Review of Institutes and Supervisory Centres Procedure

Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

(1) The Organisational Structure Policy sets out the principles applicable to the cyclical review of all institutes and supervisory centres at The University of Queensland (UQ). The purpose of this Procedure is to outline the process for the conduct of those cyclical reviews.

(2) The Procedure applies to all institutes and supervisory centres within the University.

(3) For the purpose of this Procedure, 'institute' is used to refer to all supervisory units within the scope of this Procedure.

(4) The Institute for Teaching and Learning Innovation (ITaLI), the Institute of Modern Languages (IML), and all research centres and research networks (as defined in the Research Centres and Research Networks Policy) are not within the scope of the Procedure.

Flexibility for Identified Units

Institutes Established by Joint Arrangements

(5) Where an institute is established through a joint arrangement with UQ and another organisation, the review should be conducted with consideration that the recommendations will be considered by both UQ and the other organisation. The review committee should give consideration to the arrangements in drafting recommendations.

(6) Alternative arrangements may need to be made in order to accommodate the structure of institutes established by a joint arrangement, including in:

a. Varying the standard terms of reference;
b. Varying the standard review duration;
c. Varying the review committee composition;
d. Ensuring adequate representation when engaging with stakeholders, especially when inviting submissions and arranging interviews during the review; and
e. Considering the role of the institute's advisory board.

(7) If certain provisions under the Procedure are deemed to not be suitable or practicable for the review of institutes established by joint arrangements, the University Senior Executive Team can grant an exception to certain requirements when considering the review committee membership and terms of reference for the review.

Faculty-level Institutes and Supervisory Centres

(8) Alternative arrangements may need to be made in order to accommodate the structure of faculty-level institutes and supervisory centres, including in:

a. Varying the standard terms of reference;

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

b. Varying the standard review duration;
c. Varying the review committee composition;
d. Ensuring adequate representation when engaging with stakeholders, especially when inviting submissions and arranging interviews during the review; and
e. Considering the role of the institute or centre's advisory board.

(9) If certain provisions under the Procedure are deemed to not be suitable or practicable for the review of Faculty-level institutes and supervisory centres, USET can grant an exception to certain requirements when considering the review committee membership and terms of reference for the review.

Section 2 - Process and Key Controls

(10) Academic Board, through the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee, conducts reviews of institutes on a seven-year cycle.

(11) As part of the review process, institutes undertake a self-assessment process of analysis, benchmarking, critical reflection and forward-planning.

(12) The review committee considers feedback from submissions and interviews with staff, students, other members of the University and external stakeholders, and the institute's relationships with other organisational units, resourcing, resource management and organisational structure.

(13) Through the review process, the review committee provides expert comment on the degree to which the institute contributes effectively and coherently to the UQ Strategic Plan and whether the institute is positioned to achieve its goals and objectives and to reach its potential.

(14) Following the review, the review committee's report (with recommendations), the institute's response, and the advice from Academic Review and Recruitment Committee (ARRC) are considered by the University Senior Executive Team (USET). Academic Board then reviews the report with corresponding feedback before being submitted to the Vice-Chancellor for approval.

(15) The supervisor of the institute and Institute Director are responsible for implementing the adopted recommendations. The implementation of report recommendations is monitored by the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee through a twelve-month and a three-year implementation report from the institute.

Section 3 - Key Requirements

Schedule of Reviews

(16) The Academic Review and Recruitment Committee, in consultation with the supervisors of institutes, proposes a list of institutes to be reviewed in the following year, for consideration and approval by USET.

Confirmation of the Review Committee, Terms of Reference and Duration

(17) The membership of the review committee, duration of the review and any modifications to the standard terms of reference are proposed by the Institute Director and the supervisor. For institutes established through a joint arrangement, the partner organisation will be consulted on the proposed terms of reference and membership.

(18) ARRC considers and nominates review committee members and a Chair (including reserve members), and proposes the terms of reference and duration of the review. ARRC will advise USET where changes have been made to the membership composition and terms of reference proposed by the institute. USET approves the nominees, reserve

list, terms of reference and duration. If further reserve members are required, the additional nominees will be considered and approved by USET.

(19) The Provost, following consultation with the President of the Academic Board, is authorised to:

a. approve changes to the approved terms of reference; and
b. replace a member unable to participate in the review with a person on the USET approved membership reserve list.

(20) The Provost will also consider any issues that are raised in relation to the proposed membership of the review committee, including the Secretary. The Provost may bring these issues to USET for further consideration.

Membership of the Review Committee

(21) The minimum requirement for the composition of an institute review committee is:

a. at least two external members (depending on the size and diversity of the institute). One external member should be from an overseas university; where this is not possible, up to two international contributors will be engaged;
b. one representative of the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee; and
c. one member of the University community in a senior leadership or researcher role, from a cognate institute or centre.
d. one member of the University community in a senior leadership or researcher role, from a cognate school.

(22) It is important, in considering membership, to avoid conflicts of interest, perceived or potential. Significant collaboration with the institute or with its individual members or research groups would normally be disqualifying.

(23) One of the external review committee members shall be appointed to chair the review committee.

(24) The Secretary to the review committee is a senior member of administrative staff nominated by the supervisor of the institute. For University level institutes, the Secretary will typically be the Director, Institute Operations or equivalent at a cognate institute or centre. For institutes and centres within a faculty, the Secretary will typically be Faculty Executive Manager from the faculty of the institute or centre under review.

(25) The Secretary will be determined by USET when considering the review committee membership composition, terms of reference and the duration of the review. The Secretary is supported by the Review Coordinator, with additional administrative support provided by the Executive Support Officer in the Academic Board Office, as required.

Terms of Reference of the Review

(26) The terms of reference for the review provide the framework in which the institute, through its self-assessment, and the review committee, through its enquiries, can analyse the institute’s performance and plans in relation to appropriate and attainable future objectives.

(27) Standard terms of reference are provided in Appendix B. Selection, modification or removal of specific terms of reference can be proposed by the Institute Director, supervisor of the institute, ARRC, or USET. Changes to the terms of reference may be appropriate when the institute or one or more of its key activities has recently been, or will soon be, subject to external review (for example, by an external stakeholder).

Duration of the Review

(28) The standard duration of a review is three days, which may be consecutive or scheduled over a period of time, depending on the needs of the review committee. A longer duration can be requested if appropriate by the Institute

Director, supervisor of the institute, ARRC or USET. If it is determined that the review will be held online, the duration may need to be adjusted. The committee will meet prior to the commencement of the review to determine roles of members.

Format of the Review

(29) A review is generally conducted with review committee members in-person for the duration.

(30) Alternative formats are available, if an in-person review (with the standard with a mix of Australia-based and international committee members) is not possible, or there are other good reasons to adopt a different format. Alternative approaches could include:

a. a review conducted online, with all members participating remotely in online meetings for interviews; or
b. a review conducted in-person with Australia-based external review committee members only, with feedback sought from international contributors.

(31) An online review must meet the requirements for a review as detailed in the 'Committee Deliberations' and 'Review Report' provisions. Details of considerations and possible adjustments to make to the structure of the review are outlined in Review of Institutes and Supervisory Centres Guideline.

Submissions to the Review

(32) The President of the Academic Board invites submissions from the institute, staff, students, others within the University, and external stakeholders. The submissions inform deliberation by the review committee and assist review committee members to make decisions and recommendations. The Review Coordinator sets the due date for submissions (generally one month before the commencement of the review).

Institute's Submission

(33) The institute's submission includes information about the institute that is accurate, focused, comprehensive and informative. The submission should focus on future directions and strategic intentions for the institute and include copies of the institute's future planning documents, such as strategic and/or operational plans. Planning and Business Intelligence will assist with the provision of key data to assist the institute in the preparation of the submission, as well as to provide additional data that may be required by the committee during the review.

(34) An overview of the structure and contents of the institute's submission is in Review of Institutes and Supervisory Centres Guideline.

Individual Submissions

(35) Invitations to make a submission to the review are sent to interested parties, including staff and students of the institute, heads or directors of units within the University and individuals nominated by the Institute Director.

Anonymous Submissions

(36) If an individual would prefer to make an anonymous submission (with no identifying information revealed to the review committee), they are able to contact the President of the Academic Board or Deputy President of the Academic Board to share and de-identify their submission.

(37) Individuals have the opportunity to request confidentiality when their submission is shared to anyone outside of the review committee by completing a Request for Confidentiality form.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

Release of Submissions

(38) Approximately one month before the commencement of the review:

a. all submissions received are provided to the review committee, the President of the Academic Board, the Secretary, the Provost and the Vice-Chancellor, subject to confidentiality obligations; and
b. the institute's submission is provided to the Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the institute supervisor (if not the Provost) and the Pro-Vice-Chancellors who have been invited to meet with the review committee.

(39) The institute's submission may be made available, upon request and at the discretion of the Institute Directors, to other University units, individual University staff members and to persons external to the University.

(40) In the week prior to the review, all individual submissions received are provided to the Institute Director and supervisor of the institute, subject to confidentiality obligations. For example:

a. in the case of students' submissions, all identifying details will be removed from the submission prior to release, unless a student requests to be identified; and
b. if an individual University staff member or a person external to the University requests confidentiality (by completing the Request for Confidentiality form), identifying details will be removed from their submission prior to release.

(41) All submissions may be made available to any UQ-based inquirer by the Review Coordinator after the review report has been approved by the Vice-Chancellor, subject to the above conditions regarding confidentiality.

Review Timetable

(42) The review timetable is developed by the Chair, the review committee, review secretary and other stakeholders as required. The Executive Support Officer organises interviews, in consultation with the review secretary.

(43) Based on written submissions received, the committee will identify individuals to be invited to attend an interview with the committee.

(44) A draft timetable must be circulated to review committee members, along with invitations to interviewees, at least two weeks prior to the review, and subsequent changes communicated to the committee. In developing the timetable, sufficient time should be provided to enable the committee members to consider the input to the review, as well as providing time for additional interviews as determined to be required through the course of the review.

(45) As part of the timetable, an initial dinner hosted by the supervisor of the institute will be held for the review committee on the evening immediately prior to the start of the review. The supervisor of the institute will provide additional context regarding the University to assist the committee in its deliberations.

Stakeholder Dinner

(46) A stakeholder dinner will be held on the evening of the first or second day of the review. The supervisor of the institute will typically host the dinner which will be attended by members of the review committee and representatives of industry, government, professional bodies, employer groups, and alumni. Attendees will be considered on the basis of their relevance to the institute's activities in research, learning, and engagement.

(47) A draft invitation list must be prepared well in advance by the Institute Director for consideration by the supervisor of the institute, who will ensure that those attending will be able to offer insight into the institute's activities relevant to the terms of reference for the review. The secretariat will determine whether Protocol and Events need play a role. Invitations will be issued three months prior to the date of the dinner.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

Committee Deliberations

(48) The review committee is required to consider all submissions and interview relevant institute staff, students and other University or external stakeholders.

(49) Interviews or other direct substantive communication from any staff, students or external stakeholders should not be made individually with the Chair or any review committee member(s). All information relevant to the review is expected to be made available to the entire review committee. The Chair is required to address conflicts of interest that may arise through the course of the review, such as through the provision of an in-camera session.

(50) At the end of the review, the review committee meets with the Institute Director, the supervisor of the institute (if not the Provost), the President of the Academic Board and Provost to discuss the findings and draft recommendations, and presents an overview of the findings and recommendations to a full meeting of the institute.

Review Report

(51) The review report is prepared by members of the review committee with support from the review Secretary.

(52) An overview of the suggested structure of the review report is in Review of Institutes and Supervisory Centres Guideline, and a review report template is in available online: Review of Institutes and Supervisory Centres - Report Template.

(53) The report will be finalised by the Chair in consultation with the Secretary and the other members of the review committee following the review. The report should be finalised as soon as possible, but normally within two weeks after the conclusion of the review.

(54) Initially, a copy of the review report is sent to the President of the Academic Board for review, to confirm that the report does not disclose any confidential information or include recommendations beyond the scope of the review. If the President has any comments on the report regarding confidentiality concerns or scope, the feedback is sent to the Chair for the review committee's consideration and changes if required. When the President is satisfied that the report does not disclose confidential information and that the scope is correct, copies of the review report are sent to:

a. the Institute Director, for distribution to staff in the institute
b. the supervisor of the institute
c. members of ARRC, in the relevant meeting agenda
d. USET.

Response to the Review Report

(55) The Institute Director is required to provide a response to the recommendations in the review report. The response to the review report includes comments from the supervisor of the institute, relevant implementation strategies and any anticipated challenges to implementation. Wherever possible, the response should also take into consideration alignment of implementation activities with the University's Strategic Plan.

(56) The response should generally be finalised four to six weeks after the Institute Director and supervisor of the institute have received the review report.

(57) Copies of the response are sent to ARRC and the Provost (if not the supervisor of the institute).

(58) ARRC meets with the Provost (or delegate), the ARRC representative on the review committee, the Institute Director and supervisor of the institute (if not the Provost) to discuss the final report and response.

(59) The review report, the institute's response, and the report from ARRC will be considered by USET, particularly to

consider recommendations that may have broader University significance. The review report and comments will then be provided to the Academic Board, prior to being sent to the Vice-Chancellor for approval. An annual report of the key themes arising from reviews throughout the year will be provided by the Academic Board to USET, prior to being submitted to Senate.

(60) Once approved, the review report, together with a composite statement from the Academic Board based on the report from ARRC, is distributed to the Institute Director for dissemination to the institute staff and to the University Senate for noting.

Implementation Process

(61) The Institute Director and the supervisor of the institute are responsible for implementing the adopted recommendations. The Provost may seek advice or raise specific risks with USET at any point during the implementation process. It is expected that stakeholders, including students, are consulted and involved in the implementation of the recommendations.

(62) The Institute Director is required to prepare a twelve-month and a three-year implementation report. These reports should include the initial response to the recommendations, details of the progress made on all of the approved recommendations, and comments from the supervisor of the institute.

(63) ARRC meets with the Provost (or delegate), the ARRC representative on the review committee, the Institute Director and the supervisor of the institute (if not the Provost) to discuss the twelve-month implementation report and prepare a report on its deliberations to the Academic Board.

(64) The three-year implementation report is noted by ARRC. ARRC may refer the implementation report to the Provost, USET, Vice-Chancellor or any relevant person or committee as required.

Section 4 - Roles, Responsibilities and Accountabilities

Chair of the Review Committee

(65) The Chair of the review committee:

a. Liaises with the President of the Academic Board, Provost, supervisor of the institute and Institute Director to discuss issues related to the institute as required;
b. Liaises with the review Secretary to finalise the review timetable and list of interviewees;
c. Is responsible for creating an environment that is conducive to free and open discussion without prejudice to any staff member;
d. During deliberations and interviews, the Chair is responsible for responding to conflict of interest related issues that may arise, such as through the conduct of an in-camera session.
e. Delegates report-writing tasks to review committee members and ensures the penultimate draft report is complete prior to the departure of members;
f. Presents the draft review recommendations to the Institute Director and the supervisor of the institute, President of the Academic Board, Provost (if not the supervisor of the institute) and all institute staff; and
g. Ensures completion of the final version of the report normally within two weeks of the review and finalises the review report.

Review Committee Members

(66) The review committee members:

a. Review all submissions to the review and other review documentation;
b. Liaise with the Secretary to finalise the review timetable and list of interviewees, as required;
c. Participate in scheduled meetings, interviews and other events during the review week; and
d. Assist in the preparation and finalisation of the report as directed by the Chair.

Academic Review and Recruitment Committee Representative

(67) In addition to the responsibilities listed at clause 66, the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee representative on the review committee:

a. Represents the broader interests of the University;
b. At the presentation of the recommendations to the institute, informs the institute about the process following the review;
c. Introduces the discussion on the review report at the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee meeting when the report and response are discussed; and
d. Participates, if available, in the twelve-month implementation discussion at Academic Review and Recruitment Committee and introduces the discussion.

Member from a Cognate Field

(68) In addition to the responsibilities listed at clause 66, the member from a cognate field:

a. Represents the broader interests of the University and provides guidance on University policies, procedures and protocols, based on experience with comparable associated issues (e.g. research impact, resources, external links, research training);
b. Advises the institute on the rationale underlying a recommendation, if clarification is required; and
c. Assists in the preparation of the report as directed by the Chair.

International Contributors

(69) An international contributor is not a member of the review committee, and therefore does not participate in the review committee's deliberations. When an international contributor is asked to participate in a review, the international contributor will:

a. Review the institute's submission to the review;
b. Provide written feedback on the institute's submission, which may include consideration of the institute's global focus or activities, or recommendations for the review committee to consider; and
c. Participate in a meeting with the review committee to discuss their feedback.

Review Committee Secretary

(70) The review committee Secretary plays a key role in the preparation and conduct of the review, and leads the secretariat.

(71) The Secretary is not a member of the review committee, and therefore does not participate in the review committee's deliberations. During the review, the Secretary reports directly to the Chair on all matters relating to the review.

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

(72) The Secretary:

a. Oversees the organisation of interviews and the structure of the review in consultation with the Review Coordinator, Executive Support Officer, the Chair and the President of the Academic Board, and liaises with the review committee members, the supervisor of the institute, Institute Director and interviewees;
b. Provides support for the Chair and review committee members, and provides relevant policy and procedural advice;
c. Facilitates and, where appropriate, undertakes follow-up action arising from review committee meetings;
d. Ensures that recommendations made by the review committee are consistent with University policy and practices and drafted accordingly; and
e. Takes notes during the review proceedings and assists in the drafting of the review report.

Review Coordinator

(73) The Review Coordinator liaises with the President of the Academic Board, the Secretary to Academic Review and Recruitment Committee and the review committee secretary to provide support in the lead up to the review. The Review Coordinator:

a. Confirms that members of the review committee are available to attend the review;
b. Sends advice from ARRC to the Institute Director and the supervisor of the institute on the finalised membership, terms of reference and timing of the institute review;
c. Sends invitations on behalf of the President of the Academic Board to individuals to make written submissions;
d. Disseminates relevant information to the review committee and the review Secretary including the institute's submission and individual submissions;
e. Provides other administrative assistance during the review as required; and
f. Ensures the review report is disseminated as outlined in this Procedure.

Executive Support Officer

(74) The Executive Support Officer in the Academic Board Office provides support to the review committee Secretary in organising elements of the review.

(75) The Executive Support Officer:

a. Liaises with the review committee Secretary regarding scheduling and logistics for the review, including travel, accommodation, catering and dinner meetings;
b. Schedules interviewees from the schedule developed by the review committee Chair and the Secretary;
c. Coordinates and organises any additional documentation requested by the review committee; and
d. Assists the review committee Secretary to undertake follow-up action arising from review committee meetings.

President of the Academic Board

(76) The President of the Academic Board, as the Chair of the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee:

a. Provides advice to USET on review committee membership;
b. Advises the Provost on requests to amend membership, Terms of Reference, and duration of the review;
c. Invites submissions to the review;
d. Receives anonymous submissions for reviews;
e. Participates in an interview with the review committee;
f. Receives the draft report to ensure that confidentiality is maintained and scope of the review is appropriate;

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

g. Presents to USET on Review outcomes; and
h. Provides an annual report to Senate via USET, of the key themes arising from the reviews throughout the year.

Academic Review and Recruitment Committee

(77) The Academic Review and Recruitment Committee:

a. Oversees institute reviews on behalf of Academic Board;
b. In consultation with the supervisor of the institute, makes recommendations to USET on the schedule of reviews;
c. Considers and nominates the membership of review committees, Terms of Reference, review duration for approval by USET;
d. Meets with the Provost (or delegate), the ARRC representative on the review committee, the Institute Director and the supervisor of the institute (if not the Provost) to discuss the final report and response;
e. Provides a report to USET on each review and comments received, particularly to identify recommendations that may have broader university significance;
f. Provides the review report and comments to the Academic Board; and
g. Oversees 12 month and three-year implementation reports and reports to the Academic Board, USET or Provost as required.

Institute Director

(78) The Institute Director:

a. In consultation with the Supervisor of the Institute, makes recommendations to ARRC on the proposed composition of the review committee;
b. Makes recommendations to the Supervisor of the Institute on the invitees to the stakeholder dinner, if held;
c. Oversees preparation of the institute's submission to the review;
d. Provides a response to the recommendations for consideration; and
e. Ensures implementation on approved review responses.

Supervisor of the Institute

(79) The supervisor of the institute is generally the Provost for university-level institutes, or the Executive Dean of the relevant faculty of faculty-level institutes and centres.

(80) For reviews where the Provost is the supervisor of the institute, it is expected that this information will be shared with the review committee and any conflicts of interest be discussed with the Vice-Chancellor (as the line manager) or USET.

(81) The supervisor of the institute:

a. In consultation with the Institute Director, makes recommendations to ARRC on the proposed composition of the review committee;
b. Meets with the review committee prior to the start of the review, on the first day to discuss the institute; towards the end of the review to discuss the draft recommendations; and by request during the review.
c. Hosts the initial dinner for the review committee, held on the evening immediately prior to the start of the review;
d. Approves invitations to, and hosts the stakeholder dinner held during the review;
e. Meets with ARRC regarding the review report; and

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

f. Oversees the implementation and follow up on review recommendations.

University Senior Executive Team

(82) The University Senior Executive Team:

a. Approves the annual schedule of reviews , membership and secretary of review committees;
b. Considers the review report, with comments from the Institute Director, supervisor of the institute and ARRC, with particular attention given to recommendations that raise systemic observations or which have strategic significance for the University; and
c. Addresses University-wide matters that may be identified through the reviews.

(83) Individual members participate in interviews, as appropriate.

Section 5 - Monitoring, Review and Assurance

(84) The Academic Board, through the Academic Review and Recruitment Committee and with support from the Review Coordinator, administers and monitors the cyclical seven-year institute review process. The review process includes iterative liaison with the University Senior Executive Team to ensure alignment of institute reviews with the University's strategic objectives.

(85) Specifically:

a. ARRC reviews and endorses the seven-year institute review schedule, with advice from the supervisors of institutes, annually. The schedule of reviews for the upcoming year is submitted to USET for approval;
b. On the recommendation of the Institute Director, ARRC nominates the review committee members and endorses the terms of reference and the duration of each review, which are submitted to USET for approval.
c. The review report, the institute's response and the report from ARRC are considered by USET, particularly to consider recommendations that may have broader university significance. The review report and comments are provided to the Academic Board, prior to being sent to the Vice-Chancellor for approval;
d. ARRC, with the Provost, monitors the implementation of review recommendations twelve months and three years after approval of the review report by the Vice-Chancellor;
e. USET receives reports on implementation of review recommendations to monitor university-wide and strategic matters.

(86) This Procedure monitored and reviewed by ARRC.

Section 6 - Recording and Reporting

(87) The following reports will be produced as part of the review process:

Report Title	Report Content	Report Producer	Report Recipient
Review report	Recommendations and commendations following the review of the institute.	Review committee	ARRC, Provost, senior executives who were interviewed, Academic Board, Vice-Chancellor, institute staff, all individuals other than institute staff who were interviewed or made a submission

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.

Report Title	Report Content	Report Producer	Report Recipient
Response to the review report	The institute's response to each recommendation in the review report, with implementation strategies.	Institute Director and supervisor of the institute	ARRC, Provost, Academic Board, USET, Vice-Chancellor
ARRC statement on the review	A statement on the review report and post-review discussion held at ARRC.	ARRC secretariat	ARRC, Provost, senior executives who were interviewed, Academic Board, Vice-Chancellor, institute staff, all individuals other than institute staff who were interviewed or made a submission
Twelve-month implementation report	The institute's updated response to each recommendation over the twelve-month time frame, and comments to the extent to which review recommendations have been implemented.	Institute Director and supervisor of the institute	ARRC, Provost, Academic Board, Vice-Chancellor
Three-year implementation report	The institute's updated response to each recommendation over the three-year time frame, and comments to the extent to which review recommendations have been implemented.	Institute Director and supervisor of the institute	ARRC, Academic Board

(88) Records are retained in accordance with UQ's legislative requirements.

Section 7 - Appendix

Definitions

Term	Definition
Online review	A review where all review committee members participate through online meetings. External members (both Australia-based or overseas) do not travel to UQ in order to participate in the review.

Standard Terms of Reference

(89) Standard terms of reference are available on the Academic Board's 'Reviews' website: Standard Terms of Reference for School, Institute, and Supervisory Centre Reviews.

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	12th December 2024
Review Date	12th December 2029
Approval Authority	Vice-Chancellor and President
Approval Date	3rd December 2024
Expiry Date	Not Applicable
Policy Owner	Kathryn Blyth Director, Academic Services Division and Academic Registrar
Enquiries Contact	Academic Services Division

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to refer to The University of Queensland's Policy and Procedure Library for the latest version.