Griffith UNIVERSITY

Framework for Program Review

Approving authority	Director, Learning Futures
Approval date	19 December 2018
Advisor	Program and Teaching Quality, Learning Futures | jude.williams@griffith.edu.au | (07) 373 55998
Next scheduled review	2024
Document URL	http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/Framework for Program Review.pdf
TRIM document	2018/9005185
Description	The Framework for Program Review (Framework) is designed to support the review panel and stakeholders as they discuss their experiences of the program and gather and analyse data to inform their decisions about its future.

Related documents

Program Approval and Review
Program Review Template
Graduate Research – Good Practice Principles

The Framework for Program Review (Framework) is designed to support the review panel and stakeholders as they discuss their experiences of the program and gather and analyse data to inform their decisions about its future.

- The Framework lists terms of reference that are typical of those written by review panels at the start of the review process.

- As the terms of reference are generally broad, the Framework also outlines aspects of a program (related to each term of reference) that may be considered when evaluating how well the program is performing and meeting regulatory requirements. These aspects are referred to as criteria.

- It is anticipated that each review panel may add to or amend the terms of reference and the list of criteria to reflect the specific circumstances of a particular program, for example, in programs that have specific professional accreditation requirements or characteristics that may change the focus of review.

- The criteria have been written with the Higher Education Standards Framework (2015) in mind and show how the review panel might use data to demonstrate the program's compliance with national regulatory standards. An overview of the relationship between the higher education standards (italics) and the Framework's criteria is as follows:

Standard 3.1 Course Design

- Continued relevance and fit for purpose
- Currency and appropriateness of program content and structure
- Annual Monitoring

Standard 3.2 Staffing, Standard 3.3 Learning Resources and Educational Support, & Standard 4.2 Research Training

- Viability and sustainability
- Learning environment (including physical resources)

Standard 1.1 Admission

- Student participation and achievement (enrolments, progression, retention, outcomes, employment)

Standard 1.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment

- Learning outcomes – student achievement

- Quality of assessment
- Program Leadership
- Staff quality/characteristics
- Quality of teaching

Standard 5.3 Monitoring, Review and Improvement

- Relevance and effectiveness of the program for stakeholders
- Results of internal or external benchmarking activities
- Other issues of particular relevance to a program

- The first column of the Framework contains typical terms of reference that have been developed and used by previous review panels at Griffith University.

- The second column provides the list of criteria and a series of questions designed to prompt discussions among stakeholders about how well the program is performing. These questions are not a checklist.

- In the third column there appears, where appropriate, a list of evidence that may be useful in discussions about program performance. This list is not exhaustive and review panels may decide they need to gather additional information from a broader range of sources

- The fourth column of the Framework indicates where the information is available or who is responsible for providing the information. The cells in the fourth column that are shaded grey indicate that the data will be automatically generated through the Planning and Statistics Portal and reported as pre-populated data in a program review portfolio.

- The Terms of Reference for your Program review should be framed from the following criteria to reflect the findings of the initial program assessment. Choose one or more Terms of Reference (1-9) from the table.

Scope of the Program Review What are the Terms of Reference?	Questions What might be useful to know?	Evidence What evidence could be used?	Source/ Responsibility Where is the evidence available?
Program design is appropriate and consistent with relevant external professional accreditation bodies and the Australian Qualifications Framework			
1. Assess the program's continued relevance and fit for purpose	**History of the program**		
	What was the program rationale? What was the market need and fit to Group Program Profile?	The original program proposal (Part 1 and Part 2, section 1).	This is available in Records Services- contact your Academic Services Consultant (ASC)
	Brief program description		
	What AQF level does the program fit? What are the program level outcomes? What are the core and elective courses? What are the capstone courses? Is there an academic plan? What is the research component of the program? What are the	Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) Programs Committee approved Program Learning Outcomes From courses and program website Course profiles	Program Director

	possible pathways that students can take to progress to the qualification?		
	Annual monitoring		
	What process is used to review and implement scheduled course and program monitoring? What changes have been made to the program since inception/last review? What were the reasons for these changes? Has there been a tracking or evaluation of the impact of these changes? What have been the impacts of these changes? Is information about the program up to date?	Documents on minor and major changes submitted to Programs Committee. Number, type and scope of changes proposed and implemented	Program Director/ASC
	What was the result of the last accreditation review/visit (if applicable)? Were there recommendations? Were the recommendations enacted? What was the outcome? Is the program aligned to the profession's stated meta values?	Survey of stakeholders' experiences of the program Comprehensive program mapping Conference presentation Program award application Shortlists for awards	Review team to decide
Program resourcing and information is adequate			
	Student demand		
2. Assess the viability and sustain-ability of the program	What is the number of current enrolments? What is the enrolment trend over 5 years?	Student load – current and over past 5 years	Planning and Statistics Portal
	What are the characteristics of the students of this program?	Student Profile data (current cohort and trend over past 5 years)(gender, age, Socio-Economic Status (SES), ethnicity, educational background) Proportion of load from Queensland/ interstate / international	Planning and Statistics Portal
	What is the demand in the market for this program relative to competitors offering like qualifications in the same Field of Education?	Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre (QTAC) demand: 1st preferences % of 1st preferences in Field of Education (FOE) (market perception indicator) – 6 digit FOE detail (proposed new) 1-6 preference numbers (proposed new) Program Ranking based on preference (provide a rank	Planning and Statistics Portal

	ordered list to show % of market) (proposed new)	
What proportion of students expressing an initial interest and obtaining an offer go on to enrol?	Offer → acceptance → enrolment ratios and numbers	Planning and Statistics Portal

Teaching and Learning are of high quality		
Staff quality/characteristics		
Do staff possess the appropriate levels of qualifications and expertise to teach this program? Do they possess current knowledge of their discipline and have an understanding of pedagogical and/or adult learning principles?	Staff Profile Numbers of teaching staff, their qualifications, expertise, awards and grants in Learning and Teaching (L&T) Number of teaching staff who are fellows of the Higher Education Academy	Review team to decide
Are academic staff equipped to design and deliver online courses?	Staff Profile	Review Team to decide
Are staff teaching a post-graduate program actively carrying out research, publishing in the relevant discipline area and appropriately supervising students in scholarly pursuits and research?	Academic publications and Higher Degree (HDR) supervision Staff Profile	Review Team to decide
Compliance and risk		
Does the program comply with professional body accreditation requirements? Have risks been identified, considered and minimised, i.e. reliance on third parties to deliver the program, high reliance on casual teaching staff, high students – teaching staff ratio, declining admissions standards, student complaints?	When was the last accreditation approved? What progress has been made on accreditation requirements?	Program Director
Program leadership		
How do program directors communicate with program services officers, course convenors, Deans (L&T), Head of School and year level coordinators and students about aspects of the program and its design, including moderation procedures and ensuring consistent and appropriate assessment?		Program Director

Admission criteria are appropriate			
	Admission		
3. **Assess the program's performance in terms of student participation and achievement**	Are the admission criteria for the program appropriate, take account of external benchmarks and ensure that students have adequate prior knowledge and skills to undertake the course of study successfully?	Alignment with Undergraduate Programs Admission Policy. Alignment with Postgraduate Programs Admission Policy	Program Directors
	Orientation and transfer		
	What strategies are in place for supporting, inducting and "connecting with" new students to this program?	Preparation and orientations; connection and engagement; learning and pastoral support	Review team to consider
	Progression and retention		
	What is the retention rate for the program? At what points does student attrition from the program occur? What strategies have been used to date to enhance student retention?	Overall Retention Retention First Year to Second Year % Retained (new) In Program Retention for target groups (low SES), indigenous etc) At Griffith (trended) Program completion rate Program performance indicators in the Planning and Statistics Portal	Program Director Review Team to consider Planning and Statistics Portal
Assessment is effective and expected student learning outcomes are achieved			
	Learning outcomes - student achievement		
	What is the GPA and failure rate of students in each year of the program (current and for the past 5 years)?		Planning and Statistics Portal
	How does the program ensure equivalent student learning outcomes regardless of a student's place or mode of study? (as applicable)		Review Team to consider
	Are program level learning outcomes achieved and the standard of achievement moderated?	Innovative Research Universities (IRU) Calibration project data	Review team to decide
	Are students obtaining generic employability skills as a consequence of their studies? How do the Program Learning Outcomes align with the Griffith Graduate Attributes?	Generic Skills	Review team to consider Planning and Statistics Portal
	What level of employment (FT/PT/Seeking FT) are students gaining after graduating?	Graduate Destination Survey (GDS) - Graduate Success Griffith Destination graph Graduate Experience	Planning and Statistics Portal

	Are they going on to further study (in like FOE or different FOEs)?		
Program monitoring			
4. Examine the learning environment in which the program is offered	Are there sufficient resources to meet the demand for the program?	Student and staff Feedback Employer/Industry feedback Learning and Teaching Consultants (Curriculum)	Review Team to decide
	Do students have access to adequate IT, electronic or physical library and information sources, and specialist equipment in order to achieve the program's learning outcomes and ensure program quality?	Student Feedback	Review Team to decide
	What processes are used to ensure cross-campus consistency and equivalence of student experience (where applicable)?		Program Director
	What impact, if any, are staff-student ratios having on student experience, learning and satisfaction? What strategies are in place to address issues identified?	Student:Staff Ratio Student feedback	Program Director to discuss with Group Learning and Teaching Consultants (Design)
5. Evaluate the currency and appropriateness of the program content and structure	Does the program: • provide students with the opportunity to develop the knowledge, skills and application of knowledge appropriate for its AQF level • link theory to practice? • ensure that course and program level outcomes can be assessed and attained? • provide a developmental sequence in student's learning? • draw from current and emerging knowledge in one or more disciplines and include relevant theoretical frameworks and research findings? • have gaps or repetition in program content? • take into consideration entry and exit pathways, including articulation from other studies and to further studies? • ensure the development of the Griffith Graduate Attributes?	Student feedback Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) /Student Experience of Course (SEC) qualitative comments SEC/SET data Mapping from the Course Profile system CEQ data and comments Survey of stakeholders' experiences of the program	Program Director

	How has the program been 'internationalised'?		
	Do undergraduate programs provide students with the opportunity to complete at least one of the following units of study: work integrated learning, service learning, a research project/practicum, or an international study experience?		
	Have appropriate career and employment content been embedded in the program?		
	Has the program been designed so that it can be studied online, on-campus or flexibly with a mix of modes?		Review Team to decide
6. Evaluate the quality of teaching	What is the quality of the teaching across the courses of the program? Are industry personnel invited to speak/participate in the delivery of the program as and when appropriate? What is the level of student satisfaction with the teaching quality? Are the teaching strategies adopted for the delivery of online courses appropriate for this mode of delivery? Does the program meet Griffith's good practice standards for online teaching and learning?	Good Teaching Scale Peer enhancement of teaching and Learning (PETAL), International Student Barometer (ISB) (teaching) Overall SEC score patterns University Experience Survey (UES) Teaching Quality scale	Planning and Statistics Portal
			Group Learning and Teaching Consultants (Design)
	Are there processes in place to enable teaching staff to take note of and where appropriate act on student feedback of their teaching?	Low SEC score strategy (institution wide)	Program Director
	How is technology used in the program to enable learning?		Group Learning and Teaching Consultants (Design) Program Director
	How do the learning and teaching strategies support students to attain program learning outcomes?		Review team to consider
	Are academic staff reasonably available for students seeking academic assistance?	CEQ qualitative comments SEC qualitative comments	Program Director
	What arrangements are in place to assure the quality of student work placements, practicum and other forms of work-integrated		Group Learning and Teaching Consultants

	learning in the course of study, including assuring the quality of supervision?		(Curriculum)Program Director
7. Evaluate the quality of assess-ment	Are assessment tasks appropriate for validly assessing the attainment of program and course level learning outcomes?	Curriculum mapping	Review Team to decide
	How are Griffith Graduate Attributes being assessed?	Review course profile system information	Program Director
	Is there an appropriate timing and spread of assessment across courses in the program?	Review course profile system information	Program Director
	Are opportunities for formative assessment available?	Review course profile system information	Program Director
	How is assessment moderated within courses across the program?	Feedback from Course Convenors, SEC data and comments, CEQ comments	Program Director
	Is the assessment designed and conducted by appropriately qualified academic staff, and timely, adequate feedback is provided to students on their assessed work?		
8. Evaluate the relevance and effective-ness of the program for stake-holders	What are the students' perceptions of the learning outcomes from the program (both generic and discipline-specific)?	CEQ qualitative comments Industry advisory group feedback and/or	Planning and Statistics Portal
	What do major employer stakeholders think about the program? What do past graduates think of the program? What are the views of the teaching staff about this program? What do other stakeholders think about the program? Eg, clinical staff, consumers, professional bodies.	Employer feedback / survey GDS, CEQ Alumni feedback survey Teaching staff feedback	Review team to consider
9. Other Terms of Reference			