



CHRISTIAN HERITAGE COLLEGE

POLICY: Course Review

Policy Group(s)	Group C: Administration – 1: Academic (Ref: C1/0417.2.1)		
Related Policy:	Course Development and Accreditation External Moderation of Assessment Internal Moderation of Unit Exit Results Benchmarking		
Commencement Date:	April 2017	Review Date:	Initial review - April 2018 Scheduled review - April 2022

POLICY STATEMENT

Intent:

Christian Heritage College (CHC) is committed to providing students with a quality, transformational learning experience through their engagement with their studies which develops critical and independent thought and the capacity for life-long learning. As part of that commitment CHC has developed a policy to outline the mechanisms for the reviewing of its courses.

The purpose of course review is two-fold: for the continuous improvement of courses, as promoted by regular review processes; and for the renewal of accreditation of courses, as undertaken at periodic intervals according to the applicable accreditation period. The various mechanisms that form this framework of review each contribute to the systematic improvement of the courses offered by CHC.

CHC's model is intended to sustain a culture of continuous review whereby courses respond quickly and flexibly both to changing circumstances and to review findings, rather than relying upon a compliance-driven, 'minimum standard' renewal of accreditation exercise.

Scope:

This policy applies to all CHC courses.

Restrictions: Nil

Exclusions: Nil

Objectives:

1. To facilitate the outworking of CHC's vision, mission, values and strategic goals.
2. To specify the mechanisms through which CHC courses are reviewed.
3. To ensure the review of courses complies with the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) 2015.
4. To ensure the review of courses forms a part of CHC quality assurance processes.

Policy Provisions:

1. General

- 1.1 This policy sets out the processes for the review of courses. These processes are based on the Approach-Deployment-Results-Improvement (ADRI) model of quality assurance and include:

- 1.1.1 annual monitoring of existing courses through School Annual Reports to assess the ongoing performance of these courses and to initiate improvements;
 - 1.1.2 course reviews for the purpose of preparing documents for submission to TEQSA for renewal of accreditation of existing courses;
 - 1.1.3 review for specific purposes such as initiating changes in curriculum, course structure and organisation and subsequent changes to courses within an accreditation period.
- 1.2 These processes are designed to assure CHC's stakeholders, including employers of CHC graduates and professional bodies, that its courses:
- 1.2.1 advance CHC's mission and strategic goals;
 - 1.2.2 are reviewed on a systematic basis, with reference to course performance data, student satisfaction data and with advice from internal and external experts, for the purpose of maintaining quality and currency;
 - 1.2.3 are supported by resources which facilitate quality learning experiences and outcomes; and
 - 1.2.4 are likely to produce graduates who are equipped with knowledge and skills which will specifically contribute to the wider Christian community and society in general and which promote life-long learning.
- 1.3 The Dean of each School is responsible to ensure that course review mechanisms are employed according to the relevant timeframes, and the outcomes are assessed and implemented as appropriate.

2. Review Bodies

- 2.1 There are a number of bodies at CHC that are charged with the review of courses:
- 2.1.1 Academic Board;
 - 2.1.2 Learning and Teaching Committee;
 - 2.1.3 School Boards of Studies; and
 - 2.1.4 School Advisory Committee.
- 2.2 Academic Board is the academic governing body of CHC. It is responsible for overseeing the planning, development, implementation and review of CHC's academic programs, and for assuring, auditing, evaluating and improving the quality of academic programs and processes. Academic Board engages in processes of course review through its consideration of School Annual Reports and the approval of applications for renewal of accreditation.
- 2.3 The Learning and Teaching Committee engages in processes of course review through its consideration of applications for renewal of accreditation, for recommendation to Academic Board (NB: in the case of research courses, the Research Committee sits jointly with the Learning and Teaching Committee).
- 2.4 School Boards of Studies engage in course review through the analysis of student feedback, as collected in the CHUE process, and staff feedback regarding the delivery of units at the conclusion of each semester, and in preparation for the subsequent offering of units.
- 2.5 The School Advisory Committee (SAC) meets on a biannual basis to review the Annual Report prior to its tabling at Academic Board to monitor the performance of courses, provide external advice regarding trends and developments in the relevant fields of study, and to make recommendations regarding the work of the School. The report of the SAC is appended to the School Annual Report.

The SAC is also to provide expert advice to Schools regarding the review of courses for renewal of accreditation, as scheduled according to the applicable accreditation expiry dates. Provision 5.5 of CHC Policy: *Course Development and Accreditation* details the role of the SAC in this regard.

3. Review Mechanisms

- 3.1 There are two types of review mechanisms:
 - 3.1.1 regular review mechanisms; and
 - 3.1.2 periodic review mechanisms.
- 3.2 Regular review mechanisms occur on an annual basis according to a declared timeline. They are intended primarily to provide for the systematic analysis of data and feedback for the continuous improvement of courses and their delivery.
- 3.3 Periodic review mechanisms occur on a needs-basis, either in conjunction with the development of applications for the renewal of course accreditation as determined by the applicable accreditation expiry dates, or as scheduled in consultation with CHC partner institutions.

4. Regular Review Mechanisms

- 4.1 The regular review mechanisms are:
 - 4.1.1 School Annual Report;
 - 4.1.2 external moderation of assessment; and
 - 4.1.3 professional accreditation and reports to professional bodies (as applicable).
- 4.2 The School Annual Report is the primary mechanism of course review employed by Schools. The Report requires Schools to consider various data and feedback for the purpose of analysing trends and sector changes, including:
 - 4.2.1 contextual issues and developments that may impact upon courses, including feedback from professional associations and registration authorities;
 - 4.2.2 student enrolment;
 - 4.2.3 gender;
 - 4.2.4 type of enrolment (undergraduate/postgraduate; full time/part time);
 - 4.2.5 entry standards;
 - 4.2.6 student progress and retention;
 - 4.2.7 completion;
 - 4.2.8 grade distributions;
 - 4.2.9 student satisfaction; and
 - 4.2.10 graduate destinations and employer satisfaction.

These data are sourced from the CHC Dashboard which is compiled both from internal and external sources, including the CHC Student Management System, CHUEs (Christian Heritage Unit Evaluations) and national graduate surveys.

School Annual Reports are compiled using the CHC School Annual Report Template and are to be submitted by 1 April annually for review and comment by Academic Board in May. This allows for issues identified within the reports to be evaluated and responses enacted in a timely manner.

- 4.3 The external moderation of assessment provides for the review of academic standards in units, by persons who are external to CHC and are qualified within the disciplines of the selected units, and who may have current or recent experience in the public or private higher education sectors.

CHC Policy: *External Moderation of Assessment* requires that, normally, two units from each School are nominated for moderating. These are selected at the end of Semesters 1 and 2 of each academic year, with the timeframe for the process being as agreed between institutions. Moderators' reports are provided to School Boards of Studies for review and the actioning of recommendations prior to the subsequent offering of the units.

- 4.4 Professional accreditation and reports to professional bodies (as applicable) are a mechanism that provides a further avenue of external review as the courses to which the accreditation applies are assessed for meeting the standards and requirements of the relevant professions, thus ensuring that the currency of the courses is maintained.

Reports to professional bodies are submitted on an annual basis according to the requirements of the relevant body. Feedback as provided by the professional bodies is given to the relevant School Board of Studies, thus allowing for issues that arise regarding the courses to be evaluated and responses enacted in a timely manner.

5. Periodic Review Mechanisms

- 5.1 The periodic review mechanisms are:

- 5.1.1 Course Development Committee;
- 5.1.2 external review of courses; and
- 5.1.3 benchmarking.

- 5.2 Course Development Committees (CDC) provide external input into the review of the course with regard to factors such as course performance, course design and course delivery, in order to ensure that the course reflects best practice in the particular discipline and takes account of external requirements regarding any industry and/or professional bodies and contexts. Provision 5.6 of CHC Policy: *Course Development and Accreditation* details the role of the CDC in this regard.

The CDC is convened according to the applicable accreditation expiry dates and project timeline as detailed in the CHC Accreditation Management Tool.

- 5.3 Provision 8 of CHC Policy: *Course Development and Accreditation* indicates that courses that have been recommended by the Learning and Teaching Committee for approval by Academic Board are to be submitted to an external reviewer for the purpose of assessing the course against the core scope of assessment and minimum evidence requirements, as indicated in the *Application Guide for Registered Higher Education Providers* (Version 3.5). This mechanism allows the course to be independently reviewed by a discipline expert with regard to its meeting of regulatory requirements.

The external reviewer is engaged according to the applicable accreditation expiry dates and project timeline as detailed in the CHC Accreditation Management Tool. The report of the external reviewer is provided to the relevant School and the Learning and Teaching Committee to guide the finalising of applications for accreditation for recommendation to Academic Board.

- 5.4 CHC engages in four types of benchmarking, as detailed in CHC Policy: *Benchmarking*, for the purpose of undertaking comparative analysis studies to promote continuous improvement and to inform curriculum review. These benchmarking activities address:

- 5.4.1 quality assurance;
- 5.4.2 student engagement and retention;
- 5.4.3 learning and teaching initiatives; and
- 5.4.4 best practice.

These activities are arranged according to the schedules of the various groups involved with regard to conferences, meetings and showcases.

SUPPORTING PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

See related policies

WHO SHOULD KNOW THIS POLICY?

Deans
Academic Board
Learning and Teaching Committee
School Boards of Studies
School Advisory Committees
Course Development Committees

POLICY FURTHER INFORMATION

**Relevant Commonwealth/
State Legislation:** *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth)*

ACCOUNTABILITIES

Implementation:	Deans of each School Director of Quality and Standards Academic Registrar
Compliance:	Academic Board
Monitoring and Evaluation:	Academic Board
Development and Review:	Director of Quality and Standards
Approval Authority:	Academic Board
Interpretation and Advice:	Director of Quality and Standards

EFFECTIVENESS OF THIS POLICY

- Performance Indicators:**
- Regular and effective employment of the various review mechanisms, according to the applicable timelines.
 - Development of quality courses as evidenced through positive course performance data and student satisfaction data.

Other:

Definitions and Acronyms:	Academic Board	The academic governing body of CHC.
	Course Development Committee	A committee appointed to oversee the development and review of courses, comprising both internal and external members.
	CHC	Christian Heritage College.
	CHUE	Christian Heritage Unit Evaluation.

COPHE Council of Private Higher Education, an industry body to which CHC belongs.

Course Coordinator

The academic member of a School responsible for the coordination of a course or suite of courses and who provides academic advice to students.

Dean The Head of the School administering the course or suite of courses

Learning and Teaching Committee

A committee of Academic Board.

School Advisory Committee

A standing committee of a School Board of Studies which comprises mainly external members and provides advice to the School on matters relating to courses

TEQSA Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency

APPROVAL – Section maintained by the Director of Quality and Standards

Reference No.	Approved	Date	Committee/Board	Resolution No./ Minute Ref.
C1/0417.2.1	Approved	13 April 2017	Academic Board	5.1

REVISION HISTORY – Section maintained by the Director of Quality and Standards

Revision Reference No.	Approved/Rescinded	Date	Committee/Board	Resolution No./ Minute Ref.
------------------------	--------------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------------