



THE UNIVERSITY
of ADELAIDE

Guidelines for the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) for Academic Program Reviews

December 2022



Table of Contents

1. Purpose of the Guidelines	2
2. Overview	2
2.1. Key processes and terminology	2
2.2. Roles and responsibilities	4
2.3. Timelines	5
3. Self-evaluation	5
3.1. Stakeholder engagement	6
3.2. Sources of data	7
3.3. Guiding themes and questions	8
4. The Self-Evaluation Report	12
5. Resources	13
5.1. Policies	13
5.2. University strategies and frameworks	13
5.3. External resources	14
6. Acronyms cited in these guidelines	14
Appendix I – Standard Terms of Reference (program reviews)	15
Appendix II – SER template	18

1. Purpose of the Guidelines

These Guidelines are for University of Adelaide staff undertaking the self-evaluation that is an integral component of a University Academic Program Review. An outcome of the self-evaluation process is the **Self-Evaluation Report (SER)**, which is provided to the Review Panel (or independent reviewer/s in the case of a consolidated program review) for their feedback, advice and recommendations.

These Guidelines outline the purpose, roles and expectations of the self-evaluation process and provide examples of possible questions, themes, and resources to support the process, as well as a standard template for the final report.

The Guidelines include ideas as to how the faculty/school may choose to structure the SER. A “one size fits all” approach is antithetical to the intent of the reviews process, however. The Guidelines should be adapted as required by the circumstances prevailing in each faculty/school and in accordance with the approved Terms of Reference for the review.

The management of programs differs across the University with some being the preserve of faculties and others overseen by schools, departments, or disciplines. In these Guidelines ‘faculty’ and ‘school’ will be used inter-changeably and, where appropriate, will encompass relevant departments and disciplines. 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.

2. Overview

This section gives an overview of key terminology, processes, roles and responsibilities and timelines for academic program reviews, the self-evaluation component, and creation of the Self-Evaluation Report.

2.1. Key processes and terminology

Program Reviews

All coursework programs offered by the University of Adelaide are subject to review within a seven-year cycle in accordance with the [Program Review Process](#) and the [Coursework Academic Programs Policy \(CAPP\)](#).

Program reviews play a significant role in ensuring operational alignment with internal and external regulatory standards and frameworks, including any relevant professional accreditation standards, and support the University to meet its obligations with respect to Standard 5.3 of the [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021 \(HESF\)](#).

Importantly, reviews support and inform future decision making, including strategic direction, policies, and systems. Program reviews are specifically designed to support faculties, schools, and program staff to identify and address future prospects, acknowledge successful outcomes and identify enhancement opportunities.

Consolidated Program Review

In some circumstances a Consolidated Program Review may be approved by the PVC(SL). The Consolidated Program Review process aims to take advantage of potential resource and workload efficiencies, and where possible reduce the overall workload associated with program reviews by taking into account relevant contextual factors (such as small programs with low enrolments), or the overlapping documentation associated with other processes involving independent critical scrutiny of the program (such as successful professional accreditation or an approved major program revision).

Terms of Reference

The aim and scope of each program review is determined by its Terms of Reference (TOR). The standard TOR is provided at Appendix I. While the use of the standard TOR is recommended, with the approval of the PVC(SL) and in consultation with relevant staff, the Executive Dean may provide a modified or alternative TOR, adjusted as required to fit the circumstances that prevail or to focus on specific issues that require consideration.

Formative Self Evaluation Process

For each program review, an Internal Team of staff is appointed by the faculty Executive Dean to lead a process of self-evaluation. Ideally this process commences no less than seven months prior to the review date.

This period of self-evaluation allows staff of the program under review to reflect on past performance and future strategic goals. It should identify areas of good practice (internally and externally) along with areas for improvement, and outline evidence-informed, enhancement strategies and plans.

The concept of stakeholder participation permeates all aspects of the review process and consultation is a requirement of the self-evaluation process. The self-evaluation process relies on constructive dialogue with key stakeholders (including students, employers, alumni and the wider community) in conjunction with reflection on relevant institutional course and program data, national and international exemplars, standards and quality frameworks.

The Self Evaluation Report

An outcome of the self-evaluation process is the Self-Evaluation Report (SER). In preparing the report, the Internal Team is guided by the approved Terms of Reference for the review.

The SER should make reference to the self-evaluation process undertaken and relevant evidence, including:

- the Internal Team's consultation and collaboration with a range of internal and external stakeholders including staff, students, employers, alumni and other members of the wider community;
- benchmarked context;
- national and international exemplars, standards, and quality assurance frameworks;
- external accreditation documentation (if applicable);
- relevant institutional data.

The SER will identify areas of good practice (internally and externally) along with areas for improvement, and outline evidence-informed enhancement strategies and plans. An essential role of the SER is to explain the strategic aims of the program under review and to formulate actions and initiatives that will enable the goals to be met. The SER provides an opportunity for the Internal Team to directly provide evidence, discussion, and ideas to inform the Review Panel's considerations. The Review Panel aims to

formulate recommendations which support the school in addressing the issues raised, so the SER should clearly identify where the faculty/school is seeking the Review Panel's input.

The SER is included in the portfolio of evidence that Education Quality provides to the Review Panel to inform their review.

The SER submission deadline is provided by Education Quality. The faculty Executive Dean must endorse the SER prior to its submission by Education Quality to the Review Panel (or independent reviewer/s in the case of a consolidated review process).

Review Panel/Independent Reviewers

In the standard program review process, a five-member Review Panel is appointed to undertake the review; one of whom is an external academic.

In some circumstances, a consolidated program review process may have been approved by the PVC(SL). In that case, one or two independent reviewers are appointed to undertake the review: an external academic, typically a Professor from the same or similar area to the program(s) under review; and/or an internal academic with appropriate knowledge of the context and strategic direction of the University.

The completed SER is endorsed by the school and faculty before being submitted to the Review Panel for their feedback, advice and recommendations.

2.2. Roles and responsibilities

Faculty

The Executive Dean is responsible for ensuring that all staff relevant to the Program/s 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 standard 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 PVC(SL) for approval.

The Executive Dean in consultation with the relevant HOS and/or DDLT is responsible for appointing and resourcing the Internal Team and ensuring that the SER is completed and submitted as per the review timeline.

The Internal Team

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

Membership of the team will be widely published within the faculty/school, and listed on all documentation and correspondence relevant to the SER.

Internal Team members are responsible for the development of the SER and are involved in the consultative processes to communicate with stakeholders to obtain their views, reflect on their feedback, and discuss the proposals that result. The Internal Team members are responsible for providing constructive feedback as the SER is developed and finalised.

The outcome will be a SER prepared by the Internal Team in collaboration with a range of internal and external stakeholders.

Program Directors and Course Coordinators

Program Directors 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.

Staff

Both academic and professional staff should be 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 for the self-evaluation, including (but not limited to) providing advice through the Program Management Committee, surveys and the SELT-related annual student forum.

Education Quality

A staff member from Education Quality (EQ) will liaise with the Internal Team on the development of the SER to provide key data and evidence to inform the self-evaluation process. EQ provides guidance in developing the SER, including supply of the example reports and the standard template provided at Appendix II. It is the responsibility of the faculty/school to prepare the SER for submission to EQ, to be provided to the Review Panel, prior to the agreed deadline.

A staff member from EQ will also be the primary point of liaison with the Review Panel and may approach the Internal Team on behalf of the Review Panel to seek clarification or further information to support the review.

2.3. Timelines

The deadline for submission of the faculty endorsed SER is provided by Education Quality. See the [Timelines for Reviews resource](#) on the Reviews website for an overview of review timelines.

3. Self-evaluation

For each program review, an Internal Team of staff is appointed by the faculty Executive Dean to lead a process of self-evaluation, guided by the Terms of Reference. Ideally this process commences no less than seven months prior to the review date.

This period of self-evaluation allows staff of the program under review to reflect on past performance and future strategic goals. It should identify areas of good practice (internally and externally) along with areas for improvement, and outline evidence-informed enhancement strategies and plans.

The concept of stakeholder participation permeates all aspects of the review process and consultation is a requirement of the self-evaluation process. The self-evaluation process relies on constructive dialogue with key stakeholders (including students, employers, alumni and the wider community) in conjunction with reflection on a wide range of relevant institutional course and program data, national and international exemplars, standards and quality frameworks.

Consolidated review process

Where a consolidated review process has been approved on the basis of the program's recent external accreditation or approved major revision, the associated application and approval documentation form key data for the review. A 'gap analysis' should then be conducted by the Internal Team to identify the gaps between any review processes already undertaken and the requirements of the SER. Comparing the requirements of an external accreditation or a major revision submission with the TOR, for example, may identify those items not addressed that remain to be evaluated.

Where a consolidated program review process has been approved on the basis of low program enrolments, a complete SER is required. As discrete, "niche" programs, the evaluation process and report may not be as onerous to develop as for a large program or a larger suite of related programs.

3.1. Stakeholder engagement

A crucial element of the self-evaluation is to identify and engage with relevant stakeholders. Engagement can take many forms, and the Internal Team will determine appropriate mechanisms for this to occur.

At the start, the Internal Team should consider how stakeholders might be encouraged to reflect and comment on the program and actively participate in the formulation of the SER.

Stakeholders include those who are most affected by the program, along with those who influence the intent and success of the program. Stakeholders can include:

- Students – prospective and current. 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.

Data should be used to support this process. Stakeholders can provide insights into the trends, highlights and issues already identified by the Internal Team in reflecting on performance data. They can

add nuance to dynamic market, discipline or industry contexts, and provide feedback on innovations or proposals. They may identify new opportunities or directions to be considered, and flag emerging risks.

Stakeholders may be actively encouraged to address some of the questions, categories and themes listed below (Section 3.3), along with the review's Terms of Reference, to support the development of the SER.

Mechanisms for engagement can include, but are not limited to, workshops, roundtable discussions, focus groups, interviews or surveys.

3.2. Sources of data

Where available, EQ will provide a range of standard reports that provide strategic information and analytics, as follows:

Statistics

- Program Performance Reports (includes enrolment and retention data)
- Aggregated course SELT Reports
- Student Experience Survey as part of the national Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) surveys
- Graduate Outcome Survey as part of the national Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT) surveys
- Inclusion and Diversity data as prepared by Planning and Analytics

Strategic Information

- University of Adelaide Top Level Organisational Structure
- University of Adelaide Strategic Plan
- Dornwell Gender Equity Framework

Planning & Analytics (P&A) (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/>)

The following reports published by P&A are available to staff with a University log-in:

Name	If Acronym is employed	Link
Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching surveys	QILT surveys	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/surveys
Student experience of learning & teaching surveys	SELT surveys	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/surveys/selt
Rankings		https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/rankings
Data and Analytics applications		https://www.adelaide.edu.au/planning/data-analytics-applications

Planning & Analytics can provide data on request. The Internal Team is also able to collect and collate its own data from relevant dashboards or other sources.

MyUni course analytics

Selected course performance information may also be sought through MyUni course analytics (course coordinator access) as follows:

Name	Link
Learning management system (LMS) course analytics	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning-enhancement-innovation/our-services/learning-analytics/lms-analytics
LMS Detailed Course Report	https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning-enhancement-innovation/our-services/learning-analytics/detailed-course-report
MyUni Learning Centre - analytics	https://myuni.adelaide.edu.au/courses/24800/pages/analytics/

3.3. Guiding themes and questions

A series of summary themes have been identified that might be considered for the self-evaluation and in the development of the SER. Each theme may relate to one or several of the review's TOR requirements. (Indicative relationships to the standard TOR are included below.)

3.3.1. Theme 1 – Implementation Plan progress

See Standard TOR 1.4 (Appendix I)

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?

3.3.2. Theme 2 – Programs

See Standard TOR 2.1 - 2.4

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. With reference to relevant University policy, program quality matters to be considered include:

- Are programs academically coherent in terms of their structure, content and scaffolding of knowledge and skills?
[refer to the Coursework Academic Programs Policy (CAPP) Procedure 1a]
- How do the programs comply with the University's curriculum frameworks? (e.g. current University strategic and implementation plans, see section 5.2 below.) [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; Assessment for Coursework Programs Policy]
- How strong is the focus on research-training and how many students proceed to Higher Degree by Research (HDR) enrolment? (e.g. refer to 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.

3.3.3. Theme 3 – Inclusion and Diversity

See Standard TOR 2.2 - 2.4, 3.1 - 3.2

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)? [Refer to a 21st Century Education for a Growing Community of Learners Pillar Plan, Future Making]
- How are inclusion and diversity considered by the Program Director/ Program Management Committee when making curriculum and pedagogical enhancements?
- How do the Program Director 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.

3.3.4. Theme 4 – External Influences and Outcomes

External review

See Standard TOR 2.1 - 2.4

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)

Employment/graduate outcomes

See Standard TOR 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2

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).
- How does the engagement with employers occur?
- What evidence is there of positive graduate employment outcomes? (e.g. QILT surveys)

3.3.5. Theme 5 – Sustainability

See Standard TOR 2.1, 2.2, 3.2

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?

3.3.6. Theme 6 – Best Practice and Successes

See Standard TOR 1.1

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?

3.3.7. Theme 7 – Program Governance and Management

See Standard TOR 3.1 - 3.2

Program management

Program management matters to be reviewed might include:

- The role of the Program Director and the opportunities and challenges they address in the fulfilment of their responsibilities.
[Refer to CAPP Schedule D]
- 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 Director communicates with its stakeholders (e.g. staff, students, employers, accreditation bodies).
[CAPP Schedule D]
- The role of the Program Director 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 Director'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 1a xii, 3e, 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.

3.3.8. Theme 8 – Opportunities to be considered

See Standard TOR 1.2 - 1.3

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?

3.3.9. Theme 9 – Resources and Support

See Standard TOR 4.1

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. The Self-Evaluation Report

The themes and questions raised above are intended as conversation starters from which to examine how the future operations of programs may be enhanced. 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.

The SER will identify areas of good practice (internally and externally) along with areas for improvement, and outline evidence-informed enhancement strategies and plans. An essential role of the SER is to explain the strategic aims of the program under review and to formulate actions and initiatives that will enable the goals to be met.

The reflection process is intended to support the development of a report that is informed by the recent past but which is clearly forward-looking. The report should propose strategic objectives (with related actions) for the future, clearly delineating where the expert advice of the Reviewer/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 they draw in will be provided in the SER, with the inclusion of standard performance data sets 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 in the report (e.g. focus groups, surveys and Program Management Committee meetings).

Where a consolidated review process has been approved on the basis of the program's recent external accreditation or approved major revision, the associated application and approval documentation form key data for the review and should expect to be referred to in the report.

A draft template is provided at Appendix II 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 strategies and frameworks

- Strategic Plan – Future Making 2022-2023 (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/vco/strategic-plan>)
- Five Pillars to excellence – Pillar Plans (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/vco/strategic-plan/pillar-plans>)
- Digital capabilities framework (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning-enhancement-innovation/projects-and-initiatives/digital-capabilities>)
- Dornwell Framework (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/hr/organisational-development/diversity-and-inclusion/gender-equity/dornwell-framework>)
- Graduate Employability Framework (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/strategic-projects/student-employability>)
- Student Partnerships Values (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/strategic-projects/student-partnerships>)
- Student Retention and Success (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/strategic-projects/student-retention-and-success>)
- Assessment and Feedback Strategy (<https://www.adelaide.edu.au/learning/strategic-projects/assessment-and-feedback-strategy-project>)
- A series of University frameworks and strategies are being developed which will inform the reviews processes for the future, including:
 - o Digital education strategy

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 (2021)	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
AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework	P&A	Planning & Analytics
CAPP	Coursework Academic Programs Policy	PARD-P	Peer assisted reflection & development program
DDLT	Deputy Dean (Learning & Teaching)	PG	Postgraduate
EQ	Education Quality	PVC(SL)	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Student Learning)
HDR	Higher degree by research [student]	QILT	Quality indicators for learning and teaching
HESF	Higher Education Standards Framework	SELT	Student experience of learning & teaching
HOS	Head of School	SER	Self-evaluation report
LEI	Learning Enhancement and Innovation	TEQSA	Tertiary Education Quality Standards agency
LMS	Learning management system	TOR	Terms of reference

Appendix I – Standard Terms of Reference (program reviews)

The standard TOR is derived from the recommendations of the 2018 *Final Report of the Review the Purposes, Principles and Processes that support the Review of Academic Programs and Academic Units*. The TOR reflect the criteria and program attributes identified in the University's [Coursework Academic Programs Policy \(CAPP\)](#) and its Schedules, and align with the relevant standards of the [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021 \(HESF\)](#).

While the use of standard TOR is recommended, with the approval of the PVC(SL), the Executive Dean may provide a modified or alternative TOR, adjusted as necessary to fit the circumstances that prevail or to focus on specific issues that require consideration.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

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

The programs to be considered under the Review are:

Undergraduate

- (INSERT DETAILS OF THE PROGRAM)

Postgraduate

- (INSERT DETAILS OF THE PROGRAM)

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

The Faculty Self-Evaluation process and report should address the aims of the review outlined below.

The Review Panel is asked to assess the Faculty's self-evaluation report and its enhancement proposals for the program(s) under review and make evidence-based recommendations that address the review aims.

The aims of the program review are as follows:

1. General

- 1.1. To identify and acknowledge best practice and successful outcomes.
- 1.2. To examine future demand and growth opportunities for the programs (based on available evidence and in relation to domestic and international markets).
- 1.3. To identify opportunities and priorities for development and enhancement, including for curriculum renewal and enhancement of delivery, with a focus on student recruitment, experience, engagement, satisfaction, retention, academic performance, graduate destinations and employer satisfaction.
- 1.4. To assess progress since the previous review (if applicable) with reference to the outcomes of the implementation plan for the recommendations of that review.

2. Curriculum Quality and Student Experience

- 2.1. To evaluate the design, content, quality and overall coherence of the program curriculum, including expected learning outcomes, methods of assessment, structure, and modes of delivery (HESF 1.4, 3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.4), in relation to:
 - relevant University strategies and policies;
 - the [Australian Qualification Framework](#);
 - the University's [Graduate Attributes](#);
 - accreditation by professional statutory and regulatory bodies, where applicable;
 - national and international discipline trends;
 - the changing needs of stakeholders, including students, community and employers/industry;
 - any identified risks to the quality of the program;
 - the Program Learning Outcomes;
 - the appropriateness and effectiveness of teaching methods and methodologies to deliver the aims and objectives of the program;
 - students' achievement of learning outcomes;
 - graduate outcomes and employer satisfaction; and
 - external referencing of performance and outcomes against comparable programs.
- 2.2. To identify opportunities for enhancement of student engagement and success, considering:
 - development and innovation in learning and teaching;
 - academic aspects of student orientation (HESF 1.3);
 - continued transition and progression support, especially in the first year (HESF 1.3; 3.3.4);

- the adequacy and transparency of information provided to prospective students and current students, and effectiveness of communications with students (HESF 7.2); and
- performance against internal targets and benchmarked indicators relating to student satisfaction, equity, diversity, retention and progression, and to graduate employment destinations and graduate employer satisfaction (HESF 5.3.4).

2.3. To assess the coherence and quality of Service Teaching provision into the program(s).

2.4. To ensure the efficacy of pathways articulating into the program (HESF 5.4).

3. Governance

3.1. To evaluate the quality of program governance, management, and enhancement processes, including approaches to working with students as partners and to external engagement (HESF 5.3.4, 5.3.5, 5.3.7).

3.2. To consider Faculty/School governance and management of the program(s) (HESF 5.3.7) 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; and
- inclusive and systematic participation and input from all relevant stakeholder groups, including internal specialist services, students, alumni and employers.

4. Resources

4.1. To consider the use of human, physical and financial resources in delivering the program and identify areas where resources and support might be needed to optimise future performance and enable enhancement priorities to be addressed, noting that decisions on the provision of additional resources remain at the University's discretion (HESF 3.3).

* The Terms of Reference refer to the relevant Domains in the [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021 \(HESF\)](#).

Appendix II – 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:

School (Insert Name of School)

Faculty (Insert Name of Faculty)

[Please delete this note before submitting: Note this template is intended as a general guide to 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:

Head of School: Date

Executive Dean: Date

1. Introduction/overview/executive summary

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

2. Self-evaluation process

Provide background on how the SER was developed, describing the process undertaken, the range of conversations and consultations, and other sources of evidence gathered. In the case of a consolidated review, for example, relevant data may include existing documentation such as a recent external accreditation application or approved major revision.

3. Theme 1: Implementation Plan progress

See section 3.3.1 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Guiding themes) and section 5 (Resources) above.

4. Theme 2: Programs

See section 3.3.2 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

5. Theme 3: Inclusion and Diversity

See section 3.3.3 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

6. Theme 4: External Influences and Outcomes

See section 3.3.4 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

7. Theme 5: Sustainability

See section 3.3.5 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

8. Theme 6: Best Practice and Successes

See section 3.3.6 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

9. Theme 7: Program Governance and Management

See section 3.3.7 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

10. Theme 8: Opportunities to be considered

See section 3.3.8 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

11. Theme 9: Resources and Support

See section 3.3.9 above (Guiding themes).

See Program Review TOR (Appendix I)

Include evidence as relevant, see section 3.2 (Sources of data) and section 5 (Resources) above.

12. Outcomes/Looking forward

See section 4 above (Guiding themes).

If not specified in each of the sections 3-1 (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 Unit 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.

13. 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).

Where a consolidated review process has been approved on the basis of the program's recent external accreditation or approved major revision, the associated application and approval documentation should be provided as appendices and cross-referenced in this report.