



**THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND**
AUSTRALIA

Reviews of Schools

REVIEW PROCESS

MAY 2009

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. Introduction..... | 2 |
| 2. Pre-review process | 2 |
| 2.1 Timetable | 2 |
| 3. Conduct of the Review..... | 3 |
| 3.1 Initial briefings..... | 3 |
| 3.2 Committee considerations | 3 |
| 3.3 Visits to facilities | 4 |
| 3.4 Formulating recommendations | 4 |
| 3.5 Preparing and finalising the review report..... | 5 |
| 4. Post-review process..... | 5 |
| 4.1 Implementation | 6 |
| 4.2 6-month implementation plan..... | 6 |
| 4.3 18-month implementation report | 6 |
| Appendix 1: Review Week – Proposed (Broad Model)..... | 7 |
| Appendix 2: Review Week Timetable – Example..... | 8 |
| Appendix 3: Timelines..... | 11 |
| Appendix 4: Sample Questions | 13 |
| Appendix 5: Review Report Template | 17 |

1. Introduction

School reviews are governed by HUPP 1.40.2 – *Review of Schools and Academic Disciplines*.

The purpose of this document is to provide information regarding the school review process to review committees and schools preparing for the review. Reviews are conducted by Academic Board Standing Committee under delegated authority from the Academic Board.

The purpose of school reviews is to:

achieve improvement in the academic performance of a school and its constituent disciplines through a process of self-assessment, benchmarking, critical reflection, forward planning and peer review. Reviews provide the catalyst for a continuing cycle of development and improvement with a view to adopting good practice by international standards.

The terms of reference of the school review are determined by Academic Board Standing Committee in consultation with the Senior Executive, following receipt of recommendations from the relevant Executive Dean and Head of School. The general terms of reference are outlined in the policy statement.

2. Pre-review process

The pre-review period includes the time between notification of the review and the review itself.

Approximately 12 months prior to the review, the Head of School and other senior members of the school attend a workshop presented by the President of the Academic Board.

The Academic Board Standing Committee member briefs the school's staff on the review procedure at an open meeting approximately six months prior to the review.

The Academic Board Standing Committee representatives and internal members of the review committee meet approximately two weeks prior to the review to decide on interviews and the structure of the review.

2.1 Timetable

The timetable for the review week is developed by the Secretary to the review committee in consultation with the Chair and the President of the Academic Board.

While noting the importance of interviewing relevant persons with respect to issues arising in the review, some limitation should be placed on the number of people interviewed so that repetition is avoided. Interviews should not crowd the program so that insufficient time is available for discussion by the committee. Scheduled opportunities to discuss issues that arise during interviews should be incorporated into the review program. It is not necessary that discussion occur only at the beginning and end of the day. There should also be sufficient time available in the program to enable further discussion with those already interviewed, if required.

Notwithstanding, the review timetable should ensure that adequate opportunity is provided in the early part of the review week for all sections of the school - academic, research and general staff, postgraduate and undergraduate students - to express their views candidly to the full committee or to individual committee members if desired.

Interviews with representatives of professional and other external bodies should be arranged. There will also be an opportunity to hold informal discussions with employer and other professional groups (for schools that prepare graduates for entry into an identifiable profession) in joint session over dinner during the review week.

Appendix 1 contains a summary of review week events and suggested days for these to occur. An example timetable template is provided in Appendix 2. A timeline of the entire review process is included in Appendix 3.

3. Conduct of the Review

The purpose of this section is to assist the Chair, members of the review committee and the review committee Secretary with the conduct of school reviews.

The review committee's task is to provide an objective view of the school's perceptions and plans developed through the self-assessment process, and either confirm or recommend changes to those plans. The review committee is expected to give detailed feedback to the school on how and where its perceptions and plans fall short in meeting performance targets.

3.1 Initial briefings

On the first day of the review, the President of the Academic Board welcomes members and clarifies their roles. In addition, the committee will meet with the Vice-Chancellor and the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor to discuss specific issues relevant to the school. The first day also includes interviews with the Executive Dean and Head of School about the issues in relation to the school under review and strategic directions for the faculty.

The second day of the review will include interviews with other members of the University's senior management, such as the Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the Pro Vice-Chancellor, and Dean of the UQ Graduate School.

3.2 Committee considerations

The review committee considers the submission prepared by the school, together with other submissions made by interested persons and organisations, and consults with University staff, students and other persons as deemed appropriate, through interviews.

Schools are provided with detailed guidelines to ensure that submissions supply review committees with information about the school that is accurate, focused, comprehensive and consistent; and review committees are urged to use these same guidelines to assess the school.

Following perusal of the school submission and interviews with the Senior Executive officers, the committee should determine whether there are additional questions to be asked relevant to the review so that the terms of reference are addressed fully. The committee should also identify those areas where answers to relevant questions are not to be found within the submitted material and determine how best to obtain that information (e.g. interviews, visits, records, direct requests to the school, etc.).

A sample of questions that the review committee might consider is at Appendix 4.

3.3 Visits to facilities

Brief visits to, and inspection of, school facilities should be included in the program to provide the opportunity to clarify or to illustrate points made in the submissions. Where schools are multi-sited, the use of technologies such as teleconferencing should be considered. An alternative is for the internal members to visit the facilities and include a report to the full committee if required.

3.4 Formulating commendations and recommendations

It is anticipated that the committee will develop commendations and recommendations progressively throughout the review.

Commendations should be made in those areas where the school has achieved outstanding outcomes, or has made significant progress towards doing so.

In formulating its recommendations, the committee should take account of the resource constraints facing the University and its collective goals and objectives, as expressed in its Strategic Plan and as advised by the President and the Senior Executive.

All review recommendations, and particularly those proposing significant change or that impact on other organisational units, University rules or policies, are to be well argued, and supported by the facts/evidence from the submissions and interviews that led to their proposal.

Recommendations should not be directed toward senior officers of the University or to the University itself. They must be directed toward the Head of School so that it is clear how the school should proceed.

Every effort should be made to ensure that statements in the report are factually correct. Review committees are encouraged to include time-frames for the implementation of recommendations.

Prior to the finalisation of the recommendations -

- the Head of School meets with the review committee so that the Head has the opportunity to respond to the recommendations before they are made public; at the same time, the Head should be advised to communicate with individual staff who might be significantly affected by individual recommendations; and
- the recommendations are presented to the President of the Academic Board and the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, usually over lunch on the Thursday of the review week.

The draft final recommendations are presented to a full meeting of the school on the last day to provide a general overview of the findings from the review and an outline of the recommendations.

The presentation needs to take account of the fact that school staff are likely to be anxious to receive the report at the culmination of a possibly stressful week. The Chair needs to ensure that the school is not alienated, and that concerns are allayed, and not aroused, by a willingness to clarify issues but not enter into a debate.

At the same time, the Academic Board Standing Committee member should take the opportunity to inform the school staff about the process subsequent to the departure of the review team; touching on the time-frame for completion of the report; opportunity for the school's consideration and response; the deliberative process in the Standing Committee and the passage of the report through the Academic Board to Senate; and the implementation and follow-up process.

All review committee members should attend the school presentation and, wherever possible, visual aids should be used to facilitate the presentation.

3.5 Preparing and finalising the review report

The review report is prepared by the members of the review committee with support from the Secretary. The Chair should discuss with members the division of responsibility for drafting individual sections of the report.

It is expected that a penultimate draft of the report will be completed prior to the departure of the external committee members from the University.

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

Appendix 1 to the review report should contain a list of names of all individuals who made written submissions to the review committee and all those interviewed by the review committee. An exception to this requirement is for students - names are not listed for either postgraduate or undergraduate students. The number of students in each category who were interviewed or made a submission is sufficient. Written submissions are not included in the report.

The report consists of the following sections –

- Membership of the Review Committee
- Terms of Reference
- Procedures
- Summary of Commendations and Recommendations
- Report of the Review Committee.

There is no mandatory format for the section "Report of the Review Committee". One possible format is to organise the report around the major themes on which the committee wishes to make recommendations. Another option is to arrange the contents as follows –

- Education
- Discovery
- Engagement
- Internationalisation
- Equity
- Governance
- Space and Facilities
- Business and Finance.

Other appendices follow, if required.

A review report template based on this second format option is at Appendix 5.

4. Post-review process

The final report is sent to the Head of School for distribution to staff in the school. A copy of the final report is sent to members of the Vice-Chancellor's Executive and to the Academic Board Standing Committee.

The Head of School then prepares a written response and submits it to Academic Board Standing Committee via the office of the Executive Dean within four weeks of having received the final report. Standing Committee discusses the final report together with the written response. As part of its deliberations, Standing Committee will interview the Head of School and the Executive Dean, together with the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and other members of the Senior Executive as required.

Standing Committee prepares a report to the Academic Board to accompany the review report. The review report, the school's response, and the report from Standing Committee, are then considered by Academic Board for forwarding to the University's Senate.

4.1 Implementation

Academic Board Standing Committee monitors the implementation process. The Head of School is responsible for implementation of the recommendations in consultation with the Executive Dean.

Anticipated challenges for the implementation of any recommendation should be included in the Head of School's response to the review recommendations.

4.2 6-month implementation plan

Academic Board Standing Committee may request the development of a 6-month implementation plan for some or all of the review recommendations, to be submitted to the President of the Academic Board through the office of the Executive Dean within six months of Senate approval of the report.

Implementation plans are required where the review recommendations:

- involve significant activity (e.g. comprehensive curriculum review, extensive school reorganisation/restructure, etc.);
- involve major cross-school or cross-faculty liaison;
- are contentious for any reason; and/or
- might require modification in light of anticipated developments in the school/faculty/University.

The 6-month implementation plan is a working document that assists the school with the development of strategies and realistic time-frames to ensure the effective implementation of review recommendations.

4.3 18-month implementation report

The Head of School and Executive Dean must prepare an implementation report on progress made on all of the recommendations, to be submitted to the President of the Academic Board within 18 months of Senate approval of the report. It is expected that all stakeholders, including students, are consulted and involved in the implementation of the recommendations.

Submission of an 18-month implementation report is a mandatory requirement of the post-review implementation process for all schools. This report will be more detailed than an implementation plan. All recommendations are to be addressed.

The implementation report allows Standing Committee to compare the response to each recommendation over the 18-month time-frame and assess more effectively the extent to which review recommendations have been implemented.

Appendix 1: Review Week – Proposed (Broad Model)

Sunday evening

- dinner for all members of the review committee and the secretary to discuss review issues and orient external members to University procedures and protocols

Monday morning

- welcome by the President of the Academic Board
- interviews with the Vice-Chancellor and Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor
- interview with the Executive Dean about the procedures and protocols of the University, including its academic organisational structure and resource allocation processes
- interview with the Head of School

Monday afternoon

- interviews with academic, general and research staff, representatives of professional and other external bodies, and undergraduate and postgraduate students

Tuesday morning

- interviews with Deputy Vice-Chancellors, the Pro Vice-Chancellor, and the Dean of the UQ Graduate School

Tuesday afternoon

- visit to school, inspection of school facilities, informal gathering to meet all school staff

Wednesday

- meeting with Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor in the morning to discuss issues to date
- report writing to commence
- industry dinner in the evening for all review committee members and representatives of professional bodies and employer groups

Thursday

- report writing, outstanding/unscheduled interviews
- meeting with Executive Dean to discuss feasibility of draft recommendations
- meeting with President of the Academic Board and Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor over lunch to present draft recommendations

Friday morning

- report writing
- meeting with Head of School to present draft recommendations

Friday afternoon

- preparation for presentation to school
- presentation of draft recommendations to all school staff at the school – all review committee members to be in attendance
- finalisation of report in penultimate draft form

Appendix 2: Review Week Timetable – Example



THE UNIVERSITY OF QUEENSLAND

Review of the School of X – Schedule – Confidential Venue/s:

MORNING

| TIME | MONDAY | TUESDAY | WEDNESDAY | THURSDAY | FRIDAY |
|------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|----------------|---|
| 8.15am | Convene | Convene | Convene | Convene | Convene |
| 8.30 9.00 | President of the Academic Board | Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International) | Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor to discuss issues to date | | |
| 9.00 9.30 | Vice-Chancellor | Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) | research & technical general staff | | Report writing – draft recommendations to be completed |
| 9.30 10.00 | Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor | Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) | administrative staff | | |
| 10.00 10.15 | MORNING TEA | MORNING TEA | MORNING TEA | MORNING TEA | MORNING TEA |
| 10.15 | Head of School | Dean, UQ Graduate School | | | |
| 10.45 | | Pro Vice-Chancellor [where relevant] | Report writing | Report writing | Head of School to discuss draft recommendations [could also be on Thursday) |
| 11.15 11.45 | Executive Dean | new academic & research staff | | | finalise wording of recommendations |
| 12.00 12.15pm | | female staff | | | |

AFTERNOON

| TIME | MONDAY | TUESDAY | WEDNESDAY | THURSDAY | FRIDAY |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| 12.30 12.45 | LUNCH | LUNCH with School | LUNCH | LUNCH with President of the Academic Board and Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor to discuss draft recommendations | LUNCH |
| 1.00 1.15 | | | | | |
| 1.30 1.45 | | Tour of school facilities/discussion time | Discussion | Report writing | Prepare for presentation to School |
| 2.00 2.15 | | | | | |
| 2.30 2.45 | centre directors | | | | |
| 3.00 3.15 | professors | | | | |
| 3.30 3.45 | AFTERNOON TEA | AFTERNOON TEA | AFTERNOON TEA | AFTERNOON TEA | AFTERNOON TEA |
| 4.00 4.15 | academic staff | international directors/coordinators | | | Finalise draft report |
| 4.30 4.45 | meeting with undergraduate students | meeting with postgraduate students | | | |
| 5.00 5.30 | | | Industry Dinner (~7:00 pm) | | |

Review committee dinner on Sunday evening: venue, parking, phone number, booked in name of "xxxx".

Industry dinner on Wednesday evening: Sylvia Jones Boardroom, Customs House, 399 Queen Street, City.

Appendix 3: Timeline

Timeline of major events

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 12 months prior to review | ● | School notified of date of review |
| | I | |
| | I | Two-day School Retreat held to discuss key review issues |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| 7 months | ● | Head of School coordinates preparation of School's submission |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| 6 weeks | ● | School's submission finalised |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| | ● | Review conducted |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| 2 weeks after review | ● | Review report completed |
| | I | |
| 6 weeks | ● | School's written response to report completed |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| | ● | Review report and School's response considered by Academic Board Standing Committee, Academic Board and Senate. Review report approved by Senate. |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| 6 months after Senate approval of report | ● | School submits 6-month implementation plan (if requested) |
| | I | |
| | I | |
| 18 months after Senate approval of report | ● | School submits 18-month implementation report (mandatory) |

Timeline in detail

| 12 months prior to School Review | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | Workshop for Heads of School and key administrative staff conducted by President of Academic Board |
| | Academic Board Standing Committee representative on review committee briefs schools' staff on review process |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Two-day Retreat held to discuss the school's Operational Plan and key review issues/priorities (to include address by President of Academic Board) |
| | Detailed minutes from the Retreat used as ongoing reference during preparations |
| | Determine benchmark universities and contact them for data |
| | Check iCEVALs and TEVAL data will be available |
| 10 - 11 months prior to School Review | |
| | Check that preparation process is progressing as planned (e.g. consultative committees are meeting) |
| | Head of School to commence meeting with school and outside groups/stakeholders who are likely to be interviewed to discuss relevant issues (e.g. RHD students; Level A staff...) |
| 9 months prior to School Review | |
| | Explore in depth key issues for growth or change |
| | Meet with other relevant schools to discuss their submission to the School's Review |
| 7 months prior to School Review | |
| | Head of School prepares review document template and nominates relevant staff to coordinate/write sections of the document |
| | Collection of data for relevant section-coordinator undertaken by administrative staff |
| | Section-coordinators meet with committees/groups to allocate writing of subsections where required |
| | Academic staff to focus research discussions on past strengths and future directions |
| | Data from academic staff (e.g. awards, editorial boards) provided to review document section-coordinators |
| 6 – 2 months prior to School Review | |
| | Intensive writing period of the review documents sections |
| | Collating of draft sections by section heads |
| | Draft sections sent to external editor |
| | Overwriting of draft sections by Head of School |
| | Commence final publishing layout of review document |
| | Head of School to commence final writing and editing of review document |
| | Drafts of particular sections sent to Executive Dean for feedback, as required |

| Week prior to School Review | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| | Head of School to meet with potential interview groups to explain review process and purpose of their meeting with review committee |
| | Plan review committee's visit to school and tour of facilities |
| | Arrange catering for review committee's visit to school |
| | Head of School to meet with senior staff to confirm school's key messages |
| Week of the School Review | |
| | Schedule feedback meetings for staff interviewees with Head of School and relevant colleagues |
| | Head of School and School Manager to keep diaries clear for the week and be ready to assist as required |
| Post-Review | |
| | Review committee to finalise review report within two weeks of the review |
| | Copy of report sent to Head of School for preparation of school's written response (this is expected to be completed within four weeks of receipt of the report.) |
| | The review report, the school's response together with comments from the Executive Dean is forwarded to the next meeting of Academic Board Standing Committee (the Head of School and Executive Dean attend the meeting to discuss the review recommendations) |
| | The review report, together with Standing Committee's comments are submitted to the Academic Board and then submitted to Senate for approval. |
| | Once review report is approved by Senate, the report becomes a public document. |
| | A 6-month implementation plan may be requested by Standing Committee addressing some (or all) of the recommendations (submitted to Standing Committee 6 months after approval by Senate) |
| | An 18-month implementation report is required for all reviews (submitted to Standing Committee 18 months after approval by Senate) |

Appendix 4: Sample Questions

The following list includes areas which might be explored.

1. Curriculum and teaching

- How successfully does the school cover the major areas of its discipline/s?
- To what extent do programs meet expressed demand: by students; and by professions?
- How do programs compare with those of a similar nature throughout the state and Australia in terms of: undergraduate and postgraduate offerings; quality of students enrolling (e.g. OP/rank entry score); and employment of graduates?
- What procedures does the school have in place for regular review of its programs?
- What are the findings of previous curriculum review processes?
- What developments have occurred in the discipline/s during the past seven years?
- How have these developments been reflected in the programs/courses offered by the school?
- How does the school's future planning take into account current community needs?
- To what extent have the new developments been encouraged/supported by the faculty/University?
- What demands are made on the school for the offering of compulsory courses for specific disciplines?
- Is the school able to satisfy these demands in an effective manner and, if not, what factors prevent it from doing so?
- What is the balance of offerings between courses which are compulsory for one or more disciplines and electives?
- Does the school have appropriate and adequate liaison with schools for which it provides compulsory courses, and with relevant outside bodies?
- What demands are made by external authorities responsible for the registration and/or recognition of the professional qualifications awarded by the University?
- What contribution is made to continuing education, professional or otherwise, and how is it rewarded?
- What attempt is made to meet the intellectual and cultural needs of society?
- What innovative teaching methods are employed?
- How does the school promote and reward excellence in teaching?
- What arrangements does the school have for regular review of all courses?
- How does the school use such reviews to improve the quality of its courses and its teaching?
- What teaching and learning facilities are available to students?
- Is there a sustained pattern of demand for the programs offered by the school?
- Is there a sustained pattern of demand or lack of demand for any of the courses offered by the school?
- Are the enrolment patterns consistent with continued viability of the School?
- Does the school have, or does it need, a program for effective recruitment of students to its programs?
- What are the career destinations of the school's graduates?
- What attempts are being made to increase the proportion of postgraduate students in the school?

2. Research

- What steps are taken to foster honours and postgraduate education and improve the training of researchers at higher degree and postdoctoral levels?
- Can the school meet the demand for postgraduate supervision?
- What are the school's recognised areas of research excellence?
- What evidence is there of national and international recognition of the school's research?

- What effort is made to emphasize, promote, and fund excellence in research within the school?
- Do the school's research interests reflect and complement the major areas of its teaching?
- Are undergraduate students involved in research activities and is the value of research promoted at undergraduate level?
- Do the research interests of the school provide a range of opportunities for research by postgraduate students?
- Does the school evaluate research performance by means of an appropriate set of performance indicators and allocate funds for research competitively and on the basis of performance?
- How does the school's publication record compare with that of cognate schools and with like schools in other institutions?
- What is the school's level of success in attracting research funding?
- What external avenues are available to the school to seek additional research support?
- What proportion of the school's staff are productive researchers?
- Are non-researchers given other duties?

3. Industry/professional links and community service

- How is the school involved in service to the University?
- To what extent does the school cooperate and collaborate with other tertiary education institutions?
- What steps does the school take to promote public awareness of its activities and their contribution to the social, cultural, and economic development of society?
- How extensive is staff involvement in academic, professional and service organisations?
- What links does the school have with alumni, government at all levels, industry, commerce, the professions, and the community generally?
- To what extent is the school aware of the needs of industry, commerce and the professions?
- What links has the school established with industry, commerce and the professions to acquire research support?

4. Internationalisation

- Does the school have, or does it need, a program for effective recruitment of international students to its programs?
- What attempts are being made to increase the proportion of international students?
- Does the school have mechanisms to support its international students?

5. Equity issues

- Does the school ensure equality of opportunity?
- What effort is made to encourage the enrolment and access of students from minority and disadvantaged groups?
- Is there a need to attempt to disturb traditional gender patterns within the area of study?
- What attempt is made to increase the proportion of women who continue to honours and postgraduate level?

6. Organisational issues

- Is there an appropriate (i) supply, and (ii) balance of senior/junior staff, academic/general staff in the school to support the school's teaching, research and administrative functions, currently and for planned growth?
- Does the full complement of academic staff provide the range of expertise necessary to provide effective undergraduate and postgraduate education in the range of courses offered and, in particular, in those courses that are compulsory for some disciplines?
- Does the school have effective administrative and technical support?
- Does the school have difficulty recruiting staff and, if so, to what does this appear to be due?
- Does the school have staff development and training policies in place and working?

- Are there arrangements for the regular review and appraisal of staff?
- Are there reward schemes to establish a close relationship between performance, salaries, and other conditions of work?
- How flexible are salary arrangements and conditions of service within the school?
- Does the school have a workload document, and actively manage the workload of its staff?
- What is the role of professors within the school?
- How does the school create an organisational climate that ensures that academic, professional, technical and administrative staff work together effectively?
- What is the nature of the school's decision-making processes?
- How are funds allocated within the school?
- How effective is communication within the school?
- How effectively does the school conduct its strategic planning, including regular reviews of its aims and achievements?
- Does the school set targets and monitor performance?
- Has the school developed a sound research infrastructure?
- Are equipment, accommodation and other research facilities adequate?
- How successful is the school in securing the share of internal funding that it believes necessary or appropriate?
- How does the school's budget compare with the budgets of other schools in the faculty in relation to size and function?
- How efficient is the school in using its resources to ensure the fulfilment of its mission?
- How does the school allocate its funds in relation to programs/courses offered?
- Does the school review its elective offerings in terms of enrolment and relative costs?
- What does the school do to attract external support from industry, professions, corporations, and the University's alumni?
- What attempts, if any, are being made to increase income from full-fee-paying students and continuing professional education?
- Are the resources to the school adequate to meet its commitments to high quality teaching and research and to allow it to compete for research performance related funds?
- Does the school encourage entrepreneurial activity?
- Does the school maximise returns from innovative research and technology transfer?
- Is the accommodation provided to the school appropriate and adequate for: effective undergraduate and postgraduate teaching; and the research projects of staff and students?
- Is the accommodation sufficient for: current activities; and planned or anticipated growth?
- Are teaching and research facilities (e.g., equipment) up to date and in sufficient supply to ensure efficient and effective programs?
- Does the school have sufficient appropriately qualified technical and administrative staff to support both teaching and research endeavours?
- Does the administration and organisation of the school allow for the most effective use of the school's teaching and research facilities?

7. Relationship with Centres and Units

School Centres

- What centres have been established within the school?
- What are their goals and objectives?
- Is/are the centre(s) meeting its/their approved goals and objectives?
- What proportion of staff and students are directly involved with the centre(s)?
- What is the financial relationship between the centre(s) and the school?
- What are the reporting arrangements for the centre(s)?
- How is/are the centre(s) contributing to the teaching, research and/or service profiles of the school?
- Are the goals of the centre(s) appropriate for the discipline in the future?
- Are the goals of the centre(s) appropriate for the school in the future?

- Should the centre(s) continue? For what duration?
- What changes should be made to its/their objectives and operations?

Other Centres (i.e. Faculty Centres, University Centres) and Institutes

- What is the school's involvement in other centres and institutes within the University?
- What proportion of staff and students of the school are directly involved with the centre(s)/institute(s)?
- How is the school's involvement with the centre(s) contributing to the school's teaching, research and/or community service profiles?
- Should the school make changes in its relationship with the centre(s)?

8. Role of the School

- Has the school outlined appropriate goals for the future?
- Is the school able to project a corporate identity or sense of unity?
- Is the school clear about its priorities and the relative importance of its different activities in achieving its stated objectives?
- Has the school established realistic targets for student recruitment to its courses and the output of graduates and postgraduates?
- Has the school established appropriate directions and targets for its research and research output?
- What is the national and international standing of the school in relation to similar schools within the Queensland and nationally?
- Should the school continue in its present form; should any changes be made to its present structure?

Appendix 5: Review Report Template

[REVIEW REPORT TEMPLATE – May 2009]



**THE UNIVERSITY
OF QUEENSLAND**

**REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE
ACADEMIC BOARD
BY THE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

SCHOOL OF XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

(date of review)

CONTENTS

Page

TERMS OF REFERENCE-

MEMBERSHIP OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE-

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....-

REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE-

1. PREAMBLE-

2. EDUCATION-

3. DISCOVERY.....-

4. ENGAGEMENT.....-

5. INTERNATIONALISATION-

6. EQUITY.....-

7. GOVERNANCE.....-

8. SPACE AND FACILITIES-

9. BUSINESS AND FINANCE-

APPENDIX 1: SUBMISSIONS-

APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEWS.....-

TERMS OF REFERENCE

MEMBERSHIP OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

External members:

Internal members:

Secretary:

SUMMARY OF COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. EDUCATION

Commendation 1

The review committee commends

Recommendation 1

It is recommended –
that (insert text).....

Recommendation 2

It is recommended –
that (insert text).....

2. DISCOVERY

Commendation 1

The review committee commends

Recommendation 1

It is recommended –
that (insert text).....

Recommendation 2

It is recommended –
that (insert text).....

3. ENGAGEMENT

4. INTERNATIONALISATION

5. EQUITY

6. GOVERNANCE

7. SPACE AND FACILITIES

8. BUSINESS AND FINANCE

REPORT OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

- 1. Executive Summary**
- 2. Education**
- 3. Discovery**
- 4. Engagement**
- 5. Internationalisation**
- 6. Equity**
- 7. Governance**
- 8. Space and Facilities**
- 9. Business and Finance**

APPENDIX 1

SUBMISSIONS

Submissions to the Review were received from:

University staff (list names) and students (number of students only)

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

External (list names and organisation)

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

APPENDIX 2

INTERVIEWS

Interviews were held with the following:

University staff (list names) and students (number of students only)

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

External (list names and organisation)

| |
|--|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |