

## Academic Offerings Monitoring and Review Procedure

Version	Approved by	Approval date	Effective date
5.0	Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic Quality	2 November 2023	1 January 2024
Procedure Statement			
<b>Purpose</b>	This procedure specifies the framework, processes and responsibilities for monitoring, review and improvement of UNSW programs, specialisations and courses.		
<b>Scope</b>	The p		

## **Overview**

The UNSW academic offerings monitoring and review framework specified in this procedure comprises:

1. Course monitoring and routine review processes conducted each time a course is offered
2. Comprehensive course review process conducted as determined by Faculties and Schools
3. Program monitoring process conducted on an annual basis
4. Comprehensive program review process conducted at least every seven years.

The academic offerings monitoring and review framework is defined within the context of the University

## **1. Course monitoring and review**

1.1 Faculties<sup>1</sup> and/or Schools must implement and support quality assurance processes and continuous



### **3.3 Program review proposal, variation requests and updates**

- a) Faculties must submit a program review proposal including the proposed TOR, review panel membership and review timelines to the Faculty Education Committee (FEC) (or equivalent) or Faculty Board (or equivalent, including the University Board of Studies (BoS), and UHDC for HDR programs) and to PRC prior to the review commencing.
- b) Proposals with variation requests from the standard program review requirements specified in this procedure (such as due to small low risk program with limited enrolment numbers and data or other reasons) or non-standard program review proposals (such as for externally accredited program reviews, Generalist, combined reviews or program reviews overlapping with other University or Faculty review processes) must be provided for approval by PRC, or PRC Chair and Deputy Chair on behalf of PRC, prior to the proposal being considered by FEC (or equivalent) or Faculty Board (or equivalent, as per above).
- c) Where a program has been externally accredited within 12 months of the scheduled program review event, any findings and outcomes of that accreditation process or any material presented to the accrediting body that substantially satisfies the requirements of this procedure may be relied on in place of the relevant requirements under this procedure.
- d) The Faculty is required to submit to PRC an external accreditation program review proposal to specify the proposed program review process which

- b) Further details on the program review TOR will be provided in the program review templates and guidelines.
- c) Faculties can determine additional TOR.
- d) Program reviews must include a review of all majors, minors, postgraduate specialisations, double degree programs and exit (only) nested programs associated with the program under review, and all teaching locations, delivery modes or partners, including third party arrangements.
- e) Any requests for variation from the minimum program review TOR must be submitted to PRC for approval by PRC, or PRC Chair and Deputy Chair on behalf of PRC, prior to the review commencing.

### **3.6 Program review portfolio, including self-evaluation report (SER)**

- a) The program review portfolio is the set of documentation provided to the program review panel at least two weeks prior to the program review event. It must include the self-evaluation report (SER), data reports, program monitoring and previous program review outcomes, stakeholders' input, submissions, survey and focus group outcomes and any other relevant documentation, including, if applicable, external accreditation and third-party arrangements documentation, internal and external benchmarking, competitor analysis, market research, industry, government and workforce reports.
- b) The SER is prepared by the

- f) The interviewees should represent stakeholders relevant to all programs / specialisations under review, such as in case of a combined review or a Generalist program review.
- g) The invitees should be given the opportunity to make written submission in addition to, or as an alternative to, any interview.

### 3.8 Program review panel report

- a) The Chair of the program review panel will prepare the program review panel report, in consultation with the program review panel members, and submit the panel review report to the Dean (or delegate) within one month of the review event.
- b) The Dean (or delegate) may consult with the Chair on any clarifications required.
- c) The program review panel report must:
  - i. Include an overview of the review process,
  - ii. Summarise key findings and provide an overall evaluation of the program(s) under review,
  - iii. Address each TOR in relation to the evidence presented in the program review portfolio and at the program review event, and
  - iv. Provide contextualised commendations and recommendations, including risk / opportunity and significance rating, to address key issues, risks and opportunities identified in the review.

### 3.9 Faculty response, program review outcomes, implementation and reporting

- a) The Faculty (or GRS or BoS) response must be prepared by the Program Authority, in consultation with the ADE (or equivalent) and HOS, and approved by the Dean (or BoS Chair or equivalent) within two months of receipt of the program review panel report and should be provided to the program review panel for reporting.
- b) The Faculty (or GRS or BoS) response must address each recommendation and include implementation strategies for accepted recommendations, or reasons for recommendations not accepted and alternative strategies that would address the issue, risk or opportunity identified by the program review panel, confirming the required resourcing availability, responsible person(s), proposed tasks, actions and timelines.
- c) Faculties should prepare a program review precis outlining the program review outcomes to be shared with the University community and other stakeholders, as appropriate.







<b>Accountabilities</b>	
<b>Responsible Officer</b>	Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic Quality

**Contact Officer**



