

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 in Section 4 where proposals are resubmitted (to incorporate amendments requested by the CEO, the Board of Directors or the 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:
- 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](#) ;
 - 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 Student Connect and Engagement Manager, 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:

- a. providing students with fair and regular feedback on their progress;
 - b. providing opportunities to students to give feedback on unit delivery and assessment arrangements;
 - c. including student feedback into quality assurance mechanisms; and
 - d. using internal and external benchmarking of assessment procedures and instruments.
- (12) Units will be evaluated at least once a year:
- a. student feedback will be collated on each unit every time it is delivered;
 - b. teacher feedback will be collated on each unit every time it is delivered;
 - c. feedback results will be collated and analysed by the Unit Coordinator, with reports reviewed by the Head of Department; and,
 - d. 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.
- a. 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 Dean 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.

- (17) A comprehensive review of all ACPE courses is undertaken every 5 years from the previous review which aligns with the re-accreditation cycle. (See Appendix A - Terms of Reference for Comprehensive Course Reviews).
- (18) Minor course reviews are conducted between comprehensive course reviews and are considered a midway checkpoint to assess the effectiveness of the

implementation of the outcomes from the most recent comprehensive course review. (See Appendix B -Terms of Reference for Minor Course Reviews)

(19) Course monitoring and improvements occur on an ongoing basis.

Review of Courses for Accreditation Renewal – Comprehensive Course Review

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

(21) A 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.

(22) 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.

(23) On approval from the CEO:

- a. the proposal is submitted to Academic Board;
- b. the Head of Department (or delegate) is assigned responsibility to form a Course Development Working Group; and
- c. the Course Review commences.

(24) 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:

- a. includes a project timetable with specified milestones and deliverables (see Section 4);
- b. incorporates the requirements of relevant College policies and procedures;
- c. provides for input as required – academic and key support and administrative services, students, alumni and external stakeholders;
- d. addresses external accreditation and professional body registration requirements;
- e. ensures the College strategic and financial priorities are given due consideration;
- f. ensures that resource implications are addressed in parallel with academic developments;
- g. itemises the documents required for the approval process, including policies and/or formal agreements; and
- h. outlines the arrangements for implementing the course or changes to an existing course, such as transition arrangements and unit equivalencies.

- (25) 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.
- (26) 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. The Dean will ensure compliance with regulatory requirements for recommended changes that may require new course accreditation, in line with TEQSA's published guidelines. This includes any modifications that result in a variance of 50% or more from the accredited version.
- (27) The Academic Board will:
- review all aspects of the course including the detailed Unit outlines;
 - determine whether the proposed changes are material in the context of all changes to the course to date; and will
 - approve the course(s) for submission to TEQSA;
 - request amendments; or
 - reject the course(s).
- (28) The College will lodge the renewal of accreditation submission with TEQSA following final approval by Academic Board of the submission and all relevant documentation.
- (29) 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.

- (30) 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.
- (31) 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

- (32) The relevant Department will provide the Compliance and Marketing teams with:
- updated information on entry requirements; and
 - statements for the College Prospectus, Course Guides, Student Handbook and other publications as required.
- (33) The Compliance team and the Registry is responsible for preparing relevant documents such as:
- Professional or registering bodies;
 - Centrelink approval;

- c. Commonwealth HELP approval;
- d. CRICOS approval (including registration on PRISMS; and
- e. Tuition Assurance Arrangements through College Agreements.

(34) 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.

Ongoing Course Improvements

- (35) The Dean, Heads of Department, and the Learning and Teaching Committee monitor course feedback and performance data on an ongoing basis.
- (36) The Learning and Teaching Committee recommends course improvements to the Academic Board where required.
- (37) The Dean will ensure compliance with regulatory requirements for changes that warrant new course accreditation, following TEQSA's published guidelines. This includes any modifications amounting to 50% or more of the accredited course version.

Minor Course Review

- (38) Between two comprehensive reviews of coursework and research degree courses, relevant Minor Course Reviews will be initiated and overseen by the Dean and chaired by a senior internal academic. The Academic Board-approved Terms of Reference are provided in Appendix B.
- (39) The Minor Course Review serves as a checkpoint to assess the effectiveness of outcomes implemented from the previous Comprehensive Course Review, as outlined in Appendix B, through feedback and analysis from:
 - a. Implementation plans from the Comprehensive Course Review working group,
 - b. Any regulatory or reaccreditation decisions,
 - c. Formal and informal student feedback,
 - d. academic staff,
 - e. Industry & Alumni Panel, and
 - f. Student performance and external benchmarking data.
- (40) The Dean will submit a report for each course or course group to the Learning & Teaching Committee, with improvement recommendations as needed. These reports are then forwarded to the Academic Board for review to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, including any changes that meet TEQSA criteria for new course accreditation, particularly if course changes exceed 50%.

(41) The Academic Board may approve, amend, or reject the recommendations in part or in full.

(42) The Dean will report on the progress of accepted recommendations to the Academic Board until full implementation is achieved.

Section 4 – Timelines for Renewal of Course Accreditation – Comprehensive Review

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"> • List of course(s) proposed for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - renewal of accreditation, redesign and the extent of the design; - 'teach-out' and the period of 'teach-out' proposed; and - those course(s) for which renewal of accreditation is not being sought. • Future enrolment projections based on past three years' actual enrolments. • Critical path for meeting the submission deadline; Milestones (including dates such as Course Advisory Committee meetings). If CEO approves, the proposal is forwarded to Academic Board for approval. Course Review to commence.
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 nd meeting) 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 rd 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. Appendix A – Terms of Reference for Comprehensive Course Reviews
- b. Appendix B – Terms of Reference for Minor Course Reviews
- c. Appendix C – Unit Review Criteria
- d. Course Design, Development, and Review Policy
- e. Course Development Procedure
- f. Course and Unit Amendment and Cessation Policy
- g. Quality Assurance Framework

Legislation:

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

Document Administration

Policy Name	Course Monitoring and Review Procedure
Policy Owner	Dean
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Approval Date	4 November 2024
Effective Date	As at Approval Date
Next Review #	Three years from the Approval Date
Amendment history	
Version 1:	Document revised and reformatted into new template and aligned with updated Policy.
Version 2: 29 June 2023	Updated to include references to viability (viability previously covered in out-of-date Course and Subject Viability Policy – now archived). Removal of previously required Academic and Operations Report to TEQSA as part of a past registration condition requirement (now removed).
Version 3: 4 November 2024 Approved by the Board of Directors – 2 December 2024	Updated to clearly distinguish between comprehensive course reviews, ongoing course review and minor course reviews. Appendix A, B and C added to capture existing processes. Updated the designation of Director of Student Engagement and Wellbeing to Student Connect and Engagement Manager.

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

Appendix A: Terms of Reference for Comprehensive Course Reviews

For Course Reviews, the Terms of Reference will be informed by the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, with particular attention to the following areas:

1. **Learning Outcomes and Assessment** (Section 1.4, Standards 1.4.1 to 1.4.4): These standards mandate the design of learning outcomes, alignment with AQF levels, and the alignment of assessments with learning outcomes to demonstrate achievement.
2. **Course Design** (Section 3.1, Standards 3.1.1 to 3.1.4): These standards define requirements for course specifications, engagement with advanced knowledge and inquiry, and the relationship between teaching and learning activities to support achievement of learning outcomes, applicable across all delivery modes.
3. **Monitoring, Review, and Improvement** (Section 5.3, Standards 5.1 to 5.3): These standards guide the scope and types of evidence required for course reviews.

For all courses, with an emphasis on fully online programs, the following additional elements will also be reviewed:

- **Research by Higher Degree Courses** (if applicable) will include Section 1.4, Standards 1.4.5 to 1.4.7, specific to research training.
- **Professional Accreditation** (Section 3.1, Standard 3.1.5) applies to any course requiring accreditation for graduates to practice professionally.
- **Educational Support and Learning Resources** (Section 3.3) from the perspective of fully online delivery.

Moreover, each Course Review must evaluate the extent of changes since the last accreditation. If a course has undergone changes exceeding 50%, it may need to be resubmitted to TEQSA for accreditation as a new course.

Appendix B - Terms of Reference for Minor Course Reviews

The Terms of Reference for Minor Course Reviews will be guided by the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, enabling the review team to assess the effectiveness of implementing recommendations from the previous Comprehensive Course Review.

1. Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Section 1.4, Standards 1.4.1 to 1.4.4): These standards set requirements for designing learning outcomes, ensuring alignment with AQF levels, aligning assessments with learning outcomes, and demonstrating achievement of these outcomes.
2. Course Design (Section 3.1, Standards 3.1.1 to 3.1.4): These standards specify course requirements, including the engagement with advanced knowledge, the alignment of teaching and learning activities with learning outcomes, and applicability across all delivery modes.

For all courses, with emphasis on fully online programs, the review will also include:

- Research by Higher Degree Courses (if applicable) will incorporate Section 1.4, Standards 1.4.5 to 1.4.7, covering research training standards.
- Professional Accreditation (Section 3.1, Standard 3.1.5) considerations for any course requiring accreditation for graduates to practice professionally.
- Change Evaluation: Each review must assess changes since the last accreditation. If the course has undergone changes exceeding 50%, it may require resubmission to TEQSA for accreditation as a new course.

Appendix C: Unit Review Criteria

When conducting course and unit reviews, the following elements may be considered:

Design

- a. Appropriateness of the Unit Learning Outcomes
- b. In the case of units occurring in more than one course, the alignment to the course learning outcomes
- c. Suitability of the unit content with due regard to:
 - i. The relevant discipline
 - ii. Contemporary developments
 - iii. Accreditation requirements (if any).
- d. Suitability of assessment tasks with due regard to:
 - i. The unit learning outcomes – ensuring all unit learning outcomes are assessed, and
 - ii. Student feedback.
- e. Suitability of the unit name
- f. Sequencing of the unit and how it contributes to progression
- g. Viability of the unit in terms of attrition and enrolment trends;
- h. Prerequisite units – whether or not they are suitable; and
- i. The delivery model.

Delivery

- a. Appropriateness of the delivery model
- b. Unit outlines, unit assessment guides and teaching materials for currency and relevance

Support

- a. Range of support options available to students
- b. How academic integrity is supported in the unit
- c. Academic and English language support

Performance

- a. Course performance data
- b. Unit evaluation survey data
- c. External benchmarking data
- d. Feedback from students and staff.