Course and Unit Review Procedure

Policy Category	Policy		
Review	3 years from date of Approval		
Policy Code	AP011P		
Contacts	policy@imc.edu.au		
Version	**Approval Authority**	**Approval Date**	**Commencement Date**
2021.09	Provost	14 September 2021	14 September 2021

1. PURPOSE

The processes of reviewing, monitoring and evaluating academic courses and units are key components of the Institute's quality assurance framework. They are conducted in accordance with the policies, procedures, standards and strategic directions of the Institute, and with reference to relevant comparative and evaluative data.

The procedures outlined in this document provide the framework within which the Course Advisory Committee (CAC), on behalf of the Academic Board, oversees the review and evaluation of the Institute's academic courses and units.

This document should be read in conjunction with the *Course and Unit Review Policy*.

2. PROCEDURES

2.1 Major/Reaccreditation Course Reviews
A Major/Reaccreditation review of every course will be initiated by the Academic Board and will be conducted by CAC not less than every seven years.

An out of cycle major review of a course may be initiated by the Chair of Academic Board, or Provost, at any time, after consultation with the Provost of the School and Provost.

2.2 Overview of the process for a Major Review/Reaccreditation
1. The Chair of CAC calls for an internal review and seeks an Internal Review Report from the Provost (Appendix 1), which is subsequently scrutinized by CAC.
2. In consultation with the Chair of Academic Board, the Chair of CAC establishes a Review Panel.
3. The Review Panel conducts interviews and considers all relevant documents, submissions, and any other matters of interest within the Terms of Reference for the review.
4. The External Reviewers provide, independently, the completed *Course Assessment and Review* template to the Chair of CAC (Appendix 2).

5. The Provost provides a Statement of Response (to the Course Assessment and Review Reports), and an Implementation Plan (including time frame, monitoring responsibilities and responsible parties).
6. The reports/documentation outlined in points 1, 4 and 5 above are advanced through IMC's governance processes.

Appendix 3 provides a suggested timeline of essential steps in the Major/Reaccreditation review process.

2.3 Details Regarding a Major Review/Reaccreditation

Administrative Assistance. Prior to the commencement of a scheduled review, the Vice Principal will appoint an Administrative Assistant to work with the Chair of the Review Panel and to manage the relevant processes.

Responsibilities of the Provost: Provost is expected to:
1. Provide access to all documentation and details pertaining to the course (including course learning outcomes, course structure, unit guides, professional accreditation, curriculum mapping, exam papers, staffing details if required);
2. Provide information on external referencing, including benchmarking with other institutions;
3. Provide a summary of the Institute's Quality Assurance processes and, where relevant, peer review and moderation;
4. Work with IMC colleagues to ensure appropriate student data has been included in the Internal Review Report. This data includes admissions, enrolments, and student progress; and relevant student feedback from sources such as graduate surveys, student experience surveys and student satisfaction surveys.

Constitution of the Review Panel. For major/reaccreditation reviews, a Panel of at least three members who have relevant expertise, is to be constituted by the Chair of CAC after consultation with the Chair of Academic Board. The Panel will consist of a Chair, and at least one external expert.

Appointment of External Experts for Review Panels. External experts will be identified by:
- First, seeking suggestions from the person responsible for proposing the course(s) and members of Course Advisory Committee, Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and Academic Board;
- Second, seeking suggestions from identified experts who decline to be personally involved, and
- Finally, any other appropriate means to identify discipline leaders/experts who may be able to help or advise of suitable reviewers.

Interviewees. The Review Panel will conduct interviews with relevant stakeholders to include the Provost (or nominee), the Chair of CAC (if not on the Panel), the Provost, at least one student and one graduate of the course, and at least one staff member teaching in the course.

Academic Board Consideration of documents. The Academic Board will either:
- approve the course to be reaccredited and advise SAA and the IMC Council;
- recommend to Council that the course should not be reaccredited and be removed from IMC's offerings;
- determine other actions be taken.

Implementation of Recommendations. The Provost will provide to Academic Board updates on implementation every six months commencing at three months after reaccreditation, and until the Chair of Academic Board deems the process to be completed.

3 Offshore Delivery

In addition to the review processes outlined above, an Offshore Campus Advisory Committee will conduct annual reviews of offshore campuses. For those offshore campuses involving course delivery in a language other than English, an external assessor who is proficient in English and the language of instruction and expert in the relevant discipline will conduct a review once every two years or more regularly as required. See the *Offshore Course Delivery Policy* and *Course Delivery in a Language Other Than English Policy* for further information.

4 Third Party Arrangements

Third Party Arrangements are bound by a legal agreement that includes arrangements for review of course delivery. Depending on the scope of functions undertaken by the Third Party, the review may include procedures over and above those outlined above. The review will be the responsibility of a Third Party Arrangement Review Task Group. See the *Third Party Arrangements Policy* for details on this review function.

5 Unit Review and Evaluation

No less than every two years, a review of each unit will be conducted by the Provost (or nominee), in consultation with the Learning and Teaching Committee. Unit reviews are informed by continuous unit monitoring by teaching staff, feedback from students and other stakeholders and moderation processes which include peer review activities and external referencing (See the *Moderation Policy* and *Moderation Procedures*).

5.1 Reviews will consider the ongoing relevance and value of the unit, taking account of the aims and learning outcomes of the course in which it is offered, and any implemented changes or improvements having regard to:

  i. student demand and enrolments;
  ii. fulfilment of the Learning and Teaching Plan;
  iii. content, mode of delivery, teaching and learning methods, assessment methods, grade distributions, student progression and cohort analysis;
  iv. the extent to which students meet learning outcomes;
  v. outcomes of internal and external moderation processes;
  vi. feedback from students obtained from the Student Experience Survey and Student Satisfaction Survey;
  vii. progression rates on unit completion for each year of the course; and
  viii. equivalence of student performance and experience across onshore, offshore and online delivery of units.

5.2 A student evaluation of a unit and its teaching methods will be conducted at the end of each semester. Information derived from student evaluations of units and teaching methods will be assessed to:

  i. assist teaching staff and unit coordinators to monitor, develop and evaluate the unit by gaining feedback from students about the unit structure, content and resources and appraisal of teaching performance
  ii. compare online and face-to-face delivery modes;

iii.   provide data for the two-year review of units and the seven year major course review/reaccreditation; and

iv.   identify patterns of grades and initiate action where required.

Refer to the *Student Survey Policy* and *Student Survey Procedures* for further information on student evaluations.

5.3   **Feedback from Reviews** - The Provost is to ensure that information about changes made to courses, teaching methods and assessments as a result of the processes of course and unit review is published and effectively disseminated to staff and students. Students must be given reasonable notice of any consequences that may affect their study choices.

Additionally, implementation of recommendations arising from major reviews is to be reported to Academic Board every six months after reaccreditation until completed.

5   RELATED DOCUMENTS
i.   *Academic Quality Assurance Framework*
ii.   *Course and Unit Development Policy*
iii.   *Course and Unit Review Policy*
iv.   *Course Delivery in a Language Other Than English Policy*
v.   *Course Review Report Template*
vi.   *Moderation Policy*
vii.   *Offshore Course Delivery Policy*
viii.   *Student Survey Policy*
ix.   *Student Survey Procedures*
x.   *Third Party Arrangements Policy*

6   VERSION CONTROL

Historical Version	Approved by	Approval Date
NIL		

Appendix 1 – Internal Course Review Report

Internal Course Review Report

Australian Institute of Management and Commerce
Major Course Review (and preparation for Course Reaccreditation)

Report prepared by:

Date:

Name of course(s) under review:

Table of Contents *(please insert a list of headings and sub-headings)*

Please note:
A) This report is designed to present key findings with respect to in the terms of reference for major/reaccreditation reviews, as shown in the Course and Unit Review Policy.

B) The headings and sub-headings below may need to be supplemented depending on the context of the review

1. **Background**

This report applies to [*name of program*], which has been subjected to a course review process during [*time period*]. TEQSA requirements (consistency with AQF level) and the Institute's 'Course and Unit Review Policy' have been taken into consideration.

2. **Course rationale**
    2.1. Expected graduate employment opportunities
    2.2. Emerging developments, if any, in the field of study

3. **Review of curriculum**
    3.1. Course design and content
    3.2. Course (and unit) learning outcomes
    3.3. Methods of assessment of those outcomes, including major types of assessment, their justification, and if applicable, the use of projects and capstone units
    3.4. Alignment of unit assessment tasks with course learning outcomes (include mapping of course learning outcomes to AQF level specifications, unit learning outcomes and unit assessment)
    3.5. Structure, duration and modes of delivery (including appropriateness and any trends)

4. **Review of student participation and achievement**
    4.1. Analysis of student outcomes data including student feedback
    4.2. Feedback, if any, from students regarding curriculum (including implications of any changes in student cohorts and/or the needs of students)

5. Benchmarking and its implications
   5.1. Updated benchmarking, sector standards and/or practice
   5.2. Suggested changes to accredited course, if any
   5.3. Implications for course consistency with AQF and TEQSA Threshold Standards

6. Learning resources available and the student experience
   6.1. Learning support and appropriateness of teaching spaces/resources
   6.2. Statement outlining the overall quality of the student experience

7. Potential risks to the quality of the course
   7.1. Management of academic integrity
   7.2. Currency of knowledge in the course
   7.3. Effectiveness of learning strategies
   7.4. Adequacy of staffing and resources
   7.5. Other potential risks

8. Recommendations from internal review
   (to be considered by the Review Panel)
   8.1. Major issues and possible proposals for change
   8.2. Other issues/comments based on the internal review

*** END OF REPORT ***

Australian National Institute of Management & Commerce

Course Assessment and Review

Course Name	
Reviewer's Name	
Current position	
Brief summary of expertise and experience relevant to this report	
Signature	
Date	

Preamble

The Institute of Management & Commerce (IMC) requests an assessment and review of the course noted above, which may be a new course or an existing course.

This assessment and review form is to be used by:
- an independent external expert appointed by IMC
- the Director Quality Assurance at IMC, or
- an internal expert not closely associated with the course under review.

The principal purpose of the <u>assessment</u> is to provide an opinion on the compliance of the course with respect to the Higher Education Standards Framework[1](HES) with particular regard to the course learning outcomes, course structure, course duration and admission rules. Assessment also requires consistency with the Australian Qualifications Framework[2].

The principal purpose of the <u>review</u> is to provide an opinion on the content of the course with reference to the units (subjects) contained in the course, the learning outcomes (goals) of each unit, the extent to which unit learning outcomes collectively align with course learning outcomes, the topics to be studied in each unit, the quality and appropriateness of the assessment tasks contained in each unit, the relevance of prescribed and recommended readings and importantly, suggested improvements to any of the above. These details are captured in the seven questions that constitute the body of this report. References to the relevant sections of the HES Framework are provided.

---

[1] https://www.teqsa.gov.au/higher-education-standards-framework-2021
[2] https://www.teqsa.gov.au/australian-qualifications-framework

QUESTION 1: Do the <u>course learning outcomes</u> align with the Levels and Qualifications Descriptors[3] of the Australian Qualifications Framework? If not, then why not and what needs to be changed?

HES Framework Section 1.4.1 Course Learning Outcomes and Assessment

QUESTION 2: Are the <u>course learning outcomes</u> appropriately designed (encompass discipline-related and generic outcomes) for the course? If not, then why not and what improvements can be made?

HES Framework Section 1.4.2 Course Learning Outcomes and Assessment

---

[3] https://www.aqf.edu.au/aqf-levels

QUESTION 3: Does the set of proposed <u>units in the course</u> represent a substantial, coherent and current body of knowledge and scholarship? If not, then why not and which units are not relevant, and which other units should the course include?

HES Framework Section 3.1.2 Course Design

QUESTION 4: For each unit, are the <u>unit learning outcomes</u> consistent with:

   a) **The learning outcomes of the course as a whole;**

   b) **The topics to be studied in the unit; and**

   c) **The readings, activities and other learning resources?**

If not, then what amendments should be made to learning outcomes, topics, activities or readings?

HES Framework Sections 1.4.4 Learning Outcomes and 3.1.3 Course Design

QUESTION 5: For each unit, is the design of each <u>assessment task</u> such that it will provide a measure of the competence achieved by a student in the unit learning outcomes to which it is aligned? If not, which types of assessment and/or which units do not have alignment between assessment tasks and unit learning outcomes? Specific examples will be helpful.

HES Framework Section 1.4.3 Learning Outcomes and Assessment

QUESTION 6: Please consider the overall assessment regime of the course and comment on:

   a) **The balance of types of assessment, with special reference to AQF level;**
   b) **The (over) reliance on any particular type of assessment; and**
   c) **Any potential improvements to the overall assessment regime.**

HES Framework Section 1.4.4 Learning Outcomes and Assessment

QUESTION 7: Please provide an opinion on the following items:

d) **The rationale for the course;**
e) **The sequence of units over the course;**
f) **The course duration;**
g) **The pre-requisite structure of units in the course;**
h) **The potential for units in the course to generate positive student engagement;**
i) **The required English language level designated for the course; and**
j) **The admission rules for the course.**

HES Framework Sections 1.1.1 and 1.4.2 Student Participation and Engagement

QUESTION 8: Please comment on the following:

a) **Whether the course meets the requirements of the appropriate AQF level, and**
b) **Any perceived or potential risks to the quality of the course.**

CONCLUDING COMMENTS: Please add any other comments

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Appendix 3 – Timeline for conduct of major/reaccreditation review

Proposed timeline for major review

Step	Target date	Action	Responsibility	Status
1	15 months before accreditation due date: Starting Point (SP)	CAC calls for internal review report from Provost (template to be used, and deadline set) (up to 4 months)	Chair CAC (on behalf of Academic Board)	
2	4 months after SP	Suggestions for external reviewers sought from the Provost, CAC, LTC, AB	Chair CAC	
3	4 months after SP	Internal review report from Provost scrutinized by CAC and amended if necessary	Provost and Chair CAC	
3	1 month later (5 months from SP)	Panel Chair, and details planned (including remuneration for reviewers, administrative support, potential Panel date determined)	Chair Academic Board and Chair CAC, in consultation with Vice Principal	
4	During next month (ie during 6th month from SP)	Potential external reviewers, and other individuals who may be recommended, approached; external experts established; panel date finalized	Chair CAC in consultation with Chair Academic Board	
5	Simultaneously with step 4 (during 6th month from SP)	Provost of Business to provide Internal Review document and full program documentation to DropBox	Provost	
6	During final part of 6th month from SP	All panel interviewees and details finalized	Chair CAC and Administrative Assistant (Provost, Provost, at least one graduate and one student, staff)	
7	During next month (7th month from SP)	Panel convenes for half day	Administrative Assistant in consultation with Panel Chair and members	
8	During next week	Chair CAC provides Panel Notes to Panel members	Panel Chair and Administrative Assistant	
9	End of 8th month from SP	External reviewer reports due to Chair CAC (passed immediately to Provost for step 10)	External reviewers Provost	
10	End of 9th month from SP	The Statement of Response and Implementation Plan are provided by Provost to Chair of CAC	Provost	
11	ASAP – and within 10th month from SP	CAC discusses the Review Reports, and determines whether any further action is required to complete the review	CAC members	
12	ASAP after step 11 – expected to be within 11th month from SP	Academic Board discusses the Review Report, and the Statement of Response and Implementation Plan	Chair CAC Academic Board	
13	After step 12 (conclusion of the process, up to 12 months from SP)	Chair Academic Board progresses documents to IMC Council and any other appropriate bodies (SAA or TEQSA; professional accreditors)	Chair Academic Board	