Academic Program Review Procedure

Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

(1) Academic Program Reviews facilitate the comprehensive, cyclical review of the University's academic programs and plans. This Procedure enacts the Programs, Plans and Courses Quality Assurance Policy.

(2) The purpose of the Academic Program Review is to undertake an evidence-based evaluation of the design, market appeal, viability, competitiveness, student satisfaction, employment outcomes and longevity of programs and associated plans. In addition to the review of longitudinal performance against internal institutional thresholds, Academic Program Reviews use external benchmarking to measure performance.

(3) This Procedure applies to all coursework programs offered at UQ. This Procedure does not apply to the Higher Degree by Research (HDR) and Higher Doctorate programs.

(4) The Academic Program Review process ensures alignment with the University's Strategic Plan and fulfills relevant regulatory obligations described in the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (HESF) and the National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code).

Section 2 - Process and Key Controls

(5) The Academic Program Review process requires that all coursework programs are subject to a comprehensive review at least once every seven years. Plans are reviewed in conjunction with program reviews, however programs with a large number of plans may conduct plan reviews in stages.

(6) Reviews may be held sooner if required by the Faculty administering the program, an external accreditation review cycle, or if determined by the Provost or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

(7) New academic programs are reviewed after two cohorts have graduated or sooner. The review of a new Graduate Certificate or a new Graduate Diploma that is part of a Master's suite will be undertaken after two cohorts of the Master's program have graduated or sooner. The septennial review cycle will commence upon the completion of the initial review.

(8) Academic Program Reviews are overseen by the Appropriate Authorised Delegate. Reviews of programs which are predominantly administered within a School are overseen by the Executive Dean through the Associate Dean (Academic) and the Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. The Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science programs are reviewed with the oversight of the Academic Board through its Academic Board Standing Committee.

(9) The process is informed by dashboards and detailed reports comprising defined contextual and academic quality assurance data. Key controls include:

a. the scope of the Review and the terms of reference for the Academic Program Review Panel; and
b. reporting of the recommendations and implementation plan, and subsequent monitoring of actions arising.

(10) The key tasks within the Academic Program Review process are:

a. Selection of the Academic Program Review Panel (see section 3, ‘Academic Program Review Panel’ provisions);
b. Development of the Academic Program Review terms of reference (see section 3, ‘Academic Program Review Terms of Reference’ provisions);
c. Preparation of the Academic Program Review Submission for the Panel (see section 3, ‘Prepare the Submission’ provisions);
d. Conduct the Academic Program Review by the Review Panel (see section 3, ‘During the Review’ provisions);
e. Preparation and submission of the Academic Program Review Report to the Appropriate Authorised Delegate (see section 3, ‘Review Report and Response’ provisions);
f. Identification of priorities for the Academic Program Review Implementation Plan (section 3, ‘Implement the Review Recommendations’ provisions);
g. Development of the Implementation Plan (see section 3, ‘Implement the Review Recommendations’ provisions);
h. Implement Review recommendations (see section 3, ‘Implement the Review Recommendations’ provisions);
i. Report on progress of the Implementation Plan (see section 3, ‘Implement the Review Recommendations’ provisions); and
j. Report on the Academic Program Reviews conducted annually (see section 3, ‘Implement the Review Recommendations’ provisions).

Section 3 - Key Requirements

Principles of the Academic Program Review Process

(11) The Academic Program Review process is underpinned by the following key principles:

a. That there is one UQ Academic Program Review process that accommodates all programs identified in this Procedure.
b. That the Academic Program Review process aligns with the size, viability, and complexity of the program. Where a 16-unit bachelor’s honours program is offered following completion of a bachelor's degree program, these programs may be reviewed together as a single Academic Program Review.
c. That decision-making relating to Academic Program Reviews will ensure that decisions are made at the next higher level of academic oversight (the "Appropriate Authorised Delegate").
d. That any conflict of interest is considered and managed in accordance with the Conflict of Interest Policy.
e. That stakeholder input is sought and considered throughout the Academic Program Review process, including both student and external perspectives.
f. That where the program forms part of a dual degree, any changes resulting from the Academic Program Review will apply to that component of the dual program.
g. That Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander knowledges and perspectives are considered during the Academic Program Review process.
h. That the Academic Program Review process assures alignment with the University’s Strategic plan, and compliance with relevant UQ policies and procedures as well as with regulatory requirements including the HESF and the National Code.

Establish the Academic Program Review

Academic Program Review Panel

(12) The membership of the Academic Program Review Panel is determined by the Executive Dean or Appropriate Authorised Delegate. This is typically the Associate Dean (Academic) for programs administered within a School and the President of the Academic Board for the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science programs. The Appropriate

Authorised Delegate must consider any conflict of interest in the Review Panel selection.

(13) The composition of the Academic Program Review Panel is guided by the size, viability and complexity of the academic program to be reviewed, including whether the program is within a school, across schools, within or across faculties or whether it is a professionally accredited program. Input will be sought from all faculties and schools involved.

(14) The Review Panel will typically include:

a. the Chair;
b. the Secretary;
c. one member with relevant expertise from a cognate discipline;
d. one to three members who are external to the University with local, national, or international expertise and knowledge in a relevant discipline or disciplines;
e. student representatives; and
f. other members as determined by the Appropriate Authorised Delegate.

(15) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and the President of the Academic Board, or their nominees, may participate on the Review panel or make a submission to the Review, as appropriate.

Academic Program Review Terms of Reference

(16) The terms of reference for Academic Program Reviews are approved by the Executive Dean or Appropriate Authorised Delegate in consultation with relevant stakeholders commensurate with the size, viability and complexity of the program under review. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) may be consulted on the terms of reference as appropriate.

(17) The terms of reference provide the context for analysis of the effectiveness of the program since the previous Review, or since commencement of a new program, and for the Review panel's recommendations on the future development of the program.

(18) The terms of reference will typically cover the:

a. distinctiveness and strategic alignment of the program;
b. curriculum and pedagogical design and developments;
c. graduate attributes including Indigenisation of the curriculum;
d. assessment and student progression;
e. academic integrity;
f. academic governance;
g. market demand and competition;
h. financial viability;
i. staffing and facilities;
j. student satisfaction and graduate outcomes; and
k. quality improvement and enhancement themes nominated by any or all of: the Vice-Chancellor, Provost, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Executive Dean and Associate Dean (Academic).

(19) The Academic Program Review Panel reviews the program in accordance with the terms of reference.

(20) The timeframe for undertaking the Review will be determined by the relevant parties after the terms of reference have been approved.

Prepare the Review Submission

(21) The “Review Submission” is a document that is considered by the Review Panel. The focus of the Review Submission is to identify future directions and strategic intentions for the program through analysis and reflection on the program’s history, the program at present, and future plans for program improvement and development, as relevant to the terms of reference. The Review Submission will inform deliberation by the Review Panel and assists panel members to make decisions and recommendations.

(22) The Program Convenor coordinates development of the Review Submission to the Academic Program Review Panel, in consultation with the Head/ Heads of School and relevant teaching staff. Input must be sought from student and external representatives as well as from relevant schools/units across UQ. The Program Convenor will seek input from stakeholders (such as employers, international partners) through forums/focus groups, student and staff submissions, surveys/consultation, and workshops.

(23) The Review Submission will contain information from benchmarking and related analysis with other Australian and international universities where appropriate. To address the terms of reference, the Review Submission will incorporate information and analysis from relevant academic quality assurance reports.

(24) Planning and Business Intelligence will make available through the UQ Reportal relevant reports related to the academic quality assurance of programs, plans and courses.

Conduct the Review

During the Review

(25) In conducting the Review, the Review Panel Chair will ensure that each term of reference is addressed.

(26) During the Review, the Review Panel will:

a. Interview key stakeholders including the Head/Heads of School and the Program Convenor and Plan Convenors where relevant.
b. Consider and deliberate on the Review Submission from the Faculty/faculties, school(s) and other UQ units as well as submissions from external stakeholders.

Review Report

(27) At the conclusion of the Review, the Review Panel will:

a. Prepare the Academic Program Review Report, including a summary of findings in relation to the terms of reference and recommendations to the School and/or Faculty.
b. Submit the Academic Program Review Report to the Executive Dean and/or Appropriate Authorised Delegate.

(28) The Executive Dean and/or the Appropriate Authorised Delegate will consider the Academic Program Review Report in the context of the University and Faculty priorities and:

a. confirm the recommendations that are within the scope of the Review;
b. confirm the recommendations that are consistent with UQ’s strategic priorities; and
c. identify priorities for the implementation plan.

Implement the Review Recommendations

(29) The Implementation Plan is finalised after the Executive Dean and/or Appropriate Authorised Delegate has reviewed the Program Review Report and confirmed the scope is appropriate and strategically aligned. The

Implementation Plan is coordinated by the Program Convenor in consultation with the Head/Heads of School and relevant teaching staff. Input will be sought from other faculties and schools, and from academic units with which the Faculty has a teaching relationship.

(30) The Implementation Plan is submitted to the Executive Dean and/or Appropriate Authorised Delegate for approval.

(31) Within 4 months of the review panel's submission of the draft Report, the Review Report and the approved Implementation Plan should be circulated to the relevant Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee and/or Board of Studies followed by the Committee for Academic Programs Policy of the Academic Board for noting and discussion.

a. Requests to extend the 4-month timeframe stipulated in clause 31 should be submitted to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for approval.

(32) Each Faculty will submit an annual list of Academic Program Reviews undertaken and implementation plans approved to the Committee for Academic Programs Policy of the Academic Board for noting.

(33) The Secretary of the Committee for Academic Programs Policy will compile a summary list of the Academic Program Reviews and Implementation Plans annually for the consideration of the Committee for Academic Programs Policy of the Academic Board.

Section 4 - External Accreditation

(34) Where a program is subject to external accreditation and a complementary Academic Program Review is approved, the Executive Dean may vary the Academic Program Review process as follows:

a. The Academic Program Review may not require the constitution of a panel, depending on the scope of the complementary Review activity to be undertaken.
b. Those Academic Program Review terms of reference not included in the external accreditation process must be reviewed separately to fulfil the Academic Program Review process.
c. The Academic Program Review Report will comprise the programs' accreditation report, complemented by any required data and reflection to fulfil the Academic Program Review process. The Appropriate Authorised Delegate will oversee the preparation of the Review Report.
d. The Implementation Plan will reflect the priorities arising from both the external and accreditation recommendations and the complementary Academic Program Review recommendation/s.
e. The timing of the Review may be altered if required by the external accreditation review cycle.

Section 5 - Monitoring, Review and Assurance

(35) The Executive Dean and/or Appropriate Authorised Delegate is responsible for ensuring that the actions identified in the Implementation Plan are fulfilled.

(36) The preparation of the Implementation Plan progress report is coordinated by the Program Convenor, in consultation with the Head/Heads of School and relevant teaching staff. The actions identified in the Academic Program Review Implementation Plan will be monitored by the Executive Dean and the relevant Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee.

(37) The 12-month Implementation Plan progress report will be submitted to the Appropriate Authorised Delegate, the Associate Dean (Academic) and to the Committee for Academic Programs Policy for noting and discussion.

(38) The Implementation Plan progress report will detail the extent to which the actions identified in the Implementation Plan have been finalised and the effectiveness of those actions in meeting the agreed priorities of the Academic Program Review.

Section 6 - Recording and Reporting

(39) Reports, implementation plans and associated records are maintained in accordance with the University's Information Management Policy and Privacy Policy.

(40) The Appropriate Authorised Delegate is responsible for approving changes to the published schedule of Academic Program Reviews for their Faculty and for reporting these changes to the Secretary of the Committee for Academic Programs Policy of the Academic Board.

Section 7 - Roles and Responsibilities

Position	Responsibility
Vice-Chancellor	• May nominate quality improvement and enhancement themes for the Academic Program Review process.
Provost	• May nominate quality improvement and enhancement themes for the Academic Program Review process. • Determines whether an Academic Program Review will be undertaken earlier than the seven-year cycle.
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	• May nominate quality improvement and enhancement themes for the Academic Program Review process. • Determines whether an Academic Program Review will be undertaken earlier than the seven-year cycle. • Note the Academic Program Review Report and the Implementation Plan.
Executive Dean	• Determines whether an Academic Program Review will be undertaken earlier than the seven-year cycle. • Oversees reviews of programs which are predominantly administered within a School. • Determines membership of the Review Panel. • Approves the terms of reference of the Academic Program Review. • Reviews the Academic Program Review Report to inform the Implementation Plan. • Approves the Implementation Plan for programs administered by the Faculty and monitors progress.
Associate Dean (Academic)	As the Appropriate Authorised Delegate for programs other than the Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science, may: • Approve the Academic Program Review terms of reference for relevant programs. • Review the Academic Program Review Report to inform the Implementation Plan. • Ensure actions identified in the Implementation Plan are monitored.
Head of School	• May coordinate or contribute to the development of the Review Submission, Implementation Plan and progress reports. • May be involved in the implementation of actions identified in the Implementation Plan
President of the Academic Board	As Chair of the Academic Board Standing Committee, the President of the Academic Board is the Appropriate Authorised Delegate for reviews of the Bachelor of Arts and the Bachelor of Science programs. • May participate on the Review Panel or make a submission to the Review, as appropriate. • Receives the Academic Program Review Report and Implementation Plan for all programs which are reviewed with oversight of the Academic Board through its Academic Board Standing Committee.

Position	Responsibility
Program Convenor / Plan Convenor	• Coordinates development of the Review Submission to the Academic Program Review Panel, in consultation with the Head/Heads of School and relevant teaching staff. • Coordinates the Review Implementation Plan in consultation with the Head/Head of School and relevant teaching staff. • Coordinates the preparation of the Review Implementation Plan progress report as relevant in consultation with the Head/Heads of School and relevant teaching staff.
School Director of Teaching and Learning	• May coordinate or contribute to the development of the Review Submission, Implementation Plan and progress reports. • May support the implementation of actions identified in the Implementation Plan.
Secretary of the Committee for Academic Programs Policy of the Academic Board	• Maintains the published schedule of Academic Program Reviews.

Section 8 - Appendix

Definitions

Terms	Definition
Appropriate Authorised Delegate	The term Appropriate Authorised Delegate has been introduced to provide flexibility for the different structures within faculties and to cater for different processes for reviews of programs administered within a School, within a Faculty or across faculties. For this Procedure the Appropriate Authorised Delegate represents the next higher level of academic oversight in decision-making relating to Academic Program Reviews. Reviews of programs which are predominantly administered within a School are overseen by the Executive Dean through the Associate Dean (Academic) and Faculty Teaching and Learning Committee. The Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science programs are reviewed with oversight of the Academic Board through its Academic Board Standing Committee.
External accreditation	Where a program undergoes review through an external accreditation body to enable graduates of the program to achieve professional registration or recognition.
Program	A sequence of study leading to the award of a qualification such as an undergraduate degree or diploma, and/or a postgraduate coursework qualification.

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	16th September 2025
Review Date	20th May 2029
Approval Authority	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Approval Date	3rd September 2025
Expiry Date	Not Applicable
Policy Owner	Kris Ryan Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Enquiries Contact	Academic Services Division