Unit reviews have been part of an ongoing process of development and continuous improvement at UNE, with commitment over a number of years to a series of iterative processes that are targeted towards realising an embedded, sustainable approach to practice and delivery. As part of the cycle of continuous improvement, this document outlines the proposed next phase in the review of units.

This phase is underpinned by the commitment of UNE to the value of high quality teaching and learning, and to a continuous process of teaching and learning enhancement. To underpin the process of enhancement, it is necessary to consider teaching and learning at the unit level; with such considerations being holistic, recognising multiple sources of evidence, and avoiding dependence on any single measure.

In 2017, an inaugural cycle of Unit Reviews was undertaken, conducted by 8 schools. 3 of these schools undertook external benchmarking, and 5 of the schools reviewed their units by discipline rather than on individual unit levels. This process was led by Chairs of School Teaching and Learning Committees, or Discipline Convenors.

In 2019, AQD introduced Unit Mode Action Plans, which flagged individual units that either had high attrition, high fail rates, or a low Overall Satisfaction Index. This process was focussed on developing actions to respond to one or more perceived failings of a unit, with responsibility resting with the unit coordinator to respond to the identified metric and advise what actions would be undertaken as a result. Engagement was variable, with the process being seen as solely punitive, putting responsibility on the wrong role, and not offering support, development, and networking opportunities for staff to enhance their teaching and learning practice. A number of plans were either never completed, completed without commitment to revisions, or completed well after the unit was offered for a subsequent time, thus missing the chance to implement any improvements.

Following from consistent feedback, the Unit Mode Action Plan process was closed in Q3 2020, with Faculties and Schools advised that a return to the cyclical nature of Unit reviews outlined in the Quality Assurance Procedures for Courses and Units would be pursued.

To pursue this outcome, following from a successful trial in the UNE Business School, a draft unit evaluation spreadsheet was circulated to the October Meeting of the Quality Committee. At this meeting, it was agreed that the spreadsheet be circulated more broadly to schools for feedback. The spreadsheet provided prompts for key information that should be considered in undertaking a unit review.

That feedback process was completed, and a further feedback process completed through the Low Enrolment Units and Alternative Assessments Working Party of Curriculum Committee.

In moving to the next phase of Unit Reviews, six key principles are proposed:

**Unit Reviews are an Opportunity for positive and constructive review**

Reframing unit reviews away from Unit Mode Action Plans presents unit reviews as they should be – as an opportunity. Unit reviews provide an opportunity to step away from the regular, day to day activities of teaching and learning and reflect. They provide the space in which to engage with colleagues, and ask the questions that there is not always the time to ask. What is the importance of a unit? How is it excelling? How can it be improved to provide the best possible experience for students? What are the risks and opportunities for a unit? This opportunity for both positive and negative reflection is vital to a sustainable unit catalogue at UNE with academic excellence embedded at its core.

A range of information can be used to support members in undertaking a unit review. For example, the Online Learning Standards, as discussed at March 2021 Teaching and Learning Committee, and the latest version of the CDF, can provide assistance and support.

**Unit Reviews are grouped and undertaken by discipline, with oversight from the Faculty**

The Unit Mode Action Plans, and a report from an accreditation authority, have highlighted that considering units on an individual basis rather than as part of a nested sequence of units risks units getting out of alignment with each other. It also places significant emphasis on individual unit coordinators to determine the path of a unit, without consideration for how the discipline that the unit sits within is structured, and risks ignoring how learning is scaffolded between units and units are sequenced.

A discipline basis for unit review addresses these issues. It also means that reviews can realise economies of scale, rather than constituting review groups for single purposes, or relying on individual unit coordinators to review their own units and performance. It also allows for consideration of redundancy of and between units, consolidation points, and pre-requisites in a holistic fashion.

Discipline based unit reviews are overseen by the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning) of the Faculty, with implementation through the Head of School.

A Discipline based review at a minimum would include Chair of the School Teaching and Learning Committee, Course Coordinator/s for relevant courses, and a discipline representative nominated by the Head of School. It may include additional members, as a Learning Designer, unit coordinators, or unit academics, as deemed appropriate by the Chair of the School Teaching and Learning Committee. Wherever possible unit reviews should be aligned with course reviews, with unit reviews being undertake as part of a course review or as part of the implementation of actions from a course review, and then reviewed again halfway through the course review cycle.

**Unit Reviews focus on key metrics**

The creation of a template for unit reviews allows focus on key areas, and avoids issues of uncertainty of scale of review. Without guidance on scope, some unit reviews may either not capture sufficient information, or going to depths that present a significant resource rain and prevent them being completed. The key metrics to be considered are:

1. Currency of content and learning outcomes within units;
2. Pedagogy and assessment practices within units;
3. Quality of teaching and learning;
4. Student perceptions and feedback;
5. Benchmarking of the curriculum and assessment standards;
6. Achievement of learning outcomes within units – and any flow on effect that unit amendments may have on the achievement of learning outcomes for associated courses;
7. Review feedback;
8. External Accreditation (where appropriate);
9. Evidentiary information pertaining to Indigenous content, collaboration skills, internationalisation, ethics and sustainability, and industry connections.

Additional metrics may be incorporated in a unit review where they add value.

This focus on key metrics means a focus on not just underperforming parts of underperforming units, as was the case with Unit Mode Action Plans, but holistic assessment of how a unit is performing. On this basis, exceptional performance can be identified and best practice shared, as well as opportunities for improvement.

The focus across a number of key metrics allows information from multiple sources to be considered as part of a unit review. This moves away from concerns that there may be some imperfections with some minor aspects of diagnostic and review mechanisms. The availability of a template reinforces this broad approach.

**Unit Reviews exist as part of a broader continuous improvement landscape that includes Course Advisory Boards, Course Reviews, and School Reviews**

UNE has significant and well documented processes for annual monitoring of Courses through Course Advisory Boards, a 5 review cycle realised through Course Reviews, and School Reviews. Unit reviews provide an opportunity separate and additional to these other review mechanisms these to improve teaching and learning activities. They are, however, part of this broader continuous improvement framework. This means that unit reviews are not required to match the depth of analysis undertaken in a course review, do not require external input into all areas, and do not have formal university wide approval structures. They are a vital part of the continuous improvement tapestry, with proportionate and appropriate oversight.

As previously highlighted, opportunities should be take to align unit reviews with course reviews. In these instances, unit reviews would be undertaken during the 12 months following a course review, as part of the implementation of the course review, and then again, halfway through the course review cycle.

**Unit Reviews will be scheduled through consultation between the Head of School and the Associate Dean (Teaching and Learning), allowing for occasional circumstances where earlier reviews may be triggered**

The primary shift in moving to this phase of Unit Reviews is embedding a cycle of review and improvement, so that all units are looked at, holistically, over a three year period. There may still be instances where an earlier review needs to be triggered, either of an individual unit or discipline. The following is a list of potential examples, though is not intended to limit possible circumstances: exceptional unit evaluations results; EFTSL considerations; queries around critical mass of staff to teach; concerns highlighted through a range of formal or informal channels; evaluations of the effects of trialled innovations; as part of preparing a case for an award or other recognition of achievement process; or due to changes in units which may have a desirable or undesirable effect on other units.

**A summary of unit review activities are reported to embed continuous improvement**

The outcome of unit reviews, and the associated recommended actions, is reported to the ADTL and FEC of the relevant Faculty in line with the schedule agreed for reviews. The FEC may inquire as to particular aspects of reviews that are undertaken. Consistent with the goals of enabling continuous improvement and sharing best practice, the ADTL provides a summary of unit reviews for a given period to Education Quality for updating in the compliance register, and reporting to Teaching and Learning Committee.

**Process**

1. The Head of School consults with the Associate Dean, Teaching and Learning to establish the three year unit review schedule for disciplines in a school.
2. Once agreed, the schedule is advised to Education Quality at [quality@une.edu.au](mailto:quality@une.edu.au) for monitoring and reporting.
3. Prior to conducting a unit review, the Course Coordinator, in conjunction with the Unit Coordinator, will:
   1. Pre-populate the Unit Review Spreadsheet Template (associated document) with detail regarding the units to be reviewed, in preparation for the review to be undertaken by the team;
   2. Ensure that the Unit Review Spreadsheet is made available to the Unit Review Team in a timely manner, prior to the scheduled date for the Unit Review to be conducted.
4. For each unit under review, the Unit Review Team will:
   1. Complete the Unit Review Spreadsheet Template (associated document);
   2. Review the unit’s Moodle site; and
   3. Review the unit monitoring data through the UNE Power BI tool: <https://www.une.edu.au/staff-current/staff-services/bi-services>**.**
5. Unit Review Teams complete the Unit Review spreadsheet, listing all recommendations, and forward to the relevant Course Coordinator within agreed timeframes;
6. The Course Coordinator will:
7. Approve the recommendations arising from the unit review process;
8. Forward the final Unit Review recommendations to the Curriculum and Academic Management team.
9. The Curriculum and Academic Management team will:
10. Forward the final Unit Review Spreadsheet to the School Teaching & Learning Committee and the Faculty Education Committee, for noting;
11. Email the final Unit Review Spreadsheet to the Education Quality Directorate ([quality@une.edu.au](mailto:quality@une.edu.au));
12. Ensure the spreadsheet is saved in TRIM
13. Education Quality will:
    1. Report to Teaching and Learning Committee on Unit Reviews
    2. Request the spreadsheet be updated with an implementation report at 12 months