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Significant regulatory changes, aimed at improving students’ experience of Higher Education and ensuring comparability, quality and accountability across the sector.

Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA)

- Registers providers
- Higher Education Standards
- Program focus

*(Similar to the Quality Assurance Council in Hong Kong)*
Griffith University – long history of annual and 5-yearly program reviews.

Issues:

1. policy but no comprehensive framework and process
2. data hard to find and interpret, generally reported at course level rather than program level
Aims:

• To balance the need to ensure program compliance with a rich, meaningful program review process

• To develop staff capacity

• To use a participatory evaluation approach
Project had two inter-related components

1. Program Review Framework
2. Program Review Process
## PROGRAM REVIEW FRAMEWORK

### Scope of the Program Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Source/Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What might be useful to know?</td>
<td>What evidence could be used?</td>
<td>Where is the evidence available?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 Corporate Archives and Records Management Services (CARMSS) - contact your Academic Services Officer (ASO).

### Brief Program Description

- **What are the program level outcomes?**
- **What are the core and elective courses?**
- **What is the capstone course?**
- **Is there an academic plan?**
- **What is the research component of the program?**
- **What are the possible pathways that students can take to progress to the qualification?**

- From courses and program website

- Program Convener

### AQF Level

- **What AQF level does the program fit?**

- Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)

- Program website

- Course profiles

- Review Team to decide

### Annual Monitoring

- **What process is used to review and implement scheduled course and program monitoring?**

- Annual Program Review & Improvement Report (APRIR)

- Program Convener/ASO

---

- 8 suggested Terms of Reference
- Questions to help unpack the ToR
- List of qualitative and quantitative data
- Details of where the data can be found
DEVELOPMENT OF THE FRAMEWORK

Draft Framework
• Review of current practice
• Consultations: *readability, usability, omissions, contradictions*

Trial of Framework & Review Process
• Consultations
• Trial with one program review panel

Revision of Framework & Review Process
• Trial with six program review panels
• Evaluation
Survey and semi-structured interviews with all review panel members.

Findings:

- The Framework is useful in determining what to focus on in review – breadth and depth;
- The Framework questions were valuable to review teams;
- The suggested Terms of Reference for a program review match the requirements for professional accreditation;
- The list of data sources are useful for the collection of information necessary for review;
- The Review Panel Members’ knowledge of and confidence in program review processes increased using the new Program Review Framework; a participatory evaluation approach; and a model review process;

Issues raised: access and accessibility of data for review; and the time and resources required for a rigorous and effective review to occur.
KEY ACHIEVEMENTS

– Development of new, comprehensive data reports for program review.
– Strong partnerships across different elements of the university
– Success of participatory approach
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