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Reviews Policy

1 Objective

The University of Tasmania (the University) Quality Management Framework links strategic direction setting, planning and quality; it is aligned with the budgeting and risk management systems. The University’s approach to quality management is grounded in the philosophy and practice of continuous improvement.

The Reviews Policy outlines the University’s approach to ensuring a robust, efficient and effective system for the management and implementation of reviews. Reviews have a dual purpose in the assurance of quality and as an essential mechanism for quality enhancement.

2 Scope

This policy applies to all organisational units, all staff and all functions of the University. Over time, all elements of the University should be subject to review.

The policy excludes matters associated with appointment, probation, promotion and performance management of individual staff, although the policies and practices related to these matters are within scope.

3 Policy Provisions

3.1 Continuous improvement is a key element of quality management at the University of Tasmania. The underlying approach to achieving continuous improvement is to deploy the five-stage OADRI Cycle:

- Setting the objectives
- Planning the approach to achieving the objectives
- Deploying the approach
- Systematically monitoring and evaluating the results
- Undertaking improvements based on the evaluation

3.1 A systematic approach to monitoring performance, evaluating outcomes and recommending and implementing improvements is therefore central to quality management and continuous improvement. Reviews are a key mechanism for this purpose.

In addition, the University is subject to many forms of external review and audit process, for example those initiated by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency and by professional accreditation bodies.

3.2 Reviews must be purposeful. They must have the potential to lead to meaningful and worthwhile change; where change is not an outcome, they must provide assurance that University practice is appropriate and change unnecessary.
3.3 Initiation of a review must follow a specific trigger, such as:

- Identification of risk, strategic need/opportunity, concern about performance on the basis of regular performance monitoring, benchmarking, previous reviews or other evidence
- Major organisational or external environmental change, posing risks or creating opportunities
- An external professional accreditation or audit exercise becomes due
- A cyclic review becomes due, although reliance on cyclical reviews will be the exception and their use in specific situations will require explicit justification

3.4 Any element of University activity is potentially subject to review. Most commonly, reviews will focus on:

- Unit of study
- Major
- Course
- HDR program
- Research Group
- Academic Unit
- College
- Section
- Division
- Policy/procedure
- Process/theme (e.g. timetabling, graduations, web strategy, information and knowledge management)
- Committee (e.g. Council, Academic Senate, Quality Committee)
- Transnational education or other partnership
- Strategic direction

3.5 A variety of review mechanisms is available, depending on circumstances, for example:

- Panel review
- External consultancy
- Internal audit
- Professional accreditation

In many cases, reviews will be used in combination with other methodologies or sources of data such as a self-review, moderation exercise or survey, which may identify a risk, strategic need or performance concerns that trigger a panel review and/or provide evidence to be considered in such a review.

3.6 A review process must be:

- Evidence based
- Efficient (particularly in its use of staff time)
- Rigorous
- Transparent
- Objective
3.7 A review process must include:

- A statement of the scope and terms of reference (including reference to any specific trigger for the review and to any relevant goal or strategy)
- Defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage
- A specific but realistic timeframe
- Reference to relevant performance indicators or other data
- Reference to stakeholder data (e.g. students, staff, external)
- External stakeholder input where appropriate
- A timetable for all stages of the review
- Approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities

3.8 Consistent with the objective of continuous improvement, the requirement that reviews are purposeful and lead to meaningful outcomes and the provisions of the OADRI Cycle, it is essential that receipt of a report of a review process is followed by careful assessment of the conclusions and recommendations by the responsible body.

Typically, this will need to be followed by the preparation of an implementation plan.

Reviews typically mandate the submission of a follow-up report on implementation and outcomes within a defined timeframe.

Where reviews have been commissioned by Academic Senate or its sub-committees or Planning, Performance and Review Committee, the relevant body will subject the review report, implementation plans and follow-up reports to careful scrutiny. It will have the power to require further work or further explanation of those documents.

Commissioning bodies will maintain records of reviews commissioned, progress and outcomes achieved.

4 Responsibilities

4.1 Implementation of the Reviews Policy involves three key bodies working in partnership:

- Council has overall responsibility for the University’s strategic direction, academic and general reputation, financial viability and the maintenance of high standards of conduct and probity. Within its overall responsibility for quality management, Council has general oversight of review processes across the University. Through its Audit and Risk Committee, Council commissions the Internal Audit Program.

- Academic Senate is responsible for advising Council and the Vice-Chancellor on academic matters, including providing advice on means of achieving and maintaining excellence in academic activities. Sub-committees of Academic Senate therefore play an important role in overseeing reviews of academic matters.

- The Vice-Chancellor, supported by the Senior Management Team, is responsible to Council for the overall functioning and performance of the University. Senior management, specifically via Planning, Performance and
Review Committee, therefore has a central role to play in overseeing reviews of some types of phenomena.

The consequence of this partnership is that responsibility for commissioning and overseeing reviews is a shared function. In general:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
<th>Delegated to</th>
<th>Items (indicative only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Audit and Risk Committee</td>
<td>Internal Audits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Senate</td>
<td>University Teaching and Learning Committee, Research College Board, Board of Graduate Research, Faculty Teaching and Learning Committees</td>
<td>Academic matters including: units, majors, courses HDR program, research priorities, academic policies &amp; processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chancellor and Senior Management</td>
<td>Planning, Performance and Review Committee</td>
<td>Management/administrative matters including: Colleges, Academic Units, sections, non-academic elements of academic matters (e.g. Courses), non-academic policies &amp; processes, committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Senate sub-committees and Planning, Performance and Review Committee work closely together in planning, undertaking, reporting and following up on reviews. Each provides an annual report to Council, through Audit and Risk Committee, on their review programs and the associated outcomes.

Bodies such as Council and Academic Senate undertake periodic reviews of their own performance. Individual managers may undertake reviews of areas in their own portfolio, in consultation with Planning, Performance and Review Committee or the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee, as appropriate.

The relevant Executive Dean and Head of Academic Unit are normally responsible for overseeing professional accreditation reviews, in liaison with the Provost.

4.2 The Quality Committee is responsible for quality assuring the implementation of the Reviews Policy.

4.3 Overall operational responsibility for quality management lies with the Provost. Administration of Council’s internal audit program is the responsibility of the Manager of Risk Management and Audit Assurance, Division of the Chief Operating Officer.

5 Definitions and Acronyms

Organisational Unit

| College Faculty, School, Centre, University Institute, other University Entity, Division, Section or University Business Enterprise. |

6 Supporting Documentation
• Quality Management Policy
• Teaching and Learning Quality Assurance Manual [As updated/replaced]
• Benchmarking Policy
• Terms of Reference for Audit and Risk Committee, Academic Senate (and relevant committees) and Planning, Performance and Review Committee

7 Versioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Version(s)</th>
<th>Version 1 – Administrative Reviews Policy (approved by Council, 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Version</td>
<td>Version 3 – Reviews Policy, approved in April 2011, amended in December 2017 to update titles and reflect College nomenclature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>