Review of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Programs - Guidelines

Document Number:
3.30.06c

Topic:
3.30.06 Review of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Programs [3]

Approval Authority:
Academic Registrar

Last Approval Date:
Monday, August 14, 2017

Review date:
Friday, August 14, 2020

Evaluation Timeframe:
3 Yearly Review

Audience:
All Staff
All Students

Notes:
August 2017 - Guidelines introduced to bring up to date with PPL 1.40.06 and PPL 1.40.08 review processes.

1. Purpose and Objectives

These guidelines enact PPL 3.30.06b Review of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science Programs – Procedures [4].

2. Definitions, Terms, Acronyms

No entries for this document.
3. Guidelines Scope/Coverage

These guidelines apply to reviews of the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science programs at The University of Queensland.

4. Guidelines Statement

The following guidelines are provided to review committees to assist in the preparation for, and conduct of, the review:

- 5.1 Review timetable – proposed broad model;
- 5.3 Sample questions; and
- Form 1 Review report template [4].

Section 5.2 (Timeline) provides guidance to faculties and review committees on the general timeline of events for the pre-review, review, and post-review phases of the review process.

5. Guidelines

5.1 Review timetable – proposed broad model

Evening preceding review
- dinner for all members of the review committee and the secretary to discuss review issues and orient external members to University procedures and protocols

Day 1 - morning
- interview with the Vice-Chancellor (30 minutes)
- interview with Provost (30 minutes)
- interview with the Executive Dean (60 minutes)

Day 1 - afternoon
- interviews with academic staff, professional staff, and students

Day 2 - morning
- interviews with PVC (Teaching and Learning), PVC (Indigenous Engagement), Dean of the Graduate School (20 minutes each)
- interviews with other University staff

Day 2 - afternoon
- visit to faculty, tour of faculty facilities, informal gathering to meet faculty staff, student representatives, and alumni

Day 2 - evening
- stakeholder dinner for all review committee members, secretary, and representatives of industry, government, professional bodies and employer groups

Day 3

- interviews
- report writing to commence

Day 4

- report writing
- meeting with Provost over lunch to discuss draft recommendations

Day 5 - morning

- report writing, outstanding/unscheduled interviews
- meeting with Executive Dean to discuss draft recommendations

Day 5 - afternoon

- preparation for presentation to faculty
- presentation of draft recommendations to all faculty staff – all review committee members to be in attendance (60 minutes)
- finalisation of report in penultimate draft form

The Executive Dean should be available during the review in case the review committee requests to schedule further meetings to discuss specific issues.

5.2 Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12 months prior to review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty notified of date of review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Two-day Retreat held to discuss the faculty's Operational Plan and key review issues/priorities (to include address by President of Academic Board) |
| Detailed minutes from the Retreat used as ongoing reference during preparations |

| Determine benchmark universities and contact them for data |
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- Check QILT data will be available

### 10 - 11 months prior to review

- Check that preparation process is progressing as planned (e.g. consultative committees are meeting)
- Executive Dean to commence meeting with staff/outside groups/stakeholders who are likely to be interviewed to discuss relevant issues

### 9 months prior to review

- Explore in-depth key issues for growth or change
- Meet with relevant schools to discuss their submission to the review

### 7 months prior to review

- Executive Dean prepares faculty’s review submission template and nominates relevant staff to coordinate/write sections of the document
- Collection of data for relevant sections of review submission undertaken by administrative staff
- Section-coordinators meet with committees/groups to allocate writing of subsections where required

### 6 – 2 months prior to review

- Intensive period of writing the review submission sections
- Collating of draft sections by section heads
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Week prior to review</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Dean to meet with potential interview groups to explain review process and purpose of their meeting with review committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plan review committee’s visit to faculty and tour of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arrange catering for review committee’s visit to faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Executive Dean to meet with senior staff to confirm faculty’s key messages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review**

- Schedule feedback meetings for staff interviewees with Executive Dean and relevant colleagues
- Executive Dean and senior faculty staff to keep diaries clear for the five days of the review and be ready to assist as required

**Post-Review**

- Review committee to finalise review report within two weeks of the review
- Copy of report sent to Executive Dean for preparation of faculty’s written response (this is expected to be completed within four weeks of receipt of the report)
- The review report and the faculty’s response are forwarded to the next meeting of Academic Board Standing Committee (the Executive Dean and the Provost attend the meeting to discuss the review recommendations)

- The review report, the faculty's response, and Standing Committee’s comments are submitted to the Academic Board for forwarding to the Vice-Chancellor for approval

- Once the review report is approved by the Vice-Chancellor, the report becomes a public document

- A 12-month implementation report is submitted by the Executive Dean to Standing Committee 12 months after approval by the Vice-Chancellor

- A three-year implementation report is submitted to the Vice-Chancellor and the Vice-Chancellor’s Risk and Compliance Committee within thirty-six months of the Vice-Chancellor’s approval of the review report

### 5.3 Sample questions

The following list includes areas which might be explored.

#### 1. Curriculum and teaching

- To what extent does the program meet expressed demand by students and by external stakeholders?
- How does the program compare with those of a similar nature throughout the state and Australia in terms of course offerings, quality of students enrolling (e.g. OP/rank entry score), and employment of graduates?
- What procedures does the faculty have in place for regular review of the program outside the Academic Board’s septennial review cycle?
- What are the findings of previous curriculum review processes?
- What developments have occurred in the relevant disciplines during the past seven years?
- How have these developments been reflected in the courses offered in the program?
- How does the faculty’s future planning take into account current community needs?
- To what extent have the new developments been encouraged/supported by the University?
- What demands are there for the offering of compulsory courses for specific disciplines?
- What is the balance of offerings between courses which are compulsory for one or more disciplines and electives?
- What attempt is made to meet the intellectual and cultural needs of society?
- What innovative teaching methods are employed?
- How does the faculty promote and reward excellence in teaching?
- What arrangements does the faculty have for regular review of all courses?
- How does the faculty use such reviews to improve the quality of its courses and its teaching?
- What teaching and learning facilities are available to students?
• Is there a sustained pattern of demand for the program?
• Is there a sustained pattern of demand, or lack of demand, for any of the courses offered in the program?
• Does the faculty have, or does it need, a program for effective recruitment of students to the program?
• What are the career destinations of the graduates?

2. Research

• Are students involved in research activities and is the value of research promoted at undergraduate level?
• What are the faculty's recognised areas of research excellence?
• Does the faculty's research reflect and complement the major areas of its teaching?
• What steps are taken to foster honours and postgraduate education?

3. Industry/professional links and community service

• What steps does the faculty take to promote public awareness of the program and its contribution to the social, cultural, and economic development of society?
• What links does the faculty have with alumni, government at all levels, industry, commerce, the professions, and the community in relation to the program?
• To what extent is the faculty aware of the needs of industry, commerce and the professions in relation to the program?

4. Internationalisation

• Does the faculty have, or does it need, a program for effective recruitment of international students to the program?
• What attempts are being made to increase the proportion of international students?
• Does the faculty have mechanisms to support international students in the program?

5. Equity and diversity issues

• Does the faculty ensure equality of opportunity in the program?
• What effort is made to encourage the enrolment of students from minority and disadvantaged groups?
• Is there a need to attempt to disturb traditional gender patterns within the disciplines?
• What attempt is made to increase the proportion of women who continue to honours and postgraduate level?

6. Organisational issues

• Does the full complement of academic staff provide the range of expertise necessary to provide effective undergraduate education in the range of courses offered and, in particular, in those courses that are compulsory for some disciplines?
• Does the program have effective administrative and technical support?
• How effectively does the faculty conduct its strategic planning, including regular reviews of program objectives?
• Are equipment, accommodation and other facilities adequate for program delivery?
• How does the faculty's budget for the program compare with the budgets of other faculties delivering programs similar in size and function?
• How does the faculty allocate its funds in relation to courses offered?
Are the resources to the faculty adequate to meet its commitments to high quality teaching?

- Is accommodation sufficient for current activities and planned or anticipated growth?
- Are teaching and research facilities (e.g., equipment) up to date and in sufficient supply to ensure an efficient and effective program?

7. Advisory Boards

- If the faculty has an advisory board for the program, is it functioning well?
- If not, how can it be improved (e.g. revise composition/membership, change terms of reference, increase frequency of meetings)?
- If the faculty does not have an advisory board for the program, would the program benefit from establishing one?
- If so, what would the main functions of the advisory board be (e.g. to increase industry engagement, strengthen links with the scientific community, ensure input from employer groups)?
- Would the faculty be able to secure a membership that would ensure the satisfactory functioning of the advisory board, and therefore, be able to meet its objectives?
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