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1. Executive Summary

These Guidelines support the implementation of the Course Review Procedure.

2. More information

For further information, contact the Student Evaluation, Review and Reporting Unit (SERRU), in the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Education).

3. Annual Course Evaluation Report Guidelines

All coursework courses will be reviewed annually through an online Course Evaluation Report. The Course Evaluation Report database is on the SERRU website, under Course and Unit Evaluation.

An annual Course Evaluation Report will be submitted by Course/Major/Discipline Coordinators by March of the following year. These Course Evaluation Reports will be submitted to the Learning & Teaching Evaluation Sub-Committee of ULTC for consideration and assessment. Refer to the Unit and Course Evaluation Report Procedure.

4. Targeted Course Review Recommendation Guideline

This template is to be used by all organisational units when submitting recommendations to an Academic Senate sub-committee for a targeted course review.

The completed template is to be submitted to the Academic Senate sub-committee by the Head of organisational unit/s. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the recommendation. A full targeted course review proposal, including implementation and follow-up plans, should only be submitted following a written directive from the sub-committee.

The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Course Review Procedure should be referred during the completion of this template. Any queries should be directed to the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).

The targeted course review recommendation should include:

<p>| The title of the proposed review |  |
| Date of this application |  |
| Name(s) and contact details of Head of organisational unit/s |  |
| What organisational units will be involved in the review? |  |
| What course elements does this review target? |  |
| What is the rationale for the review? Include a risk assessment of the issues that will be addressed in the review taking into account the UTAS Risk Management: Principle; Policy; Framework; Toolkit; and Matrix. Attach additional documentation as necessary. |  |
| What methodology(ies) are recommended for the review? |  |
| What is the estimated duration of the review in |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>weeks?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the estimated resources required for the review, including funding and staff time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the expected outcomes from the review?</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. 4. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there any other information you would like to submit to the sub-committee?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List any attachments to this review recommendation.</td>
<td>1. 2. 3. --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Formal Notification of Commissioning of a Targeted Course Review Guideline**

This guideline is to be used by the Academic Senate sub-committee in providing formal notification to an organisational unit of the commissioning of a targeted course review.

The formal notification should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of formal notification</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of the proposed review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name(s) and contact details of staff available to respond to any queries in the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students &amp; Education)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference to Targeted Course Review Recommendation (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of the course elements to be included in the targeted course review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary of the triggers flagging the need for review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A summary of the topics to be covered by the terms of reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review methodology(ies) to be followed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A timeline for completion of the review, including timeframes for submission of follow-up reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected outcomes from the review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Targeted Course Review Proposal Guideline and Template**

This guideline is to be used by all organisational units when submitting proposals to an Academic Senate sub-committee for a targeted course review.

The completed proposal is to be submitted to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee by the Head of the organisational unit/s. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the proposal. The review should not commence until a written directive is received from Academic Senate. However, Heads of organisational units are encouraged to begin pre-planning in anticipation of possible approval to minimise lead-in time.
The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Course Review Procedure should be referred to during the completion of the proposal. Any queries should be directed to the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).

6.1 Developing the Targeted Course Review Proposal

The proposed review should be:

- evidence based
- efficient (particularly in its use of staff time)
- rigorous
- transparent
- objective.

The targeted course review proposal should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The name(s) and contact details of Head of the organisational unit/s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The title.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date of the proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A list of the organisational units and staff that will be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A statement of the scope and terms of reference including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reference to any specific trigger for the review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reference to any relevant goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reference to the methodologies to be used as specified by the Academic Senate sub-committee. Example methodologies include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- self-review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- internal or external panel review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- external consultancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- internal or external audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- professional accreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- methodology-specific information (see section 7 below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reference to whether the review will be undertaken in combination with other methodologies or sources of data such as a moderation exercise or survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- proposed terms of reference covering the topics specified by the Academic Senate sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A risk assessment of the issues that will be addressed in the review taking into account the UTAS Risk Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- matrix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A review budget including resources required and staff time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage.

Reference to relevant performance indicators or other data that will inform the review.

Reference to stakeholder data (e.g. students, staff, external) that will inform the review.

Plans for external stakeholder input where appropriate.

A specific but realistic timetable for all stages of the review including implementation, reporting and follow-up. This timetable should align with the details specified within the Academic Senate sub-committee’s written notification of the need to conduct a review (as per section 5 above).

A communication strategy identifying stakeholders and advising of they will be informed of the review outcomes in a timely manner.

Approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities.

6.2 Amendments to Targeted Course Review Proposals

This guideline is to be used by responsible organisational units when submitting to the appropriate Academic Senate sub-committee requests for changes to approved targeted course review proposals.

The completed request is to be submitted to the Academic Senate sub-committee by the Head of the organisational unit/s. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the submission. No changes should be made to the review process until a written directive is received.

The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Course Review Procedure should be referred to during the completion of the amended proposal. Any queries should be directed to the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).

The submission to amend an approved targeted course review proposal should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The title of the review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The date of the original Academic Senate approval of the review proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date/s of any subsequent approved changes to the review proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date of this submission for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The name/s and contact details of the Head of the organisational unit/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rationale/s for the proposed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where relevant, a new risk assessment of the issues that will be addressed in the review taking into account the UTAS Risk Management:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matrix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of the requested amendments, including any changes to:
- the scope, methodology and/or terms of reference
- the budget
- defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage
- the timetable
- approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities.

Include references to the currently approved review proposal as relevant.

7. **Review Methodology-Specific Guidelines**

The Academic Senate sub-committee identifies the type of review to be initiated based on a consideration of the risk. A variety of review mechanisms are available, including:

- self-review
- internal or external panel review
- external consultancy
- internal audit
- external audit
- professional accreditation.

Each different review methodology imposes varying requirements on the organisational unit.

7.1 **Self-review**

The self-review will be carried out under the leadership of the Head of the organisational unit or their nominee (generally the Course Coordinator). It will include academic staff who are involved in the course under review, as well as representatives from cognate areas within the Faculty/University and the Course Advisory Committee, as nominated by the Head of organisational unit/s.

A suite of relevant data will be provided to the organisational unit to assist in reviewing the targeted elements of the course.

Data sources are available through the Student Evaluation, Review and Reporting Units (SERRU) and can include:

- eVALUate unit evaluations (may include previous Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning (SETL) reports
- Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ)
- Graduate Destination Survey (GDS)
- Australiasian Survey of Student Engagement (AUSSE)
- University Experience Survey (UES)
- Retention/progression rates/completions
- Enrolment trends and entry scores of students including first preference data
- Student/staff ratios

The self-review will culminate in a report which makes a critical assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the course, as well as suggestions for improvement.
The report will be completed using the template provided.

Reports of reviews of courses will reference annual Course Evaluation Report findings and include comment on some or all of the following (depending on the elements of the course targeted for review):

- Compliance with UTAS University Standards Framework (USF)
- Compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)
- The Statement of Curriculum Philosophy
- Positioning and standing of the course including:
  - Course positioning with regard to competitor courses
  - Course contribution to the profession and community
  - The emphasis of the course in terms of its goals and graduate attributes
  - Evidence of standing of the course at the state, national and international levels.

- Viability and capacity to deliver the curriculum including:
  - Staff numbers and expertise
  - Trends in student enrolment, progression and graduation, with particular reference to the various student cohorts and their needs/capacities
  - Library and other learning resources
  - Infrastructure (rooms, IT and equipment)
  - Web-based support.

- Currency, relevance and quality of the curriculum including:
  - The currency and relevance of curriculum content
  - The structure of the curriculum in terms of its ability to achieve the course goals and objectives
  - The capacity of the curriculum to develop graduate attributes and allow for the integration of knowledge with a focus on where the discipline/profession is expected to go over the next 5 years.

- Quality of learning, teaching and assessment including:
  - The learner centred nature of the course in terms of course and unit design
  - The range of teaching, learning and assessment tasks and associated learning outcomes
  - Student workload
  - The performance of the course and units against national CEQ benchmarks
  - The effectiveness of course level quality assurance processes and their connection to school and faculty processes.

7.2 Internal or external panel review

7.2.1 Proposed panel membership

The following characteristics will be considered to ensure an appropriately balanced membership on each committee:

- expertise in the area (or some of the areas) concerned
- impartiality/objectivity
- respect for, and confidence in, the members chosen
- consistency/continuity.
Panel members are selected so that the panel as a whole possesses the expertise and experience to enable the external review to be carried out effectively.

- The targeted course review panel will be appointed by the Academic Senate upon the recommendation of the relevant sub-committee, after consideration of nominations from the relevant Dean/Director of the organisational unit made in consultation with the Chair of the Academic Senate sub-committee.

- An external targeted course review panel would normally comprise:
  - a senior UTAS academic officer (e.g., a member of the professoriate or another senior academic external to the course concerned)
  - at least two external senior academics (usually of professorial rank) in the same or a cognate area from other universities
  - one or two internal senior academics possibly from a cognate discipline to that under review
  - at least one external member of industry, professional association or government organisation. (Review Committees for courses providing for VET sector articulation should include the membership of a relevant representative from the VET sector.)
  - at least one student representative
  - at least one member of the review panel will have particular expertise in Learning and Teaching.

- The proposed panel membership should be included in the Targeted Course Review Proposal. The Head’s nominations should be accompanied by a brief rationale for their decisions, including details of the present position of each nominee.

### 7.2.2 Proposed Terms of Reference

- When informing organisational units of the requirement for a targeted course review, the Academic Senate sub-committee will provide guidance on the required coverage of the terms of reference.
- Based on the guidance provided by the Academic Senate sub-committee, the organisational unit will draft proposed terms of reference within the Targeted Course Review Proposal document.

### 7.2.3 Internal self-review report

- Refer to section 6.1 Self Review above.
- The internal self-review report will be provided to the Review Panel one month prior to convening of the panel.

### 7.2.4 Panel review process

- Preparation
  - This stage involves the assembly of information fundamental to commencement of the review proper. The Head of organisational unit/s will provide the main submission to the Review Panel, namely the internal self-review report.
  - The Chair of the Review Panel will also invite/seek submissions and input from other internal and external stakeholders (including students, staff, relevant industry, community and professional associations).
  - Groups and individuals making submissions will be informed that the submissions will be made accessible within the University when the review
report is finalised, unless there is a clear indication from the Head of Organisational Unit that the submission is to be kept confidential to the Review Committee.

- The Panel Review
  - The review will involve an intensive program of interviews, discussions and deliberations with the Review Panel and will provide the opportunity for input from and consultation with all interested parties, including all staff involved in teaching the course and student representatives.
  - The review panel will sit for up to 3-4 working days.
  - Reviews of courses with cross-campus responsibilities will provide the opportunity for the review panel to visit all campuses (when relevant to the elements of the course targeted for review) and talk to staff and students face-to-face. The review panel will have the opportunity to visit all appropriate University facilities and invite comment from other University staff and external stakeholders.

- Administration of the Panel Review
  - The organisational unit/s will nominate a staff member to provide administrative support to the Panel.
  - The organisational unit/s will ensure that each Panel member receives a briefing prior to conducting the review.

7.2.5 Preparation of review report

- The review panel will provide a final report to the Dean/Director of the organisational unit within one month of completion of the panel review, including commendations, affirmations and recommendations arising from the review process.
- The review panel report will be prepared using the template provided.
- The Chair of the review panel shall normally be responsible for writing the report, and will ensure that all panel members agree with its contents, or have the opportunity to register a minority view.

7.3 External consultancy

7.3.1 Drafting the terms of reference

- When informing organisational units of the requirement for a targeted course review, the Academic Senate sub-committee will provide guidance on the required coverage of the terms of reference.
- Based on the guidance provided by the Academic Senate sub-committee, the organisational unit will draft proposed terms of reference within the Targeted Course Review Proposal document.

7.3.2 Identification of consultants

- The Dean/Director of the organisational unit will be expected to propose two alternative potential consultants within the Targeted Course Review Proposal, and to provide a brief description of the qualifications and suitability of each given the review to be undertaken and the terms of reference.

7.3.3 Administration of external consultancy

- The organisational unit will provide the consultant with a self review document (refer to section 7.1 above) to inform the review.
- The organisational unit will work with the consultant to ensure they have the information necessary to successfully complete the consultancy, such as lists of interviewees, room bookings and the like.
- The Consultant may wish to invite/seek submissions and input from other internal and external stakeholders (including students, staff, relevant industry, community and professional associations). Groups and individuals making submissions will be informed that the submissions will be made accessible within the University when the review report is finalised, unless there is a clear indication from the Head of Organisational Unit that the submission is to be kept confidential to the Review Committee.

7.3.4 Preparation of consultant report
- The external consultant will provide a final report to the Head of the organisational unit within one month of completion of the review.

7.4 Internal/external audit
- Internal and external risk and compliance audits at UTAS are coordinated by the Office of Risk Management and Audit Assurance.
- Organisational units may also undertake desktop audits to ensure compliance with external reference points.

7.5 Professional accreditation

7.5.1 Review plans
- The Dean/Director will report any professional accreditation reviews planned over the coming triennium to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee on an annual basis.

7.5.2 Preparation of the accreditation submission
- The drafting of the accreditation submission will be the responsibility of the organisational unit concerned with oversight from the Faculty (or equivalent) Learning and Teaching Committee. The format for the submission will be as determined by the professional body.
- The Dean/Director will forward a copy of the draft accreditation submission to the Provost and Chair of the Academic Senate sub-committee in sufficient time to provide the opportunity for comment.
- The Dean/Director will forward the final version of the accreditation submission, incorporating feedback, to the professional body, the Provost and the Chair of the Academic Senate sub-committee.

7.5.3 Review visit
- The schedule for the professional accreditation review visit will be determined by the professional body in consultation with the organisational unit. The Head of the organisational unit will circulate the schedule to all affected staff and students at least two weeks prior to the visit.
- Reviews of courses with cross-campus responsibilities will provide the opportunity for the review panel to visit all campuses (when relevant to the elements of the course targeted for review) and talk to staff and students face-to-face. The review panel will
have the opportunity to visit all appropriate University facilities and invite comment from other University staff and external stakeholders.

- There will be a briefing session with the Provost (or nominee) at the beginning and end of the review proper to provide advice on institutional planning and broader contextual and budgetary issues.

### 7.5.4 Review reports and implementation plans

- The report and recommendations of the professional accreditation body will be provided to both the Provost and the Academic Senate sub-committee.
- University reporting requirements (for submission of the review report, response, implementation plan and follow up reports) will align with those of the professional body.

### 8 Media Guidelines

#### 8.1 Prior to review

All media inquiries should be handled by the Dean, Institute Head or Head of Division in consultation with the Communications & Media office. Inquirers from the media can be provided with information about the review process, dates for the review (when they are set), terms of reference and names of members of review panels/consultants/auditors (once approved by Academic Senate), and numbers of submissions received where applicable (all other details of submissions are confidential).

#### 8.2 During the review

Members of the review panel/consultants/auditors should not make any media comment. All panel discussions/consultant or auditor interviews are confidential. Media inquiries should be referred to the Dean, Institute Head or Head of Division. At this stage, media comment should focus only on the process being followed.

#### 8.3 After the report has been finalised

As per the Course Review Procedure, the review report will first be received by the Head of the organisational unit/s. While the report should be considered confidential at this stage, it still needs to be made available to relevant staff within the organisational unit/s to inform the preparation of the initial response and the subsequent Outcomes Implementation Plan.

If there are media inquiries at this stage, the Dean, Institute Head or Head of Division may indicate that a report has been received and is being discussed. The message should be that the report is not public because it contains recommendations that may or may not be accepted and that various processes have to be worked through before the report can be released. At this stage, the Dean, Institute Head or Head of Division (in consultation with the Communications & Media office) may choose to highlight some of the main recommendations or points made in the review, particularly if this is helpful to prevent or counteract negative media coverage or speculation.

#### 8.4 Completion of Outcomes Implementation Plan

If there is media interest in the outcomes of the review, once the Outcomes Implementation Plan has been presented to Academic Senate, the Dean, Institute Head or Head of Division should work with the Communications & Media office to prepare a press release.
9 Review Report Response Guidelines

This guideline is to be used by Heads of organisational units when completing a response to a review report.

The Head of the organisational unit/s submits to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee the completed response together with a copy of the review report. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the response and review report.

Recommendations or other actions arising out of the review should not be acted on until a written directive is received from the sub-committee. However, line managers are encouraged to begin pre-planning in anticipation of possible Academic Senate approval to minimise lead-in time.

The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Course Review Procedure should be referred to during the completion of the Review Report Response. Any queries should be directed to the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).

The review report response should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The title of the review.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The name/s and contact details of Head of the organisational unit/s. The date of the original Academic Senate approval of the review proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date/s of any subsequent approved changes to the review proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A brief overview of any approved changes to the review proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment of the review outcomes, including:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• which outcomes and recommendations are supported and why;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• which outcomes and recommendations are not supported and why; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• any revised recommendations with rationales.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Outcomes Implementation Plan Guideline and Template

This guideline is to be used by all organisational units when submitting plans to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee for the implementation of approved recommendations and other actions arising from targeted course reviews.

The completed plan is to be submitted to the sub-committee by the Head of the organisational unit/s. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the plan. Delivery on the review outcomes should not be commenced until a written directive is received from Academic Senate. However, line managers are encouraged to begin pre-planning in anticipation of approval to minimise lead-in time.

The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy, Unit and Course Evaluation Report Procedure and the Course Review Procedure should be referred to during the completion of the Outcomes Implementation Plan. Any queries should be directed to the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).
10.1 Developing the Review Outcomes Implementation Plan

The review outcomes implementation plan should be prepared using the template provided and should include:

- the title of the review
- the date of the original Academic Senate approval of the review proposal
- the name(s) and contact details of responsible line manager(s)
- a list of the recommendations and other actions approved by Academic Senate arising from the review
- detail on how the organisational unit(s) will meet the recommendations and other actions approved by Academic Senate
- an implementation budget including resources required and staff time
- defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage of the implementation process
- a timetable for all stages of the process including implementation, reporting and follow-up
- approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities.

10.2 Changes to Outcomes Implementation Plan

This guideline is to be used by responsible organisational units when submitting to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee requests for changes to approved targeted course review outcomes implementation plans.

The completed request is to be submitted to the sub-committee by the Head of the organisational unit/s. The sub-committee will respond in writing following a consideration of the submission. No changes should be made to the implementation process until a written directive is received from Academic Senate.

The submission should include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The title of the review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The date of the original Academic Senate approval of the outcomes implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date(s) of any subsequent approved changes to the implementation plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The date of this submission for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The name(s) and contact details of responsible line manager(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rationale for the proposed changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details of the requested amendments, including any changes to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how the organisational unit/s will meet the recommendations and other actions approved by Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the implementation budget including resources required and staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined responsibilities for initiation and carriage of the implementation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the timetable for all stages of the process including implementation, reporting and follow-up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approval, reporting, implementation and follow-up responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Follow-up Report/s

This guideline is to be used by all line managers when submitting follow-up reports to the relevant Academic Senate sub-committee on the implementation of approved recommendations and other actions arising from targeted course reviews.

The completed report is to be submitted to the sub-committee by the Head of the organisational unit/s. If further action is required, the Head of the organisational unit/s ensures it is undertaken and develops and submits to the sub-committee a further follow-up report. Academic Senate may require a series of follow-up reports until final approval is given and the review process concluded.

The Reviews Policy, Learning and Teaching Evaluation Policy and the Course Review Procedure should be referred to during the completion of the follow-up report. Any queries should be directed to the Student Evaluation, Review and Reporting Unit (SERRU) in the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students & Education).

11.1 Developing Review Follow-up Reports

The review follow-up report should be prepared using the template provided and should include:

- the title of the review.
- the date of the original Academic Senate approval of the review proposal.
- the name(s) and contact details of responsible line manager(s).
- a list of the recommendations and other actions approved by Academic Senate arising from the review.
- detail on how the organisational unit(s) have met the recommendations and other actions approved by Academic Senate.
- detail on any of the approved recommendations and other actions that have not been met with explanations.
- a reflection on the outcomes from the review process, including:
  - how elements of the course, the curricula, the student experience and other processes or activities have been improved through the review process
  - any recommendations for more reviews
  - any shortcomings with the review undertaken
  - how similar reviews may be improved in the future, if appropriate
- a reflection on the Course Reviews Procedure and relevant templates, guidelines and checklists. Can they be improved? If so, how?

12 Supporting Flowcharts and Templates

A Course Review process flowchart is attached for reference.

The following templates are either attached to or contained within the body of these guidelines:
• Annual Course Report template (Note: still under development as part of the Business Intelligence project. Will be attached prior to final release of guidelines).
• Targeted Course Review Recommendation template (contained within Section 4 of these guidelines).
• Targeted Course Review Proposal template (contained within Section 6.1 of these guidelines).
• Proposal Amendment template (contained within Section 6.2 of these guidelines).
• Self Review template (attached).
• Panel Review template (attached).
• Review Report Response template (contained within Section 9 of these guidelines).
• Outcomes Implementation Plan template (attached).
• Changes to Outcomes Implementation Plan template (contained within Section 10.2 of these guidelines).
• Follow-up Report template (attached).

13 Glossary

Audit A review process that aims to ensure that procedures are in place to assure quality, integrity or standards of provision and outcomes.

Consultancy review An appraisal by professional expert/s who conduct an evaluation in the field targeted for review, based on pre-determined terms of reference.

Panel Review A panel of individuals who have professional and/or academic expertise in the field targeted for review, appointed by Academic Senate to undertake an evaluation based on pre-determined terms of reference.

Self-review Critical self-evaluation/audit/study of the targeted review area, potentially providing information to an external review consultant or panel, and facilitating improved self-awareness of the factors contributing to the need for review and improvement.

Professional accreditation review An external review conducted by a professional and/or accrediting body in order to grant or confirm continued accreditation of a professional course offered by the University.

14 Versioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Former Version(s)</th>
<th>Version 1 – Course Review Guidelines drafted January 2012; reviewed Month, 2013.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Version</td>
<td>Version 2 – Course Review Guidelines (current document); approved Month, 201x.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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