


<b>PROCEDURE</b>		
Ref. to Legislative Frameworks:  HESF2021: Standard 1 / 3 / 5 / 6.3 / 7.2  National Code 2018: Standard 11	<b>Course Review and Reaccreditation</b>	
Version: 4.4	Approved by: Academic Dean	Approved on: 26/09/2024 Review by: 26/09/2026

### Revision History

Current Version	Description of Change	Procedure Developer	Effective Date
4.4	Inclusion of Annual Course Performance Review within the Continuous Improvement Reviews along with semester reports.  Added definition of both course course reviews.	Compliance Manager and Academic Dean	26/09/2024
4.3	Clause 3.2.3 has been rephrased to avoid the duplication of formal reporting to the Academic Board.	Compliance Manager and Academic Dean	22/01/2024
4.2	Updated to HESF 2021; Updated title; Updated References; Inclusion of one additional responsibility for Academic Board.	Compliance Manager and Academic Dean	17/03/2023
4.1	Inclusion of Transition planning principles	Chief Executive Officer and Associate Academic Dean	07/01/2020

4.0	Separated Course Development from Course Review into two different sets of policies and procedures.  Aligned the policies and procedures to the amended Course Development, Review and Approvals Framework and Institutional Quality Assurance Framework published in late September 2017	Academic Dean	09/10/2017
-----	---	---------------	------------

## PURPOSE

This procedure explains the sequences of activities required in the review and reaccreditation or discontinuation/teach out of a higher education course developed by Academies Australasia Polytechnic (AAPoly) and accredited by Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Authority (TEQSA).

## SCOPE

This procedure applies to the review of an AAPoly higher education course that has been accredited by TEQSA.

## DEFINITIONS

Academic Quality Assurance Framework	A system that monitors students' performance and evaluations to provide feedback that informs teaching and learning quality.
Australian Qualifications Framework	The national policy for regulated qualifications in Australian education and training
Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) (Threshold Standards) 2021	The national framework comprising the requirements that a higher education provider must meet – and continue to meet – in order to be registered by the Australia's Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) to operate in Australia as a provider of higher education.
Comprehensive Course Review	A review of all aspects of the course at least once every seven (7) years. <sup>1</sup> This may include several internal audits and performance reviews, independent reviews by external reviewers and cross-institutional benchmarking.
Continuous Improvement Reviews	Include summary reports after each semester and a detailed course performance review annually.

## PROCEDURE

1. Course Review and the subsequent approval to renew its accreditation or discontinue it are guided by the Board of Directors. The Course Review is integral to a typical Course Lifecycle consisting of four phases, namely:

Phase 1 - Initial Course Proposal

Phase 2 - Course Development

Phase 3 - Continuous Improvement Review

---

<sup>1</sup> TEQSA Guidance note: Academic Quality Assurance, available at <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/guidance-notes/guidance-note-academic-quality-assurance>

## Phase 4 - Course Reaccreditation or Discontinuation

2. The process of reviewing courses and constituent subjects accords with review and improvement activities consistent with Standard 5.3.1 of the HESF 2021, and in accordance with the Academic Governance of AAPoly.
3. There are two types of Course Reviews applied to an AAPoly higher education course:
  - a. Comprehensive Course Review – a review of all aspects of the course at least once every seven (7) years. This may include several internal audits and performance reviews, independent reviews by external reviewers and cross-institutional benchmarking.
  - b. Continuous Improvement Reviews - include summary reports after each semester and a detailed course performance review annually.

### 3.1 Comprehensive Course Review

At least once every seven (7) years, each higher education course undergoes a Comprehensive Review. In line with HESF 2021 requirements, a comprehensive course review includes the curriculum and content of each course, the expected learning outcomes, the degree by which students achieve those outcomes, and potential changes due to emerging developments in the respective academic discipline, modes of delivery, students' needs and identified as well as anticipated risks that can affect the course quality. The Academic Dean has oversight responsibility for Academic Quality and will initiate the Comprehensive Review, reporting to the Academic Board.

A Comprehensive Course Review may result in a determination to re-accredit the course. The following schema illustrates the major steps in a Comprehensive Course Review:



Each of the major steps in a Comprehensive Course Review requires the following inputs:

- a. Review and analyse course performance since last accreditation. Inputs to this step include student progress data, student evaluations of teaching and the course, teaching staff feedback and academic quality indicators. Results of any interim improvements are also considered.

- b. **Review and revise Course Learning Outcomes**  
Inputs to this step include external environmental scan, current research in the relevant discipline areas, similar courses offered elsewhere, any revision to Graduate Attributes, graduate satisfaction surveys and industry consultations. If a new set of Course Learning Outcomes results from this review, the course may have to be re-accredited. The Course Learning Outcomes will be tabled at the Academic Board for discussion and validation.
- c. **Review and revise Subject Learning Outcomes and Assessments**  
Based on the revised Course Learning Outcomes, it may be necessary to modify the Subject Learning Outcomes. Using the student progress data and with reference to contemporary assessment methodologies, existing assessment strategies may be revised.
- d. **External Academic Expert Review and External Benchmarking**  
The Course Learning Outcomes, Subject Learning Outcomes and Assessments should be reviewed by external qualified academics, not associated with the development of these instruments. At least two (2) external academics have to provide input to the Comprehensive Course Review. These external academics must have current academic course development experience.  
  
Peer reviews and benchmarking are also necessary to validate any course design decisions, including course learning outcomes and assessments.  
  
Outcomes of the External Academic Experts review and any benchmarking reports are tabled at Academic Board for discussion and validation.
- e. **Course Review Documentation for Approval and Accreditation**  
Upon completion of the Comprehensive Course Review, the Course Review documentation will be presented to the Academic Board for discussion and approval for implementation.

### 3.2. Continuous Improvement Review

The Continuous Improvement Review include summary reports after each semester and a detailed course performance review annually. The annual course performance is detailed and summarises the end of semester reports. The end of Semester Summary reports occurs regularly at the end of a semester. The scrutiny aims to identify issues pertaining to subject content and quality of teaching and learning. Its purpose is to develop resolutions that enhance students' learning experience. Regular monitoring of the Academic Indicators by the Academic Dean and faculty staff ensures the attention to quality. They receive reports on the performance of courses and constituent subjects that may or may not entail significant findings and initiate any necessary actions in a timely manner. These findings and actions are communicated and implemented via End of Semester Reviews, Change and Performance Management, and Formal Reporting to the Academic Board.

### 3.2.1. End of Semester Summary reports

In any one Academic Year, AAPoly has three (3) semesters for teaching and learning, and review periods:

- Semester 1: March – June;
- Semester 2: July - October;
- Semester 3: November – February.

As part of ongoing quality assurance in teaching and learning, AAPoly implements a structured arrangement of regular course reviews within each Academic Year, including End of Semester Reviews. These reviews take place in July (for Semester 1), November (for Semester 2), and March (for Semester 3). The End of Semester Review is an evaluative process, underpinned by students' experience.

The End of Semester Review for each accredited higher education course utilising constituent subjects offered during that semester is undertaken to monitor and evaluate:

- Summary data and analysis related to student progress and grade distributions;
- The quality, scope and adequacy of course/subjects related information provided to students and prospective students;
- The appropriateness of methods of delivery relating to students' need and demand;
- Analysis of significant trends drawn from student and teacher evaluations and feedback data;
- External referencing or other benchmarking activities;
- Issues to be flagged for action, including matters raised by lecturers in relation to the teaching and learning of the constituent subjects (e.g. assessments, textbooks etc)

The outcomes of the End of Semester Review are used to mitigate future risks to quality and to guide continuous improvements. Outcomes of the End of Semester Review include:

- Actions for the following semesters that will contribute to the enhancement of teaching and learning, and quality standards;
- Identified risks – resources, compliance, financial viability

### 3.2.2. Change and Performance Management

To ensure that appropriate consideration is given towards proposals that may result in change at the various levels (i.e., both macro and micro), AAPoly arranges that not only suggestions from interested parties are adequately represented in the review and consideration process, but also any alterations are undertaken systematically and appropriately integrated in due measures, including managing academic staff performance. Accordingly, any formal changes to the content of subjects (e.g. changes to subject assessments, textbooks etc.) normally occur once a year, and

scheduled for the commencement of the Semester 1 of the Academic Year. This is to ensure that the introduction of any revised arrangements occur in a systematic way and are also not overly burdensome on the resources base. These arrangements may be varied by the Academic Dean or may be the result of adverse trends in key academic indicators for particular courses or subjects.

### 3.2.3. Formal Reporting to the Academic Board

End of Semester reviews are formally communicated to the Academic Board at the end of each semester, to assist with academic risk management, and to support ongoing quality assurance through independent oversight and scrutiny".

The Academic Board may give specific feedback and/or request additional information based on End of Semester Reviews.

### 3.3. Course discontinuation/ Teach-out/Transition

A course may be discontinued for a number of reasons, such as:

- A persistent and steep decline in student demand;
- A change in business priorities by the AAPoly Board of Directors, or
- Course accreditation or Institutional registration outcomes.

Course discontinuations are approved by the Academic Board (from an academic perspective) and by the Board of Directors (from a business perspective). Course closure occurs in two stages:

- Stage 1
  - Where a course is closed to new admissions, but the course is continued in a teach-out mode; or
  - Temporary closure to new admissions, for the maximum period of three (3) years – during which a review will be required.
- Stage 2
  - The formal discontinuation of a course;
  - The course is removed from Higher Education offerings.

Any course closure must consider the impact on students and seek to protect their interests. Any proposal for a course closure must have a holistic teach-out strategy or transition plan and regard to relevant regulations and legislation (e.g. the *Education Services for Overseas Students Act, 2000, as amended*). Further, AAPoly will ensure appropriate management and resourcing of the final student cohort in any course or constituent subject(s) to be discontinued.

The Academic Dean justifies, and the Academic Board approves any enrolment variations to standard course requirements in respect to course rules of progression and completion.

## **RESPONSIBILITIES**

The **CEO** is accountable to the Board of Directors for:

- Conducting effective business management of AAPoly higher education courses and related matters; including the financial viability of courses and prudent resources management;
- Ensuring courses are aligned with strategic directions of AAPoly; relevant and compliant with all regulatory standards
- Managing relevant risks

The **Academic Dean** has the responsibility for the maintenance of the quality processes and for sponsoring the development, change and approval of higher education courses as may be required by:

- Ensuring existing and new courses are aligned with AAPoly's strategic direction, Teaching and Learning Framework and Higher Education Assessment Framework;
- Ensuring an existing or reaccredited course meets all relevant Australian quality standards;
- Demonstrating how changes to the current courses may facilitate achievement of the necessary graduate attributes and employability skills;
- Engaging the necessary external industry accreditation or registration approvals;
- Reporting the course performance matters to the AAPoly Academic Board;
- Overseeing that changes to arrangements, including course discontinuation/teach out, are implemented organization-wide;
- Managing relevant risks.

The **Associate Dean (Education)** responsibilities include but are not limited to:

- Reporting on existing course performance;
- Monitoring and undertaking existing subject and course reviews;
- Conducting internal, external, academic and industry consultations to generate feedback that contributes to course development;
- Collecting, analyzing and responding to feedback from students and teaching staff about the existing course;
- Maintaining course quality and academic integrity.

The **Academic Board** is responsible for:

- Formulating and reviewing policies, rules, guidelines and procedures in relation to course development, review and approval;
- Assuring consistently high quality course delivery, teaching and scholarly activities;
- Overseeing the development and review of existing and proposed HE courses and programs and recommending these to the BOD for approval.
- Approving any enrolment variations to standard course requirements in respect to course rules of progression and completion.



## **FEEDBACK**

Feedback about this procedure should be directed to the Academic Dean through [academicdean@aapoly.edu.au](mailto:academicdean@aapoly.edu.au). The Academic Dean will respond to the written question or feedback within two (2) weeks from the receipt, unless an extenuating circumstance requires an immediate response or action. The subsequent outcome will be documented in the version register which will form a part of quality assurance and continuous improvement of AAPoly.

---

## REFERENCES

Source	Document Title
Internal	AAPoly Academic Board Charter
	Course Development, Review and Approval Framework
	Course Development and Approval Policy and Procedure
	AAPoly Institutional Quality Assurance Framework
	AAPoly Quality Assurance Policy and Procedure
	Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure
External	Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
	National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018
	TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Governance
	TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Quality Assurance
	TEQSA Guidance Note: Course design (including learning outcomes and assessment)
	TEQSA Renewing Course Accreditation