering.

Inactivation is an administrative process conducted by Academic Administration that occurs when there are no longer any students enrolled in a program identified with a status of Teach Out. This process requires the status of a program to be updated to Inactive in the SIMS and academic information system.

A proposal to disestablish a program must contain the following information:
- Reason for suspension or closure
- Program application and enrolment data
- Proposed timing of suspension or closure
- Identified impacts of disestablishment including resolution of any third-party arrangements,
- Student transition plan which addresses the impact on applicants and students and their ability to complete the program in the maximum time for completion (as specified in the Academic Progression Procedure). This must include consideration of students on approved program leave or academic suspension.
- Evidence of consultation with impacted parties and resolution of issues. In the case of a cross-faculty double degree award program the Managing Faculty is required to consult with the secondary Faculty.

Once a program is approved for suspension or closure, the Managing Faculty must liaise with the relevant offices, including External Relations and Admissions, regarding any follow up actions required on their part (e.g. existing applications offers and deferrals on previous code, updating marketing collateral).

A decision not to offer a core course, specialisation or any other component of a program without appropriate substitution and without which the program cannot be completed constitutes a decision to suspend or close the program and must be dealt with according to this Procedure.

4.1.1 Suspension approval workflow
The approval workflow for the suspension of a program is:
1. Endorsement by the relevant Dean (or nominee)
2. Approval by the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
3. Noting by the relevant university committee (ABPC or UHDRC)
A request to re-open the program follows the same approval workflow and must be supported by a rationale addressing the concerns that led to suspension.

If a program has not been reviewed within the last seven years, it must be reviewed according to the Academic Program Review Procedure prior to re-opening. It must also be compliant with University policies and procedures that are applicable at time of re-opening.

4.1.2 Closure approval workflow

The approval workflow for the closure of a program is:

1. Endorsement by the relevant Dean (or nominee)
2. Endorsement by the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor.
3. Endorsement by the relevant university committee (ABPC or UHDRC)
4. Approval by Academic Board

Where the program to be closed is in a category listed in the University’s funding agreement under Closure of courses, the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic will liaise with the Commonwealth regarding approval of the closure.

4.2. Specialisations

A specialisation may be closed when a Faculty does not wish to continue to offer the specialisation in the future. A closed specialisation will be in a status of teach out until the inactivation process can be followed when the specialisation is no longer required for graduation. A specialisation in teach out cannot be reopened and the process for establishing a new specialisation must be followed.

A disestablishment proposal to close a specialisation requires the following information:

- Reason for closure
- Enrolment data
- Proposed timing of closure
- Identified impacts of disestablishment on programs within and outside the Faculty,
- A plan to manage the dissolution of any relevant third-party arrangements,
- Student transition plan.
- Evidence of consultation with impacted parties

Where the specialisation to be closed is in a category listed in the University’s funding agreement under Closure of courses, the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic will liaise with the Commonwealth regarding approval of the closure.

The approval workflow for closure of a specialisation (excluding minors) is:

1. Endorsement by the relevant Head of School
2. Endorsement by the relevant Deputy Vice-Chancellor
3. Recommendation for approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.
4. Review by APAG. This must be completed before the disestablishment proposal can proceed to ABPC or UHDRC.
5. Recommendation for approval by the relevant University academic committee
6. Approval by the Academic Board.

The approval workflow for closure of a minor is:

1. Endorsement by the relevant Head of School
2. Approval by the relevant Faculty Board or Committee.

No associated program revision is required to remove the specialisation from the associated programs in which it appears as the removal is implicit in the request to close the specialisation.

4.3. Courses

A course may be closed when a Faculty does not wish to continue to offer the course in the future. A closed course is made inactive in the curriculum management system and SIMS. An inactive course cannot be reopened and the process for establishing a new course must be followed.

A disestablishment proposal to close a course requires the following information:

- Reason for closure
- Enrolment data and trends
- Proposed timing of closure
• The role of the course in related programs, specialisations and as a course prerequisite within and outside of the Faculty. This is important so that students are able to complete their program of study within the minimum time required.
• Resolution of any third-party arrangements,
• Evidence of consultation with impacted parties

The approval workflow to close a course is:

1. Recommendation for disestablishment by the School or Faculty that owns the course.
2. Approval by the relevant Faculty Committee.

The timing of a decision to close a course must be considered. A course may be closed at any time prior to the course planning deadline for the following year. Once enrolments have opened, and a course has registered enrolments it may be cancelled in consultation with Scheduling and Academic Administration and a disestablishment proposal must be submitted to be effective the following year.

Academic Board may require the Faculty to close a course on the basis of low enrolments, duplication of content, consideration of the overall portfolio of academic offerings, or consistently poor student experience feedback.

A course may be administratively closed if it is not offered for three consecutive years unless a justification is provided for approval by DVCA or delegate e.g. some project, independent study, or research courses are not regularly offered but may need to be kept active.

5. Operational considerations

5.1. Consultation

Where the establishment, revision or disestablishment of an academic offering can reasonably be anticipated to impact on another School or Faculty, the proponent is expected to consult with them and address potential issues as part of the academic proposal prior to it being considered by the relevant approval authority

The approval authority may choose to not consider an academic proposal until evidence of adequate consultation is provided.

Where it is anticipated that a change to UNSW academic offerings may impact on parties outside of UNSW, the same expectations for evidence of consultation hold.

5.2. Third-party arrangements

All third-party arrangements associated with an establishment, revision or disestablishment proposal, particularly arrangements to deliver some or all of a program or course, must comply with UNSW policies and procedures, including the UNSW Risk Management Framework for Third-Party Arrangements and the Guide for staff managing a Third-Party Arrangement (TPA). A draft of the third-party agreement for programs must be submitted to APBG and APAG for consideration. Where there is a Third-Party Agreement for a course this should be submitted to the faculty committee along with the establishment proposal.

Signed third party agreements must be in place prior to a program being marketed and opened to enrolments. Consideration should also be given to mitigation measures for identified risks, ensuring that required resources are in place and confirming that UNSW still wishes to proceed with offering the program, specialisation or course.

5.3. Approval cut-off dates

All new and revised academic offerings must be approved by 30 June in the year prior to the first intake to ensure that all necessary arrangements (eg Handbook publication, CRICOS registration, marketing and agent notification, student load planning, student enrolment planning, and resource development) are in place before commencement and to meet key administrative deadlines for curriculum planning, publishing and enrolment. The exception is new research programs or coursework programs which are fully online and associated new courses. These must be approved six months prior to the first intake.

APAG can recommend a shorter cut-off date in exceptional circumstances.
5.4. Transition plans

The transition plan is to support students to complete the program or specialisation with the published structure, academic requirements, and learning outcomes, or equivalent, in place at the time of their initial enrolment or acceptance of an offer to the program.

The transition plan forms part of the approval documentation for the revision or closure of an academic offering.

The transition plan must specify arrangements for students enrolled in, on approved leave from, or accepted into the program (including options to teach out or transfer without disadvantage to an equivalent program) and demonstrate how the quality and integrity of the student experience will be maintained.

A brief stakeholder communication plan should also be included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislative Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Procedure supports the University’s compliance with the following legislation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Qualifications Framework 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Standards for Education 2005 (Cth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Document (Policy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Governance Policy (title to be confirmed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Program Review Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progression and Enrolment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Progression Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission to Coursework Programs Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission of Higher Degree Research Programs Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Design Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Implementation Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for Award of Doctor of Philosophy Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions for Award of Master of Philosophy Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Quality Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Quality Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree Research Admissions and Pathways Guideline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated Curriculum Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myExperience Survey Procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design and Delivery Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design Procedure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Definitions and Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic offering</strong></td>
<td>A program, specialisation or course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic proposal</strong></td>
<td>An approval document providing academic details relating to an academic offering. There are three types: establishment proposal, revision proposal, and disestablishment proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative closure</strong></td>
<td>Closure of an offering for administrative reasons where it has been superseded by an equivalent new offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AQF</strong></td>
<td>Australian Qualifications Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority to proceed</strong></td>
<td>An approval document providing a high-level justification to establish a new academic offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Award/Qualification</strong></td>
<td>A degree, diploma or certificate conferred following completion of an award program. It provides official recognition of successful completion of that program and carries the official seal of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business case</strong></td>
<td>An approval document providing the commercial and operational rationale to establish a new academic offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career</strong></td>
<td>Career refers to a student's academic level. UNSW has the following careers: Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Research and Non-award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
<td>The status of an offering which indicates that it will no longer be offered to new students. A closed offering cannot be re-opened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course</strong></td>
<td>A planned and structured sequence of learning and teaching that allows a student to gain knowledge skills and understanding in relation to an agreed set of learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Authority</strong></td>
<td>Position with overarching responsibility for all aspects of a course. The Course Authority may delegate responsibilities to nominated staff or an administrative unit within a School or Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disestablishment</strong></td>
<td>The discontinuation of offering an academic program, specialisation or course. It can incorporate the 3 processes of suspension, closure and inactivation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disestablishment proposal</strong></td>
<td>An academic proposal to suspend or close an academic offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Establishment proposal</strong></td>
<td>An academic proposal to create a new academic offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Board</strong></td>
<td>Includes a board of studies established by Council which is authorised to act as a Faculty Board.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Superseded Documents**
- Program Disestablishment Procedure, v1.1

**File Number**
- [For Governance Use]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inherent requirements</td>
<td>The essential elements of a program or course that all students must meet for admission, progression and successful completion of a program or course. They are used as a reference point for students to identify their ability to successfully undertake the course of study and for identifying potential educational adjustments for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivation</td>
<td>The administrative process of updating the status of an academic offering to ‘Inactive’ in the SIMS and academic information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>A specified sequence of study in a discipline or sub-discipline area within a program. Majors require students to take an approved set of courses at different levels and units of credit. In postgraduate programs, the term specialisation is used instead of major. In some programs more than one major may be completed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Faculty</td>
<td>In a double degree the Managing Faculty is the Faculty with overarching responsibility for the administration of a double degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>A specified sequence of study within a discipline or sub-discipline, smaller in size and scope than a major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer</td>
<td>A formal invitation from the University to an applicant to commence a program (award or non-award).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prerequisite</td>
<td>A course that must have been successfully completed prior to a student undertaking another course, usually due to the need for a student to have particular knowledge in order to engage successfully with the curriculum in the latter course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Authority</td>
<td>Position with overarching responsibility for all aspects of a program. The Program Authority may delegate responsibilities to nominated staff or an administrative unit within a School or Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program rules</td>
<td>The academic requirements a student must satisfy to be awarded the qualification. Program rules include core, electives, and general education course rules; unit of credit requirements; specialisation requirements; and limit rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision proposal</td>
<td>An academic proposal to change attributes of an already approved and existing academic offering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialisation</td>
<td>The umbrella term for the defined area of disciplinary study. In undergraduate programs, they are referred to as majors and minors. In postgraduate coursework program they are referred to as specialisations. See Major and Minor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Information</td>
<td>The approved enterprise-wide university system for the admission and management of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management System (SiMs)</td>
<td>The approved enterprise-wide university system for the admission and management of students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>The process by which an academic offering is suspended, at which point it will not be offered to new students for a specified period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach out</td>
<td>The status of an academic offering to indicate it has been closed but remains open in the SiMs system for existing students to complete their program and / or specialisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit of credit (UOC)</td>
<td>The value assigned to programs and courses indicating workload and thus duration. For a course, UOC indicates the student workload expectations and the contribution of the course to meeting program requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Revision History**
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Approved by</th>
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</thead>
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</tr>
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6. Appendices

APPENDIX 1

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ADVISORY GROUP
TERMS OF REFERENCE

PURPOSE OF THE GROUP
The Academic Programs Advisory Group’s purpose is to support the quality and efficacy of the academic program approval process. The group reports to the Academic Board Programs Committee (ABPC) and University Higher Degree Research Committee (UHDRC). The group is tasked with reviewing academic program proposals to identify issues of either academic or operational significance for the attention of the Committees in advance of meetings or for follow up through operational channels where this is more appropriate. The group will also identify gaps and other information requirements and play a support role through providing feedback to proposal proponents in order to assist and guide them in the proposal development process.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
The Group is responsible for:

- Supporting the work of ABPC by providing advice and input in relation to the Committee’s responsibility for detailed examination of program matters as outlined in the Terms of Reference:
  - 2.2 (b) Considering and recommending to the Academic Board for approval the establishment, major revision or termination of university coursework programs, including program rules and other academic requirements
  - 2.2 (c) Considering and providing advice to the Academic Board on broad issues relating to the quality and standards of academic coursework programs

- Supporting the work of UHDRC by providing advice and input in relation to the Committee’s responsibility for detailed examination of program matters as outlined in the Terms of Reference:
  - 2.2 (c) In relation to higher degree research programs and higher doctorates, considering and recommending to the Academic Board for approval the establishment, revision or termination of all award programs, including program rules and other academic requirements

- Examining the operational aspects of program and stream proposals in order to identify issues, constraints and risks with a focus on operational, policy and procedural, regulatory, data, system and reporting considerations.

- Identifying significant issues with proposals for consideration by ABPC and UHDRC.

MEMBERSHIP
The group’s membership is intended to provide for breadth of expertise, with both academic and professional staff membership. Given the advisory-only role of the group, the membership is intended to be inclusive and others may be invited to join meetings according to the issues discussed.

Members:
Head, Academic Administration [Chair] and/or delegate
Director, Student Services and Systems

And representatives of the following roles/offices:
Faculty Associate Dean (Education) [may be on a rotating basis]
Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)
University Planning and Performance
Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Academic Board
Governance
Admissions Office
Graduate Research School
MEETING SCHEDULE
The Group will meet on a regular basis, approximately 2 weeks in advance of meetings of ABPC.

REPORTING AND MINUTING
Feedback from meetings will be provided to proposal proponents through comments in AIMS as soon as practicable following meetings. The Group will report as a standing agenda item at ABPC and UHDRC. Additionally, the group will report through operational management channels on an as needs basis according to the issue.
There will be no administrative support for the Group and there is no expectation for comprehensive minutes.
APPENDIX 2

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS BUSINESS GROUP
DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE

PURPOSE OF THE GROUP
The purpose of the Academic Programs Business Group [APBG] is to advise the Academic Board on all Business Cases associated with new Program proposals. The APBG will make recommendations to the Board on commercial and business-related aspects of academic program proposals, such as student demand, graduate demand, resource implications, impact on existing programs and courses, and risk. The Business Case may also address other drivers for the proposal, such as equity or strategic considerations. The group will also identify gaps and other information requirements and play a support role through providing feedback to proposal proponents in order to assist and guide them in the business case development process.

Most new program proposals will be required to include a Business Case which will be approved by the relevant Faculty Executive Director prior to consideration by APBG. Academic approval bodies will not address the Business Case, and the APBG will recommend the proposal proceed or not prior to the academic proposal being considered by the Academic Board Programs Committee or University Higher Degree Research Committee.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
The Group is responsible for:

- Supporting the Academic Board in relation to its responsibilities to approve new programs by providing advice and input on commercial, risk and resource considerations of new program proposals;
- Making recommendations to Academic Board Programs Committee and University Higher Degree Research Committee on whether a new program proposal should proceed in relation to its commercial viability, resource implications or risk profile.

MEMBERSHIP
Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education) (Chair)
Director, Student Services and Systems
Chief Financial Officer or nominee
Director, Risk Management Office or nominee
Vice President, External Relations or nominee
Head, Academic Administration
Director, Graduate Research School
Faculty Executive Director representative

Quorum: 5 members

MEETING SCHEDULE
The Group will meet approximately two weeks before each ABPC. Meetings may be by circulation or in person.

REPORTING AND MINUTING
The outcomes of the meeting and feedback will be recorded on an action sheet with a clear recommendation and provided to proposal proponents and the appropriate committee.
APPENDIX 3

Example: Establishing a new coursework program

**Establishment Process**

1. **Authority to Proceed**
   - Submit business case
   - BOD/University Senate decision
   - University Senate

2. **Financial Need Assessment**
   - Business case evaluated
   - Financial implications considered

3. **APPC Review**
   - Academic Program Planning Committee (APPC)
   - Comprehensive review

4. **APPC Approval**
   - Submission of business case
   - Approval by APC

5. **Business Case**
   - Submission for approval
   - APC review

6. **AMC Approval**
   - AMC approval of new program

7. **Amendment**
   - Approval by AMC

**Notes**

- A program proposal is approved by the Academic Program Advisory Group (APAG)
- An internal Associate Dean (Education) or equivalent
- APC includes all faculty deans and administrators
- APC includes Associate Dean (Education), Director of Student Services and Systems, Chief Financial Officer, Director of Risk Management Office, Vice-President Student Services, Head Academic Program Planning Committee, and Academic Program Planning Committee Chair
- AMCP includes the Academic Program Planning Committee (APPC)
- Establishment processes are managed by the Faculty Board of Studies (FBS) and the University Senate
Example: Establishing a new major

Establishment Proposal

1. Submit Establishment Proposal
2. HECI Review
3. HECI Approval
4. Academic Board Approval
5. Academic Board Report
6. Academic Board Approval
7. Academic Board Report
8. Academic Board Approval
9. Academic Board Report
10. Academic Board Approval
11. Academic Board Report
12. Academic Board Approval

Business Case

1. Submit Business Case
2. HECI Review
3. HECI Approval
4. Academic Board Approval
5. Academic Board Report
6. Academic Board Approval
7. Academic Board Report
8. Academic Board Approval
9. Academic Board Report
10. Academic Board Approval
11. Academic Board Report
12. Academic Board Approval

Reference Information gathering and consultation

New major consideration

Authority to Proceed

2-3 months depending on frequency and timing of key meetings in relation to scheduled University Committee meetings

NOTES
- HECI is the Program Authority Group.
- HECI is comprised of Head of Academic Administration, Director of Student Services and Systems, and representatives from the following units/offices: Faculty Associate Dean (Education/Office of the Pro Vice Chancellor - Educational); Associate Dean (Graduate); Academic Board; Graduate Office; Graduate Research School.
- Academic Board is comprised of Pro Vice Chancellor (Education), Director of Student Services and Systems, Chief Financial Officer, Director of Risk Management Office, Vice President (Finance), Academic Board, Director (Graduate Research School), Dean (Nexus), and Director of Administration.
- Academic Board Approval is the Academic Board Program Committee.
- Establishment of new majors is approved by the Faculty Board or Faculty Board-appointed Committee. Individual faculties may have different governance workflows, prior to faculty level endorsement. These are not represented here for simplicity.
Example: Establishing a new minor

Academic Offerings Approval Procedure
Consultation Draft 28 June to 18 July 2019
Example: Establishing a new course

- Authority to Proceed
- Establish Proposal

Flowchart:

1. Authority to Proceed
   - Submit Proposal
   - Chair Approval
   - FDR Approval
   - FBC Approval
   - MDG Approval
   - Vice-Chancellor Approval

1. Establish Proposal
   - Submit Establishment Proposal
   - Chair Approval
   - FDR Approval
   - FBC Approval
   - MDG Approval
   - Vice-Chancellor Approval

Note:
- FDR is the Faculty Dean.
- Establishment proposals are endorsed by the Faculty Board or Faculty Board-Seasoned Committee. Individual faculties have different governance workflows prior to faculty-level endorsement and these are not represented here for simplicity.