



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE



July 2020

Guidelines for the Self-Evaluation Reports (SER) for Academic Program Reviews (version 6)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	3
1. Introduction.....	4
2. Process.....	4
3. Themes to be considered in the SER.....	7
3.1 Theme 1 – Implementation Plan progress.....	7
3.2 Theme 2 – Programs.....	7
3.3 Theme 3 – Inclusion and Diversity.....	8
3.4. Theme 4 – External influences and outcomes.....	8
3.5. Theme 5 – Sustainability.....	9
3.6. Theme 6 – Best practice and successes.....	9
3.7. Theme 7 – Program governance and management.....	10
3.8. Theme 8 – Opportunities to be considered.....	10
3.9. Theme 9 – Resources and support.....	11
4. Completion of the SER.....	11
5. Resources.....	12
5.1. Policies.....	12
5.2. University frameworks.....	12
5.3. External resources.....	12
6. Acronyms cited in these Guidelines.....	12
Appendix I – The framework for the development of the self-evaluation process.....	14
Appendix II – The generic TOR for a program review.....	15
Appendix III: SER template.....	18

Prepared by
Learning and Quality Support
Division of Academic & Student Engagement
RMO 2016/4707

Version:	Date:	Change:	Initial:
5.0.0	4/2/2019	Updated format for ToR and SER.	PNS
6.0.0	16/7/2020	Included section 3.3. Inclusion and Diversity	AAA
Document Path	I:\reviews\2019\resourcesapproved\ser#1programreview12_2018_v200.docx		
Effective Date:	01/02/2019	Review Date:	01/02/2020
		Authorised by:	Manager L&QS

1. Introduction

The new program review process is aimed at addressing future prospects and enhancement through formative self-evaluation and participatory stakeholder engagement. This process is intended to result in a school/faculty submission for the Review Panel in which enhancement strategies and plans, benchmarked against national and international standards, are identified for the Panel's feedback and recommendations. The concept of an internal and external stakeholder-led process permeates all aspects of the revised review processes.

This document deals specifically with the development of the self-evaluation report (SER) for program reviews. The rationale for the SER is provided at Appendix I.

The aim of the SER is to identify areas of good practice and also areas for improvement. An essential part of the process is an explanation of the strategic aims of the Program and identify actions to enable those strategic goals to be met. Part of the Review Panel's role is to provide support in formulating strategic initiatives in addressing issues. It is important that the SER clearly identifies where the School is seeking the Review Panel's support.

It is recognised that a "one size fits all" approach is antithetical to the intent of the new process and that the Guidelines will be modified as required by the circumstances prevailing in each faculty/school.

Please note in these Guidelines 'faculty' and 'school' are used inter-changeably.

2. Process

The Guidelines provide support and ideas as to how the faculty/school may choose to draft its SER. A set of key themes derived from the Terms of Reference (TOR) governing reviews have been developed to assist the faculty/school staff in addressing the main requirements. The TOR are provided at Appendix II.

2.1 Internal team

The Internal Team is chaired by the Program Coordinator and includes the faculty ADLT (or equivalent) and course coordinators, as determined by the Executive Dean in consultation with relevant Heads of School and/or ADLT.

Membership of the team will be widely published within the faculty/school, listed on all documentation and correspondence relevant to the SER. The outcome will be a SER prepared by the team in collaboration with all academic program and unit staff as well as stakeholders, and which is submitted to the Review Panel.

A staff member from LQS will provide support and guidance to the Internal Team on the development of the SER including the draft template provided at Appendix III, but it is the responsibility of the faculty/school to prepare the SER for submission to LQS to be provided to the Review Panel, prior to the review.

2.2 Consultation

A key part of developing the SER is consultation with relevant stakeholders. Consultation with stakeholders can take many forms, the team overseeing the review will determine an appropriate mechanism for this to occur. It is suggested that workshops, surveys or focus groups might be a useful starting point.

Stakeholders might include those who are most affected by the program and how they might be encouraged to take a lead in reflecting and commenting on the program and participating in the formulation of the SER through addressing the questions and matters included in the listed themes.

Stakeholders include:

- Students – prospective, current and graduates (alumni). Current students should include students from each year level and a mix of international and domestic students and where relevant, may also involve student associations and clubs;
- University teaching staff – teaching into the program or employing graduates as tutors, researchers, etc;
- Staff with teaching expertise and knowledge of the latest trends, technologies and analytics;
- Discipline representatives – as exemplified by Discipline leaders and those who set threshold standards;
- Employers – including (but not limited to) those in the related professions and professional accrediting bodies as well as employers such as the government and other agencies providing placements for students;
- Alumni and community members;
- Policy-makers – including all tiers of government;
- Researchers – in the Discipline and related fields;
- Teachers in the secondary sector - preparing students for University entry;
- Recruitment staff – those recruiting prospective students.

2.3 Data sets to facilitate consultation

Consultation can be informed by a range of analytics and LQS will provide a range of standard reports providing strategic information and analytics as follows:

Statistics

- Comparisons Go8 and SA Universities
- Faculty Performance Reports
- Program Performance Reports
- SELT Expectation Standards
- Aggregated SELT Reports

Strategic Information

- University of Adelaide Top Level Organisational Structure
- University of Adelaide Strategic Plan
- Faculty Operational Plan 20xx-20xx
- Faculty Business Plan 20xx-20xx
- Faculty Internationalisation Strategy 20xx-20xx
- Dornwell Gender Equity Framework
- University of Adelaide Budget Model
- Program Structure Standard Requirements

Data sets should include information provided through Learning Enhancement and Innovation (LEI) (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning-enhancement-innovation/>) which is able to provide learning and teaching data as follows over the page:

Name	Link
Canvas learning and analytics	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/Learning_Analytics_Pathways_-_V5.pdf
Learning management system (LMS) analytics	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/LMS-Analytics/
Data source and tools	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/data-source-tools/
Reports	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/reports/
Academics	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/academics/
Learners	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/learning-analytics/learners/

Planning & Analytics (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/>) provide the following reports available to staff with a University log-in:

Name	If Acronym is employed	Link
Faculty Performance Reports		https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/staff-only/plans-reports/current-plans-reports.html
Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching surveys	QILT surveys	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/ags/
Student experience of learning & teaching surveys	SELT surveys	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/selt/
Rankings		https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/rankings/

LEI and P&A

Learning Enhancement & Innovation, and Planning & Analytics provide data as requested.

The Internal Team is, however, also able to draw on relevant program data that is available and collect and collate its own data as part of the process.

2.4 Responsibilities

Faculty

The Executive Dean is responsible for ensuring that all staff relevant to the Program and its management are informed of the impending review and are consulted on the formulation of the TOR for the review – which may include TOR that are additional to the generic set. All staff should also be provided with the opportunity to provide feedback about the nomination of potential Review Panel members. The finalised TOR are submitted to the PVCSL for approval.

The Executive Dean in consultation with the relevant HOS and/or ADLT is responsible for appointing and resourcing the Internal Team and ensuring that the SER is completed and submitted as per the the review timeline – see Guidance Note #4 *Review Timelines*.

Coordinators

Program Coordinators are to serve as chair of the internal team producing the SER.

Course Coordinators are required to participate in the consultative processes to provide input to the SER.

Internal Team members

Internal team members are responsible for the development of the SER and are involved in the consultative processes and communicating with stakeholders to obtain their views and to reflect on their feedback, as well as discussing the proposals that result. They are responsible for providing constructive feedback as the SER is developed and finalised.

Staff

Both academic and professional staff are encouraged to highlight good practice, raise issues and opportunities and contribute to the SER as it is developed.

Students

Students are key stakeholders and will be canvassed for their views on the program under review and improvements that might be made. A variety of mechanisms may be employed in the consultation including (but not limited to) providing advice through the Program Management Committee, surveys and the SELT-related annual student forum.

2.5 Briefing Paper

LQS provides support and guidance as required to the SER team. It also prepares a Briefing paper which accompanies the SER and is submitted to the Review panel at least one month before their visit.

2.6 Timelines

See Guidance Note #4 [Timelines for Reviews](#) for information on the timelines.

3. Themes to be considered in the SER

A series of themes have been summarised to be considered in the development of the SER.

3.1 Theme 1 – Implementation Plan progress

Previous Implementation Plan

Matters to be addressed might include:

- How have programs progressed since the last Review (Program or Unit)? What were the barriers if the Implementation Plan was not completed?
- Which recommendations have worked or not worked?
- Has the Implementation Plan been completed?
- Is it the intention to build upon the Implementation Plan or to set a new direction?

3.2 Theme 2 – Programs

A key consideration is the quality, relevance and currency of programs (and their curriculum) and their sustainability tested against the highest discipline standards to which the program might aspire.

Program quality matters to be considered include:

- Are programs academically coherent in terms of their structure, content and accretion of knowledge and skills? (e.g. Undergraduate Curriculum Structures) [CAPP Procedure 1a, Schedule A]
- How do the programs comply with the University's curriculum frameworks? (e.g. Undergraduate Curriculum Structures; current University strategic and implementation plans) [Coursework academic programs policy (CAPP) principle 6]
- If the program has a non-standard structure has this benefitted or hindered the program's success? Explain how and why.
- How are programs meeting the University's Graduate Attributes? [CAPP Procedure 1a; Schedule A]
- Are Program Learning Outcomes appropriate and achievable? How are these assessed? [CAPP Policy principle 3, 4; Procedure 1a; Schedule A]
- How strong is the focus on research-training and how many students proceed to a higher degree by research [HDR] enrolment? (e.g. Program Performance reports, HDR completions and graduations, QILT surveys)

The reflection should include the steps that might be taken to improve the quality, relevance and currency of the programs.

3.3 Theme 3 – Inclusion and Diversity

The Self-Evaluation Report should include an assessment of diversity and inclusion in the programs.

Questions to be answered might include:

- How does the curriculum address inclusion and diversity (e.g. curriculum internationalisation, opportunities to engage with Indigenous knowledges, methodologies and pedagogies)? [A 21st Century Education for a Growing Community of Learners Pillar Plan, Future Making]
- How does the Program Management Committee consider inclusion and diversity in curriculum and pedagogical enhancements?
- How does the Program Coordinator and teaching staff promote the principles of inclusion and diversity in the programs?
- What is the diversity profile of the student cohort?
- What are the entry pathways for the programs, and do these allow for flexibility entry points? [A 21st Century Education for a Growing Community of Learners Pillar Plan, Future Making]
- How are students supported in the context of diversity and inclusion? [A 21st Century Education for a Growing Community of Learners Pillar Plan, Future Making]

The reflection should include proposed solutions to address any issues that are identified.

3.4. Theme 4 – External influences and outcomes

The Self-Evaluation Report should include an assessment of external influences and outcomes in the programs.

Industry engagement

Questions to be answered might include:

- How does engagement with employers occur, and how does this engagement shape curriculum design?
- Are there opportunities for students to participate in industry and networking events?
- Are there opportunities for industry to be involved in the delivery of the program e.g. providing guest lectures?

Employment/graduate outcomes

Matters to be considered might include:

- Are students being prepared for employment and offered opportunities for work integrated learning (WIL) and external placements? If not, why not? How do you assess this preparation?
- Are programs meeting the needs of potential employers? (e.g. QILT surveys, Program Management Committees, external accreditation reports).
- What evidence is there of positive graduate employment outcomes? (e.g. QILT surveys)
- Is there opportunity to develop a Professional Honours year? [A 21st Century Education for a Growing Community of Learners Pillar Plan, Future Making]

External review

Questions to be answered might include:

- How did the program perform when it was reviewed by the external agencies accrediting programs for professional practice (largely Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, Engineering, Teaching, and Architecture)?
- How does the program perform in comparison to equivalent programs at other institutions?
- How does the program perform in benchmarking with equivalent programs elsewhere? (e.g. QILT surveys)

3.5. Theme 5 – Sustainability

Program performance

Matters to be addressed might include:

- How are programs tracking against internal and key external quality indicators (e.g. Program Performance reports, Quality indicators for learning and teaching (QILT) surveys and SELT)?
- Are there sufficient enrolments to ensure program viability? (e.g. Program Performance Reports). Have you a minimum number of enrolments in mind for a program to be viable?
- Are enrolments, retention and completions increasing and attrition dropping? (e.g. Program Performance Reports)
- Is there direct competition which is affecting a program and are there lessons to be learned from them? (e.g. benchmarking similar programs in South Australia, nationally and internationally)
- Is the program sufficiently differentiated from other internal and external programs to position itself in the market? (e.g. benchmarking similar programs internally and in South Australia, nationally and internationally). How is it differentiated? Is differentiation significant and do students and external stakeholders understand the differences?

3.6. Theme 6 – Best practice and successes

Recognising and rewarding best practice

Matters to be addressed might include:

- What does the faculty/school recognise as exemplars of best practice in the design and delivery of programs?
- What does the faculty/school recognise as valuable outcomes for their programs?
- Are there Discipline norms where the program is a national/international leader?

Acknowledging successful outcomes

Questions to be answered might include:

- How are successful program outcomes recognised?

- How are successful program outcomes rewarded?
- How are successful program outcomes disseminated to the University?
- How are successful program outcomes shared with the national/international community?
- How many staff teaching into the program are members of the Adelaide Education Academy?
- Is there a community of practice in which staff teaching in the program participate?

3.7. Theme 7 – Program governance and management

Program management

Program management matters to be reviewed might include:

- The role of the Program Coordinator and the opportunities and challenges they address in the fulfilment of their responsibilities. [CAPP Schedule E]
- The effectiveness of the Program Management Committee in addressing the attributes listed under Theme 1 (e.g. program coherence, mapping Program Learning Outcomes, meeting Graduate Attributes, compliance with University curriculum structures). [CAPP Schedule D]
- The ways in which the Program Management Committee communicates with its stakeholders (e.g. staff, students, employers, accreditation bodies). [CAPP Schedule D]
- The role of the Program Management Committee in updating program material including to prospective and current students. [CAPP Schedule D]
- The outcomes of Program SELT (including the aggregated course data, the annual student forum and the SELT questions) and the Program Management Committee's response to the feedback. [SELT Policy Procedure 1b, Procedure 9].

The reflection should include proposed solutions to address any issues that are identified.

In taking a 'students as partners' approach, matters to be addressed might include:

- How are students encouraged to 'engage' with the program? Explain whether this has been successful and the reasons for the success or lack thereof.
- How strong is the student voice and what opportunities are there for students to provide feedback and to be involved in the ongoing program development as partners? [CAPP Procedure 3b, Schedule D, SELT policy - Policy principle 1, 6; Procedure 1, 9]

The reflection should include how student involvement was assessed and what initiatives might be taken to involve students more directly in their learning and teaching.

Enhancement activities

Identify program enhancement activities that are already taking place and how they are contributing to the performance of the program. The activities might have been introduced as a response of staff actions, advice from LEI or as a consequence of University/faculty/school initiatives. They might also provide the basis for proposing further developments.

3.8. Theme 8 – Opportunities to be considered

Curriculum renewal

Matters to be addressed might include:

- Are there opportunities to innovate and respond to emerging discipline trends and to take account of evolving pedagogy? (e.g. benchmarking similar programs in South Australia, nationally and internationally; taking account of national threshold learning outcomes)
- What will a graduate of a program need to equip themselves for the future?
- Are there ways to enhance current structures that may be inhibiting the delivery of programs?

Delivery

Matters to be addressed might include:

- Are there complementary modes of delivery which might supplement the University's commitment to face-to-face teaching? (e.g. Blended learning).
- What are the learning analytics demonstrating?
- Whether advice and support has been sought from LEI?

3.9. Theme 9 – Resources and support

Notwithstanding that the provision of additional resources is at the discretion of the University, consider whether there are human, physical and financial resources that might be re-organised or increased to deliver high quality academic programs.

A case might be made:

- as a result of benchmarking with equivalent institutions;
- for building upon existing strengths to generate growth;
- for developing new initiatives and projects in emerging disciplines;
- for commercialising activities.

Questions might include:

- Does the current structure suit the delivery of the program?
- Is the most effective use being made of resources in delivering the program? How can changes/amendments be made to the program within current resources?
- Are there emerging disciplines, modes of delivery and expectations that should be addressed?

4. Completion of the SER

The questions raised in the themes listed, are intended to be conversation starters and provide a basis upon which the operations of programs may be enhanced for the future. It is recognised that the current environment is dynamic and that the University has to position itself to respond to emerging trends and opportunities for growth and development in the learning, teaching and also research fronts.

It is intended that the reflection process will result in a Report that is informed by the recent past but is clearly one which is forward-looking. It should propose strategic objectives (with related actions) for the future, clearly delineating where the expert advice of the Review Panel would be welcomed.

The Review Panel is expected to take an evidence-based approach, and it is anticipated that some of the evidence will be provided in the SER, with the inclusion of performance data as listed in section 2.3 above or as tailored to the Program as required by either P&A or by Program staff. Information on the range of consultations and the methods employed as well as the outcomes should also be included (e.g. focus groups, surveys and Program Management Committee meetings).

A draft template is provided at Appendix III for the SER. Please note that the template is provided for guidance only and it may be adapted as required. Again, the template will be updated as an iterative process, through feedback from users, as the new review processes are implemented. The template

as provided takes a themes-based approach, but areas may, if preferred, draft their report in the sequence of the TOR.

5. Resources

5.1. Policies

A range of policies inform program and governance issues, these include:

Name	If Acronym is employed	Link
Assessment for coursework programs policy		https://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/700/
Coursework academic programs policy	CAPP	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/669/
Student experience of learning & teaching policy	SELT policy	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/policies/101/

5.2. University frameworks

- Digital capabilities framework (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/library/digital-capabilities/staff/>)
- Dornwell Framework (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/gender-equity-diversity/dornwell/>)
- A series of University frameworks and strategies are being developed which will inform the reviews processes for the future, including:
 - Graduate employability framework
 - Students as partners framework
 - Digital education strategy
 - Learning analytics project
 Additional detail will be provided as the projects are finalised.
- There is also a project devoted to the peer review of teaching which includes the Peer Assisted Reflection & Development Program (PARD-P) which might impact on programs/curriculum and staffing resources and enhancements. Details on the PARD-P are available at: <https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/teaching/peer-review/reflection-development/>

5.3. External resources

Name	If Acronym is employed	Link
Australian qualifications framework	AQF	https://www.aqf.edu.au/
Higher Education standards framework	HESF	https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2015L01639
Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching	QILT	https://www.qilt.edu.au/
Tertiary Education Quality Standards agency	TEQSA	https://www.teqsa.gov.au/

6. Acronyms cited in these Guidelines

Acronym	Meaning		Acronym	Meaning
ADLT	Associate Dean Learning & Teaching		PIRI	The University's Quality assurance planning and budgeting, implementation, review and improvement cycle
AQF	Australian qualifications framework		PVCSL	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Learning)
CAPP	Coursework academic programs policy		QILT	Quality indicators for learning and teaching
HDR	Higher degree by research [student]		SELT	Student experience of learning & teaching
HESF	Higher Education standards framework		SER	Self-evaluation report
LEI	Learning Enhancement and Innovation		TEQSA	Tertiary Education Quality Standards agency
LMS	Learning management system		TOR	Terms of reference
LQS	Learning & Quality support		UG	undergraduate
P&A	Planning & Analytics		WIL	Work integrated learning
PARD-P	Peer assisted reflection & development program			
PG	postgraduate			

Appendix I – The framework for the development of the self-evaluation process

Recommendations 9, 10 and 11 established the broad framework for the development of the self-evaluation process, as follows:

REVIEW STAGE 1 - SELF-EVALUATION

Recommendation 9

That a self-evaluation process be launched no less than six months prior to the Review Panel's visit, and that this be supported through partnership with central University services including LQS and based on Guidelines to be developed by LQS in consultation with stakeholders. A self-evaluation report will be prepared by the team and submitted to the Review Panel.*

* Please note that as the Review Panel has to be provided with the SER a month before the visit a seven month timeline is preferred operationally.

Recommendation 10

That consultation with student, employer and alumni stakeholder groups is undertaken as a requirement of the self-evaluation process. This engagement should include, as a minimum:

- *students from all year levels including international and domestic students, and engagement with relevant student associations and clubs;*
- *relevant employer groups, professional organisations and research partners;*
- *alumni and community members.*

Recommendation 11

That a Briefing Paper is prepared for the Panel by LQS in consultation with the following staff:

Academic Program reviews: PVC(SL), Executive Dean, Head of School, Program Coordinator

Academic Unit reviews: PVC(SL), Executive Dean, Head of School

*The Briefing Paper, **together with the self-evaluation report**, will be provided to the Review Panel at least one month prior to the Panel's visit, with the expectation that the Panel will have formed a broad understanding of the context and themes of the review prior to its meetings with the areas under review.¹*

The Guidelines reference the imperatives required in Recommendation 10 but also recognise examples of internal and external best practice. It is also recognised that the management of programs differs across the University with some being the preserve of faculties and others overseen by schools or departments or disciplines. In these Guidelines 'faculty' and 'school' are used inter-changeably and also encompass the departments and disciplines where appropriate. While programs are generally referred to in the singular it is recognised that multiple programs may be under review especially with Double and concurrent degrees, nested awards, and the inclusion of Honours programs.

¹ Final Report of the Review the Purposes, Principles and Processes that support the Review of Academic Programs and Academic Units, pages 12-13.

Appendix II – The generic TOR for a program review

Many of the criteria which are listed in the generic TOR are dependent on the program attributes recorded in the Coursework Academic Programs policy (CAPP) and its Schedules.

Approval has been received for the generic TOR governing Program Reviews² and is included in the following pages. It should be noted that it may be modified as required to fit the circumstances that prevail or to focus on the issues that require consideration.

² Final Report of the Review the Purposes, Principles and Processes that support the Review of Academic Programs and Academic Units, Recommendation 5, Appendix A.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

REVIEW OF THE (INSERT DETAILS OF THE PROGRAM) OFFERED BY THE FACULTY OF (INSERT DETAILS OF THE FACULTY)

The Faculty of (INSERT DETAILS OF THE FACULTY) offers the following programs:

- (INSERT DETAILS OF THE PROGRAM)
- (INSERT DETAILS OF THE PROGRAM)

The Review is conducted within the University's five-year Program Review cycle. The Review will take into account the views of all relevant internal stakeholder groups, including students, staff and other relevant academic areas of the University, and of all relevant external stakeholder groups including employers, alumni and representatives of relevant professions.

Both the Faculty Self-Evaluation process and report, and the Review Panel assessment, should address the Aims of Program Reviews which are as follows:

- To evaluate the quality of the curriculum and its delivery in UG and PG coursework programs in relation to the expectations set out in relevant University strategies and the University's Graduate Attributes, national and international trends in the discipline(s) and, where relevant, accreditation by professional statutory and regulatory bodies;
- To evaluate the quality of program governance, management and enhancement processes, including approaches to working with students as partners and to external engagement;
- To assess the program's progress since the previous review, with reference to the outcomes of the implementation plan in response to the recommendations of that review;
- To identify and give recognition to best practice and successful outcomes;
- To identify opportunities and priorities for development and enhancement, including for curriculum renewal and enhancement of delivery, and with a focus on student recruitment, experience, engagement, satisfaction, retention, academic performance, graduate destinations and employer satisfaction;
- To identify areas where resources and support might be needed to enable enhancement priorities to be addressed;
- To ensure that a high standard of academic program awards is maintained.

The Review Panel is asked to assess the Faculty's self-evaluation and its enhancement proposals for the program(s) under review, and make evidence-based recommendations. The following areas of consideration are in scope of the Review Panel's assessment of the quality of the program(s) and of the enhancement proposals:

1. Overall coherence of the program and alignment of program learning outcomes with the University's Graduate Attributes;
2. Curriculum currency and relevance in light of discipline trends and to enable positive graduate outcomes;
3. Opportunities for enhancement of student engagement and success through development and innovation in learning and teaching, and of academic aspects of student orientation and continued transition support especially in the first year;
4. Performance against internal targets and benchmarked indicators relating to student satisfaction, retention and progression, and to graduate employment destinations and graduate employer satisfaction;
5. Faculty/school governance and management of the program(s) and the extent to which these ensure:
 - that the structure, content, quality and overall coherence of the program(s) and its courses are developed, evaluated and enhanced;
 - inclusive and systematic participation and input from all relevant stakeholder groups including internal specialist services, students, alumni and employers;
6. Future demand and growth opportunities for the program (based on available evidence and in relation to domestic and international markets);
7. Adequacy and transparency of information provided to prospective students and students, and effectiveness of communications with students;
8. The use of human, physical and financial resources in delivering the program, noting that decisions on the provision of additional resources remain at the University's discretion.

Appendix III: SER template

The template found on subsequent pages is provided as an example – it is not mandatory, but may inform the development of the SER:



Academic Program Review Self-evaluation Report to Review Panel

Review of the (name of review)

Sign off:

Program Coordinator (Insert of program coordinator)

Additional endorsements may be provided (as appropriate) by:

Discipline/s (Insert Name of Discipline)

Department/s (Insert Name of Department)

School/s (Insert Name of School)

Faculty/s (Insert Name of Faculty)

Programs included in this Self-evaluation Report:

(list programs in full)

Please note:

This document is intended as a general guide when completing the Self-evaluation Report. All sections may not be applicable, and likewise there may be special considerations that should be addressed that are not included. Please add or delete topic areas as necessary to conform to the needs of your SER.

I/we commend the following Self-evaluation Report to the Review Panel for consideration:

Program Coordinator/s: Date

Additional endorsements may be provided (as appropriate) by:

Head of School/s: Date

Executive Dean/s: Date

1. Introduction/overview/executive summary

Please summarise your findings and the proposals arising from the reflection process.

2. Self-evaluation process

Provide background on how the SER was developed, describing the process undertaken including the range of consultations.

3. Theme 1: Implementation plan progress

See section 3.1 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

4. Theme 2: Programs

See section 3.2 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

5. Theme 3: Inclusion and Diversity

See section 3.3 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

6. Theme 4: External influences and outcomes

See section 3.4 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

7. Theme 5: Sustainability

See section 3.5 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

8. Theme 6: Best practice and successes

See section 3.6 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

9. Theme 7: Program governance and management

See section 3.7 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

10. Theme 8: Opportunities to be considered

See section 3.8 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

11. Theme 9: Resources

See section 3.9 above (Guidelines).

See TOR for a Program review (Appendix II)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 5 above (Guidelines).

12. Outcomes/Looking forward

See section 4 above (Guidelines).

If not specified in each of the sections 3-10 (Self-evaluation Report) provide the outcomes of the deliberations as well as a realistic appraisal of how the strategies/proposals/enhancements will impact on the Program under review in the current University climate.

Specify where you would welcome the advice of the expert Review Panel and the kind of advice you require.

113. Appendices (if required)

Provide appendices if required of evidence to the Review Panel to support the outcomes (if not already included in sections 3-11 of the Self-evaluation Report).