

Faculty of Science Guidelines

Guidelines Title	Unit reaccreditation
Parent Policy/Procedure	Coursework Course and Unit Accreditation Policy
Date Effective	1 August 2016 (with retrospective effect on units delivered from the beginning of 2016 academic year)
Review Date	1 August 2019 (three years from date effective)
Guidelines Owner	Associate Dean (Education)
Category	Academic Quality and Standards
Version Number	1.0
Content Enquiries	sci-education@monash.edu
Scope	All Science owned units
Purpose	To establish a framework for the review and reaccreditation of Science units
GUIDELINES STATEMENT	

1. Preamble

1.1. Academic Board delegates to Deans of faculties (or their delegates) the responsibility for accreditation and reaccreditation of units.

Before accrediting a unit the Dean (or delegate) must be assured that:

- There is alignment between unit outcomes, learning activities, assessment and the overall relationship to course outcomes.
- The rationale for offering the unit is sound, e.g. by considering the unit's role within courses of study, strategic importance and overlapping content with other units.
- Adequate resources are in place to successfully offer the unit, including academic staff, support staff, physical resources and services.
- Mechanisms are in place for continuous monitoring of the quality and viability of the unit.
- Where the unit involves academic content or resources of another faculty, or offering at another campus, that faculty or campus has been adequately consulted.

Period of accreditation

1.2. The maximum period of accreditation is for five years.

[Monash University Coursework Course and unit Accreditation Policy](#)

Record of accreditation

1.3. Following approval of new units and their creation in the University's Student Management System, the Faculty will maintain a register of units approved for delivery.

2. Principles of reaccreditation

Faculty of Science Guidelines

- 2.1. Reaccreditation is a faculty process by which unit performance is reviewed over the period of accreditation for the purposes of continuing its offering. This quality assurance process is designed to recommend to the Dean (or their delegates) which units should be reaccredited.
- 2.2. Units reaccreditation consists of 3 phases:
- Monitor
 - Review for accreditation
 - Recommend

Monitor

- 2.3. Through the use of education management tools and resources, the Associate Dean (Education) and the Science Board of Studies Committee will monitor the performance of units; indicators to measure will be:
- Low enrolment
 - Failure rate
 - Average mark
 - Performance in unit evaluations (SETU)
- 2.4. It is anticipated that this process will be run regularly to allow teaching schools sufficient time to make necessary improvements ahead of the review for reaccreditation.
- 2.5. Based on performance on the above four indicators the Associate Dean (Education) may instigate a Unit Review at any point during the accredited period of a unit.
- 2.6. Outcomes and recommendations from regular monitoring and Unit Reviews will be recorded on the Unit Lifecycle Register.

Review for accreditation

- 2.7. This is the five-yearly review of units needing reaccreditation. The Science Board of Studies (on behalf of the Dean) will consider the reports for the five year period of accreditation or since last reaccreditation.

Recommend

- 2.8. The Science Board of Studies (on behalf of the Dean) will recommend units for reaccreditation; units may be reaccredited with or without conditions and for a period not exceeding five years.

3. Procedures

- 3.1. The first step in the reaccreditation process will be a desktop review. This desktop review (the Unit Health Check) is a Business Intelligence report which will identify triggers for the following measures:

Low enrolment

- The trigger will be an enrolment of less than 15
- Exception to above criterion:
- No enrolment trigger applies to research project units and specialist units that are offered to select students; instead only criteria Failure rate, Average and Performance in unit evaluations (SETU) will be measured.

Failure rate

Faculty of Science Guidelines

- The trigger will be a failure rate greater than 20%

Average

- The trigger will be an average below 60%

Performance in unit evaluations (SETU)

- The trigger will be the same as that set by the University for “needing critical attention”; currently this is a SETU score of 3.0 or less.

3.2. Reports will be run bi-annually (In February and in August) and considered by the Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee. A register will be created and maintained to record the reports and facilitate semester-on-semester review.

3.3. At the end of the five year period, the Science Board of Studies will review the unit reports for the period of accreditation and determine which will be reaccredited in line with the University’s conditions described under the policy.

3.4. Units that perform at or above the trigger level for all four criteria will be recommended for reaccreditation.

3.5. Units that perform below the trigger level in one or more criteria may be subject to a Unit Review. This review may be instigated by the Associate Dean (Education) at any point during the accreditation cycle of the unit. Any of the following will trigger a review:

- Poor performance against the same criteria in two consecutive teaching periods.
- Poor performance against any three of the four criteria in one teaching period.
- Poor performance against one or more of the four criteria in three consecutive teaching within the five year accreditation cycle.

3.6. The purpose of a Unit Review is to provide detailed information about the unit including learning outcomes, learning and teaching activities, assessment tasks and assessment regime, student evaluations, and resources. The outcome of a unit review may include:

- Recommending actions that can be taken to improve.
- Placing conditions on the reaccreditation.
- Recommending that the unit be discontinued.

Responsibility for implementation	Associate Dean (Education) Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee Science Board of Studies Coursework Programs Manager
Status	New
Approval Body	Name: Science Board of Studies Meeting: 05/2016 Date: 19/07/2016 Agenda item: 6.3
Endorsement Body	Name: Faculty Learning and Teaching Committee

Faculty of Science Guidelines

	Meeting: policy endorsed out of meeting via circulation Date: 27/06/2016 Agenda item: NA
Definitions	Accreditation Unit Review Unit Lifecycle Register Unit Health Report
Related Policies	Grade distribution policy
Related Documents	