

## COURSE MONITORING AND REVIEW PROCEDURE

### Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

- (1) This Procedure:
- sets out the processes and responsibilities for monitoring and reviewing units and courses by implementing the requirements of the Course Design, Development and Review Policy; and
  - applies to all courses and all staff.

### Section 2 - Definitions

- (2) In addition to the definitions set out in the Course Design Development and Review Policy, the following applies:

**Examiners' Committee** means the sub-committee of Academic Board which meets to determine grades and ensure quality in assessment processes.

**Unit** means the smallest stand-alone component of an award course for which a grade is assigned.

### Section 3 - Procedure

- (3) For course reviews:
- the key stages for course reaccreditation are set out below; and,
  - the indicative timeline for course reaccreditation is set out at Section 4 where proposals are resubmitted (to incorporate amendments requested by the CEO, the Board of Directors or Academic Board), the relevant Head of Department must ensure the stated timeframe can be met.
- (4) At each stage of the approval pathway, the relevant approval authority may:
- approve;
  - not approve;
  - seek further information about;
  - seek amendments to; or
  - otherwise defer consideration of; the submission.

### Units and Courses – Continuous Improvement

- (5) The College supports its comprehensive reviews of courses with regular interim monitoring of student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course degree.
- (6) The College has a number of organisational units and structures that contribute to the monitoring the quality of courses and units including:

- a. Academic Board
  - b. Learning and Teaching Committee
  - c. The Examiners' Committee
  - d. Departmental Review of Courses: Unit Reports and Moderation of assessment processes and outcomes
  - e. Course Advisory Committees
  - f. External Experts
- (7) The College implements different practices to support the continuous improvement of courses and units including:
- a. annually updating each unit offered within a course, undertaken by the Unit Coordinator in consultation with the Head of Department;
  - b. annually monitoring and reviewing courses through the auspices of the different academic and operations reports prepared by the Heads of Department; the Dean and the CEO, for reporting to the Academic Board, the Board of Directors the Board of Directors and the Executive Team; and
  - c. external referencing and benchmarking activities. Recommendations are put to Academic Board for approval.
- (8) Student and staff feedback form an important part of monitoring and continuous improvement of units and courses, with regular reports submitted to Academic Board. Mechanisms include:
- a. the Quality Feedback Monitor (the ACPE Feedback Monitor link);
  - b. internal end-of-semester student surveys and teacher satisfaction questionnaires for every unit each time it is delivered and student focus groups; and
  - c. external student surveys (Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT), Student Experience Survey and Graduate Outcomes Survey); and
  - d. unit reports: staff analysis and evaluation of student feedback, moderation reports, informal student and staff feedback.
- (9) Information and feedback are:
- a. analysed by the Director of Student Services and Campus Wellbeing, escalated to the CEO as required; and
  - b. regularly reported to the Academic Board, with recommended changes.

### **Unit Review**

- (10) The College is committed to the review (minimum) of each unit offered in accredited courses on a regular basis, to help identify areas of strength and areas in need of improvement. This will include:
- a. reviewing the content of the unit based on feedback;
  - b. monitoring unit delivery and assessment methods to ensure students are able to achieve the unit's learning outcomes.

- (11) The College strives for continuous improvement of course delivery and assessment monitoring by four quality assured procedures:
- providing students with fair and regular feedback on their progress;
  - providing opportunities to students to give feedback on unit delivery and assessment arrangements;
  - including student feedback into quality assurance mechanisms; and
  - using internal and external benchmarking of assessment procedures and instruments.
- (12) Units will be evaluated at least once a year:
- student feedback will be collated on each unit every time it is delivered;
  - teacher feedback will be collated on each unit every time it is delivered;
  - feedback results will be collated and analysed by the Unit Coordinator, with reports reviewed by the Head of Department; and,
  - the Head of Department, with the relevant Unit Coordinator, will put recommendations for change to the appropriate governance approval authority.
- (13) As part of the annual evaluation of courses, their viability is assessed, based on parameters set by the Board of Directors, with input from the CEO.
- This assessment is based on the number of past student enrolments in the courses of study (on campus or online).

### **Course Review**

- (14) The College is committed to regular reviews of its accredited courses to ensure that the course aims, structure, units, learning objectives, assessment activities, resources, study modes, delivery methods, teaching and scholarship; and any identified risk to quality are monitored and updated where necessary, according to the principles of continuous improvement and quality assurance.
- (15) The College undertakes a financial viability study through data relating to student enrolments and student performance.
- (16) The CEO prepares and circulates academic/operations reports to relevant internal stakeholders, that includes collected data concerning course performance and its viability (including enrolments, retention/attrition, student academic performance, student evaluations of courses)

*Note: The consideration of the viability of courses is normally assessed over the period of the preceding three years and future projections.*

### **Review of Courses for Accreditation Renewal**

- (17) The Dean and the relevant Head of Department are responsible for accreditation renewal projects.

- (18) A dashboard report which highlights the performance indicators of each award based on data gleaned from internal review processes, will be provided to the Academic Board and ultimately the Board of Directors for consideration.
- (19) Based on the timeframe and process set out in Section 4, the Head of Department submits a proposal to the CEO setting out the proposed course(s) for reaccreditation, redesign or teach-out.
- (20) On approval from the CEO:
- the proposal is submitted to Academic Board;
  - the Head of Department (or delegate) is assigned responsibility to form a Course Development Working Group; and
  - the Course Review commences.
- (21) The process of undertaking a comprehensive course review for reaccreditation is a major academic project. Accordingly, the Course Development Working Group is responsible for developing and implementing a project management plan and methodology that:
- includes a project timetable with specified milestones and deliverables (see Section 4);
  - incorporates the requirements of relevant College policies and procedures;
  - provides for input as required – academic and key support and administrative services, students, alumni and external stakeholders;
  - addresses external accreditation and professional body registration requirements;
  - ensures the College strategic and financial priorities are given due consideration;
  - ensures that resource implications are addressed in parallel with academic developments;
  - itemises the documents required for the approval process, including policies and/or formal agreements; and
  - outlines the arrangements for implementing the course or changes to an existing course, such as transition arrangements and unit equivalencies.
- (22) Following the above process (clause 21) the Head of Department will present the Course Development Working Group's draft submission to the Course Advisory Committee for its review and endorsement.
- (23) Following endorsement by the Course Advisory Committee, the Head of Department will refer the submission to the Compliance team for final review and preparation for presentation to Academic Board.
- (24) The Academic Board will:
- review all aspects of the course including the detailed Unit outlines;

- b. determine whether the proposed changes are material in the context of all changes to the course to date; and will
- c. approve the course(s) for submission to TEQSA;
- d. request amendments; or
- e. reject the course(s).

(25) The College will lodge the renewal of accreditation submission with TEQSA following final approval by Academic Board of the submission and all relevant documentation.

(26) The College is responsible for lodging its applications with TEQSA for renewal of accreditation at least six months prior to the accreditation expiry date.

Note: The CEO will liaise with TEQSA if it is likely the College is unable to meet this timeframe for any reason.

(27) An External Expert will be engaged by the College to provide an independent review and report on the course. This report will be submitted to TEQSA in support of the reaccreditation application.

(28) The CEO will inform relevant parties, including the Board of Directors and Academic Board, of TEQSA's determination in relation to the submission.

#### **Other External Approval processes**

(29) The relevant Department will provide the Compliance and Marketing teams with:

- a. updated information on entry requirements; and
- b. statements for the College Prospectus, Course Guides, Student Handbook and other publications as required.

(30) The Compliance team and the Registry is responsible for preparing relevant documents such as:

- a. Professional or registering bodies;
- b. Centrelink approval;
- c. Commonwealth HELP approval;
- d. CRICOS approval (including registration on PRISMS; and
- e. Tuition Assurance Arrangements through College Agreements.

(31) Courses subject to renewal of accreditation may continue to be marketed under the previously-approved course name and structure, until such time as the new course name and structure has been approved by TEQSA.

### **Section 4 – Timelines for Renewal of Course Accreditation**

Eighteen months prior to submission to TEQSA.

| Date    | Action Required                             |
|---------|---|
| Month 1 | Head of Department submits proposal to CEO: |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
|                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>List of course(s) proposed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>renewal of accreditation, redesign and the extent of the design;</li> <li>'teach-out' and the period of 'teach-out' proposed; and</li> <li>those course(s) for which renewal of accreditation is not being sought.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Future enrolment projections based on past three years actual enrolments.</li> <li>Critical path for meeting the submission deadline; Milestones (including dates such as Course Advisory Committee meetings).</li> </ul> <p>If CEO approves, the proposal is forwarded to Academic Board for approval.</p> <p>Course Review to commence.</p> |
| Months 2 – 7   | Internal College processes for the Course Review as per the approved critical path. This includes Course Development Working Group meetings, Course Advisory Committee meetings, departmental meetings and the development of the course and subjects.  |
| Month 7        | Department to prepare the first draft of the submission, including units for the Course Advisory Committee to review.   |
| Month 9        | Final Course Advisory Committee meeting to approve the final draft for submission to Academic Board (if required).  |
| Month 11       | Department and Compliance team to finalise the collation of the final draft of the submission for presentation to Academic Board.   |
| Month 12       | Academic Board review: for revision and approval  |
| Months 12 - 13 | Additional meetings/circulation to consider any revision requested by Academic Board as required.   |
| Month 13 - 15  | Revisions to the documentation presented to Academic Board (2 <sup>nd</sup> meeting)<br>External Expert to provide an independent review and report on the course for submission to TEQSA.  |
| Month 16       | Final approval by the Academic Board of the documentation (3 <sup>rd</sup> meeting if required).  |
| Month 18       | Submission to TEQSA   |
| Month 2X       | Decision/Approval granted by TEQSA  |
| Month 2X       | Delivery: the year of the new period of accreditation   |

## Related documents

This Procedure should be read in conjunction with but not limited to:

- a. Course Design, Development and Review Policy
- b. Course Development Procedure

Legislation:

- a. Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
- b. Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011

## Document Administration

|                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| <b>Policy Name</b>        | Course Monitoring and Review Procedure   |
| <b>Policy Owner</b>       | Dean   |
| <b>Approval Authority</b> | Academic Board   |
| <b>Approval Date</b>      | 29 June 2023   |
| <b>Effective Date</b>     | As at Approval Date  |
| <b>Next Review #</b>      | Three years from the Approval Date   |
| <b>Amendment history</b>  |  |
| <b>Version 1:</b>         | Document revised and reformatted into new template and aligned with updated Policy.  |
| <b>Version 2:</b>         | Updated to include references to viability (viability previously covered in out-of-date Course and Subject Viability Policy – now archived).<br><br>Removal of previously required Academic and Operations Report to TEQSA as part of a past registration condition requirement (now removed). |

*# Unless otherwise indicated, this Policy will still apply beyond the Review date.*