



THE UNIVERSITY OF
NOTRE DAME
A U S T R A L I A

POLICY:

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW FRAMEWORK

Purpose:	Sets out the University's approach to institutional reviews
Location of Policy	The policy is maintained on the National Drive.
Responsible Executive:	PVC, Academic
Responsible Office:	Vice Chancellery
Contact Officer:	Director, QMAD
Effective Date:	16 March 2015
Review Date	March 2018
Modification History:	Created: February 2015; Replaces Policy: Course Reviews (June 2009)
Related Documents:	Procedures: Higher Education Course Monitoring, Review and Re-Accreditation; Procedures: School, Office and Research Institute/Centre Reviews; Guidelines: Benchmarking
Authority:	Approved by Vice Chancellor 16/03/2015. Effective From 16/03/2015

1	Purpose	3
2	Definitions	3
3	Scope	3
4	Exclusions	3
5	Principles	3
6	Roles and Responsibilities	5
7	Related Policies	5
8	Supporting procedures and guidelines	6

1 Purpose

- 1.1 The University of Notre Dame Australia (**University**) is committed to achieving quality in all its activities, and to meeting relevant standards and compliance obligations. Systematic quality assurance processes, including formal review processes, are an important part of the University's improvement and compliance strategies.
- 1.2 This policy outlines principles for institutional review processes and clarifies the responsibilities and accountabilities of staff in these processes.

2 Definitions

For the purposes of this Policy, the following definitions apply:

Institutional Review Framework: Institutional review processes cover organisational units (Schools and Offices), Research Institutes/Centres, courses, committees, or other operations that have implications or relevance across the University or across more than one organisational unit. Processes include systematic monitoring and reporting of outcomes and clear accountabilities and responsibilities for review processes and for implementing review outcomes.

Quality Assurance processes and activities that ensure specified expectations and standards of performance and outcomes are met and enhanced where feasible

3 Scope

This policy applies to all areas of the University.

4 Exclusions

This Framework does not apply to the Board of Trustees, Board of Directors, Board of Governors or any of their sub-committees or standing committees.

5 Principles

- 5.1 The University's institutional review framework supports:
- 5.1.1 evaluation of institutional performance, ensuring outcomes support the achievement of the University's Objects and strategic goals;
 - 5.1.2 improvement of operations and service effectiveness; and
 - 5.1.3 assurance that the University meets relevant standards, external reference points and compliance obligations, including:

- (i) the *Higher Education Standards Framework*;
- (ii) the *Australian Qualifications Framework*;
- (iii) the *National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training for Overseas Students* made under the *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000*;
- (iv) the *VET Quality Framework*;
- (v) the *Higher Education Support Act 2003* and related Guidelines;
- (vi) the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research*
- (vii) relevant benchmarks for disciplines, professional standards and accreditation processes and codes of practice that apply to specific activities.

5.2 The University's institutional review framework takes into account the following principles:

- 5.2.1 independent – supporting informed management decisions
- 5.2.2 fit for purpose – tailored processes that take account of context and need, and to best support improvement in the University's performance against strategic goals and regulatory provisions
- 5.2.3 transparent – clear and understood Terms of Reference and process
- 5.2.4 evidence based – using data and information from a range of sources, and including comparative data where available
- 5.2.5 rigorous – thorough processes designed to achieve maximum positive impact, tracking of outcomes, and support for implementation
- 5.2.6 efficient – timely and cost effective, including in the use of staff time and avoidance of duplication of effort where possible
- 5.2.7 integrated – cohesive planning, budget and risk processes as far as practicable
- 5.2.8 risk based – focused on known or potential areas of risk to achievement of strategic goals.

5.3 Community and stakeholder expectations and feedback are taken into account in all institutional review processes.

5.4 Systematic monitoring and reporting processes are part of each review process to support a cycle of continuous improvement.

5.5 The Institutional Review Framework includes formal review processes covering:

- 5.5.1 schools, offices (that is, non-academic organisational units) and Research Institutes
- 5.5.2 course quality and performance
- 5.5.3 governance committee effectiveness, informed by self-assessment and review of currency and ongoing appropriateness of Terms of Reference and composition.

- 5.6 Reporting, evaluation and other quality assurance processes to inform and support institutional review processes and assist in performance improvement include:
- 5.6.1 systematic collection, reporting and response to student feedback, including student evaluation of teaching and unit content
 - 5.6.2 regular formal monitoring and reporting of research, research training outcomes research supervision performance, and research student progress
 - 5.6.3 systematic processes for risk and compliance to support consistent and effective identification, management and reporting of risks
 - 5.6.4 comparison of performance outcomes and/or processes through benchmarking activities and use of comparative data.
- 5.7 Roles and responsibilities for institutional review processes are outlined in delegation schedules, relevant policies and procedures and duty statements.

6 Roles and Responsibilities

Deans manage review processes involving courses within their school or their school in accordance with provisions of relevant procedures or guidelines

Executive Directors/Heads of Offices/Directors manage review processes involving their area in accordance with provisions of relevant procedures or guidelines

Head of Campus provides leadership and guidance for review processes in accordance with relevant procedures.

QMAD provides support for review processes in accordance with relevant procedures, and provides relevant student evaluation and other data to inform review processes

University Statistics and Reporting, in conjunction with QMAD, provides relevant data to inform course review processes

Vice Chancellor (or delegate) approves policies, procedures, guidelines and delegation schedules relevant to the Institutional Review Framework as well as the schedule and timing for course reviews; and the schedule, timing, Terms of Reference and scope for reviews of schools, offices or Research Institutes.

7 Related Policies

Policy: Student Feedback

Policy: Course Approval, Amendment, Monitoring, Review, Re-accreditation and Discontinuation

Policy: Benchmarking

8 Supporting procedures and guidelines

Procedure: Risk Management

Procedure: Course Monitoring, Review and Re-Accreditation

Procedure: School, Office and Research Institute/Centre Reviews

Procedures: Benchmarking

Guidelines: Course Reviews

Guidelines: Course Monitoring

Guidelines: (VET) Course Approval, Amendment, Review and Discontinuance