

# Course Review Procedure

## Section 1 - Governing Policy

(1) These Procedures are governed by the [Course Accreditation, Amendment and Review Policy](#).

## Section 2 - Scope

(2) This Procedure is intended to provide course monitoring and review process information for all coursework award courses.

## Section 3 - Definitions

(3) General definitions in this document are consistent with the [Course Accreditation, Amendment and Review Policy](#) and the [Glossary of Student and Course Terms](#).

## Section 4 - Unit and Course Monitoring

(4) Faculties will undertake annual monitoring exercises and report any change in the quality of courses, units and microcredentials as set out in the [Course and Unit Viability Analysis Policy](#) and [Course and Unit Viability Analysis Procedure](#) and in accordance with the ACU Quality Assurance Framework, to Faculty Board, including proposals for any course revision.

(5) Annual monitoring exercises will be conducted by the relevant Course Monitoring Committee (CMC) and will be conducted on any course or related group of courses.

(6) Course Monitoring Committees will monitor the quality of courses and units against ACU benchmarks and through the use of metrics, including student surveys and feedback and other evidence of student engagement and achievement.

(7) Monitoring exercises must go to the relevant Faculty Board for consideration and action as required. Faculties will provide an annual summary report of all monitoring exercises undertaken to the Courses and Academic Quality Committee (CAQC) and Academic Board for noting.

(8) In cases where a course consistently does not perform in the annual monitoring exercise, according to benchmark requirements, this may trigger a full course review.

## Section 5 - Course Review

(9) Courses or suites of courses must be reviewed as part of the six-yearly review cycle in accordance with Section 9 of the [Course Accreditation, Amendment and Review Policy](#).

(10) A course review will have two stages:

- a. Stage One of the review will be an examination of the course using available data leading to recommendations. This stage:
  - i. is undertaken by a Course Review Committee (CRC) chaired by an external academic who does not teach into the program;
  - ii. makes recommendations for consideration by Faculty Board and the Courses and Academic Quality Committee, and for noting by Academic Board; and
  - iii. triggers Stage Two.
- b. Stage Two of the review will consider the commendations and recommendations from Stage One and will initiate any necessary change to the curriculum in accordance with the [Course Accreditation and Amendment Procedure](#).

(11) Reviews will be informed by:

- a. [ACU Mission, Identity and Values](#);
- b. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Knowings, perspectives and pedagogical practice;
- c. strategic priorities of the University;
- d. recommendations from the relevant Course Monitoring Committee;
- e. expert advice from the Centre for Education and Innovation (CEI) regarding educational innovation, contemporary pedagogy and curriculum design;
- f. indicators of student performance such as attrition, progress, completion, grade distribution, student satisfaction and graduate success considered against ACU benchmarks and external comparators as relevant;
- g. external referencing and moderation of assessment methods and grading;
- h. outcomes of annual monitoring exercises;
- i. market analysis report from Marketing and External Relations and Global and Education Pathways detailing competitor activity, student and industry demand etc; and
- j. feedback from external accreditation/professional bodies.

## **Role of the Course Review Committee (CRC)**

(12) Each Faculty will establish a CRC to oversee the review process.

(13) The membership of the CRC will be approved by the relevant Executive Dean(s) who will appoint the Committee Chair. The committee size will vary depending on the nature of the course(s) under review.

(14) The CRC will be comprised of:

- a. an independent review Chair, external to ACU, appointed by the relevant Executive Dean(s); In the case of a double degree, the Executive Dean from the Faculty with primary administrative responsibility for the course is responsible for appointing the Chair.
- b. appropriately qualified academic(s) operating independently of those involved directly in the delivery of the course;
- c. course Leader(s) involved in the delivery of the course which could include Head of Discipline, National Course Coordinator or Professional Practice Leader;
- d. member(s) of the Centre for Education and Innovation (CEI);
- e. representatives from Marketing and External Relations and Global and Education Pathways where relevant;
- f. external academic member(s);
- g. professional or industry representative(s);
- h. at least one student currently undertaking the course;

- i. at least one graduate of the course; and
- j. a representative from the appropriate professional accrediting body where required.

(15) Faculties are responsible for administrative and logistical support of CRCs.

(16) The Committee will consult with the Executive Dean, Faculty of Theology and Philosophy or nominee, where appropriate regarding Core Curriculum units.

(17) Relevant external bodies must be consulted by the CRC, as appropriate. This consultation is not a substitute for representation of categories e., f. and i. under clause (14).

(18) Where it is essential to provide for varying employer and other external client needs in different States, Course Review Sub-Committees may be established by the Executive Dean(s) in the relevant States. The work of these Sub-Committees will be co-ordinated by the CRC so as to ensure appropriate commonality and internal consistency in the course review process.

(19) The Course Review Committee will:

- a. assess data on the existing course;
- b. evaluate the existing course against sector and internal benchmarking;
- c. consider any changes that may be deemed appropriate, and the rationale, justification for and impact of such changes;
- d. formulate the proposal for revision of the course, including any revised curriculum, where relevant;
- e. devise recommendations to maintain and improve course quality and the student experience.

(20) The Executive Dean may require the CRC to submit interim reports to the Faculty Board(s) during the initial phases of the review.

(21) Any proposed amendment to the course arising from review recommendations must be submitted in accordance with the timelines set out in Schedule 3 of the [Course Accreditation and Amendment Procedures](#).

(22) Where re-accreditation is to be sought, there is not normally a requirement for the course to go through the strategic management approval stage, unless a new resource impact has been identified.

## **Section 6 - Review of Microcredentials and Short Courses**

(23) Faculties are responsible for undertaking reviews of standalone microcredentials at least on a three-yearly cycle to determine if academic approval should be renewed.

(24) Microcredentials that form part of a higher education award must be reviewed in accordance with Section 5 of this Procedure.

(25) Standalone microcredentials will be reviewed by Faculty Boards and the outcome of these reviews will be reported to CAQC and noted at Academic Board.

(26) Faculties are responsible for devising protocols to review, and for reviewing short courses on a three-yearly cycle to determine whether academic approval should be renewed. The outcome of these reviews will be reported to CAQC and noted at Academic Board.

## Section 7 - Coursework Components of Higher Degrees by Research

(27) Coursework components of Higher Degrees by Research must be reviewed in accordance with these Procedures.

(28) A representative of the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) will be included in the membership of the CRC and the review report will be submitted to the University Research Committee for consideration prior the provisions set out in clause (10)b. of these Procedures.

## Section 8 - Revisions to this Procedure

(29) The revision table includes revisions up until this document was migrated into the current policy platform. Any later changes will show in the Status and Details tab.

Date	Major, Minor or Editorial	Description of Revision(s)
30 November 2016	Minor	Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 compliance review and process consultation amendments
18 September 2019	Minor	Retitled and addition of principles for discontinuation of a course, specialisation or major
01 September 2022	Major	Retitle and major amendments to policy following scheduled Academic Board Review and on recommendations from working party.

## Section 9 - Associated Information

(30) For related legislation, policies, procedures and guidelines and any supporting resources please refer to the Associated Information tab.

## Status and Details

<b>Status</b>	Historic
<b>Effective Date</b>	19th December 2023
<b>Review Date</b>	11th May 2027
<b>Approval Authority</b>	
<b>Approval Date</b>	19th December 2023
<b>Expiry Date</b>	26th September 2024
<b>Responsible Executive</b>	Helen Murnane Academic Registrar
<b>Responsible Manager</b>	Gerard Goodwin-Moore National Manager, Student Policy and Appeals
<b>Enquiries Contact</b>	Catherine McKiver Policy and Projects Officer <hr/> Student Administration