

TABOR

COURSE REVIEW POLICY

Authorised By:	Academic Board	Revision: 1.1
Revision Date:	Revision Date: 05 Apr 2023	
Review Due Date:	Next Review: 05 Apr 2024	
Related Documents:	Scholarship Committee Terms of Reference Academic Board Policy Academic Quality Assurance Committee Academic Governance Policy Course Closure Policy Benchmarking Policy	
Responsible Officer:	Chief Academic Officer	
Review:	Academic Quality Assurance Committee	

Any person who requires assistance in understanding any aspect of this document should contact the Responsible Officer

1. Overview

The Course Review Policy describes Tabor's approach to ongoing interim monitoring and comprehensive review of all accredited higher education courses as part of institutional quality assurance processes designed to ensure the quality, currency, relevancy, and integrity of Tabor's courses.

2. Scope

This policy applies to existing TEQSA accredited higher education courses offered by Tabor.

3. Policy Principles

- 3.1. Tabor courses are monitored, reviewed, and improved as part of internal quality assurance processes.
- 3.2. Course review, monitoring, and evaluation are designed to:
 - 3.2.1. assess the overall quality of the teaching and learning environment and assess whether the educational aims and learning outcomes have been achieved;
 - 3.2.2. identify areas where improvements are required and strategies for improving performance in these areas;
 - 3.2.3. monitor and evaluate improvements over a given period of time; and
 - 3.2.4. consider the ongoing value, viability, and sustainability of units or course elements and their relevance and place within Tabor's academic profile and scope.

- 3.3. Course review, monitoring and evaluation are to be conducted with reference to:
- 3.3.1. the policies and strategic directions of Tabor as determined by the Board of Governors;
 - 3.3.2. analysis of relevant factors in Tabor's external and internal environments;
 - 3.3.3. data derived from quality assurance processes relating to teaching and learning; and
 - 3.3.4. the views of a range of relevant stakeholders including academic staff peers, students, graduates, employers, regulatory agencies, peak bodies, and professional accreditation bodies.

4. Procedures

Course review

- 4.1. Tabor considers robust course and unit review and analysis essential in the provision of quality academic courses. The processes for reviewing, monitoring, and evaluating Tabor's courses are conducted in accordance with the policies and strategic principles of the College, with reference, as appropriate, to relevant comparative and evaluative data. Information derived from evaluation, monitoring, and review processes are used to develop and shape the teaching and learning environment.
- 4.2. Existing courses are reviewed:
- 4.2.1. annually as part of Tabor's Annual Course Review process,
 - 4.2.2. at the end of their third year of offering (interim course review), and
 - 4.2.3. prior to the **renewal of accreditation** with TEQSA, and not longer than 5 years since the last accreditation decision (comprehensive course review).
- 4.3. Whether the course is undergoing annual, interim, or comprehensive review, external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study will be undertaken to inform the review.
- 4.4. In addition to the above, individual units are selected for review:
- 4.4.1. for courses two years in length or more, at least one unit will be provided to external discipline academics for external review and moderation each semester;
 - 4.4.2. for courses one year in length or less, at least one unit will be provided to external discipline academics for external review and moderation each year.

Annual Course Review

- 4.5. In the instance of an **annual course review**:
- 4.5.1. After Census 1 each year, the Chief Academic Officer's Office populates an Annual Course Review Template for the course under review. This includes adding attrition, progression, and completion rate data from both Tabor and benchmark institutions.
 - 4.5.2. The Head of Program completes an annual course review utilising the template provided by the Chief Academic Officer's Office. This review involves analysing cohort data, student numbers, grade distribution, moderation and benchmarking, student feedback, and risks to the course.
 - 4.5.3. The Head of Program submits the report to the Dean of Faculty who reviews and approves the review.
 - 4.5.4. The report is then submitted to review by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee and the Academic Board. Both committees may provide feedback for the Head of Program to incorporate into the review or recommend courses of action based on the findings of the review.

Interim Course Review

- 4.6. In the instance of an **interim course review**:

- 4.6.1. A Course Advisory Panel¹ provides the Dean of the Faculty and Chief Academic Officer with a report that:
- analyses the currency and relevance of the award's course learning outcomes;
 - analyses the structure and content of the course;
 - analyses student and staff feedback;
 - includes a review of assessment methods; and
 - includes any recommendations for change.
- 4.6.2. The Head of Program, in consultation with the Chief Academic Officer, develops a response which may include an Improvement Implementation Plan.
- 4.6.3. The Response to the Report is provided to the Course Quality Committee and the Academic Board.
- 4.7. Where the Response to the Report and/or Improvement Implementation Plan requires a major change to the course, a submission to TEQSA will be developed. This process is guided by the Material Change Notification Checklist (Appendix A). The Academic Board must approve any Major Change documentation.

Comprehensive Course Review

- 4.8. In the instance of a **comprehensive course review**:
- 4.8.1. The Dean of Faculty, in discussion with the Head of Program (HOP) and the Chief Operating Officer, determines the viability of the course and so whether to apply for renewal of accreditation.
- 4.8.2. If the Dean believes that the course should no longer be offered, the Dean will follow the procedures laid out in the Course Closure Policy.
- 4.8.3. If the Dean endorses the continued offering of the course, a Course Review Panel,² under the guidance and support of the Chief Academic Officer's Office, undertakes a Major Review (using Tabor's Major Review Template).
- 4.8.4. The Course Review Panel includes the following in the development of the first draft of the Major Review:
- 4.8.4.1. an analysis of the outcome of minor course review which will incorporate an analysis of the student performance during the current accreditation period;
 - 4.8.4.2. benchmarking of the structure and learning outcomes of the course with national and international comparators;
 - 4.8.4.3. course rationale, including expected graduate employment opportunities;
 - 4.8.4.4. the qualification to be awarded on completion;
 - 4.8.4.5. admissions criteria and pathways;
 - 4.8.4.6. course learning outcomes and how they fulfil the requirements of the AQF for the level of the course;
 - 4.8.4.7. methods of assessment and indicative student workload;

¹ Membership of a Course Advisory Panel usually consists of: the head of program, one other lecturer within the course, at least one external academic, at least one stakeholder/industry representative, one current student, and one alumnus.

² Membership of a Course Review Panel usually consists of: the head of program, at least two other lecturers within the course, at least two external academics, at least two stakeholders/industry representatives, one current student, and one alumnus.

- 4.8.4.8. list of units indicating if the unit is compulsory or elective;
 - 4.8.4.9. unit descriptions including learning outcomes and unit assessment;
 - 4.8.4.10. structure, duration, and modes of delivery;
 - 4.8.4.11. compulsory requirements for course completion;
 - 4.8.4.12. exit pathways, articulation arrangements, pathways to future learning;
 - 4.8.4.13. research content for Masters or Doctoral qualifications;
 - 4.8.4.14. staffing;
 - 4.8.4.15. student performance (i.e., extent of student's achievement of the learning outcomes); and
 - 4.8.4.16. risks to the quality of the course of study.
- 4.9. The *Major Review* provides analysis and findings from a range of sources, including:
- 4.9.1. student performance outcomes for the units of the course
 - 4.9.2. results of benchmarking against relevant disciplines and higher education providers. In this regard, the Deans of Faculty has the responsibility of working closely with peers of other higher education providers to [benchmark](#) discipline and education standards, practices, and graduate attributes.
 - 4.9.3. review of all unit materials. Revisions take into account developments in scholarship, advice and information received from industry, peer and internal sources, and reflect Tabor's emphasis on the professional development of its staff. Curation of each unit's Tabor Online site is a standard part of the semester revisions.
 - 4.9.4. the student voice. To that end students have the opportunity to use formal and informal mechanisms to provide feedback on units they are enrolled in. Feedback is sought through a standard online instrument, Student Subject Evaluation forms. After grades are released, these student evaluations are reviewed by the lecturer and Dean of Faculty. As a result of these reviews, changes may be made to the unit for the next offering. Students are informed of any changes made to the units via a comment box on the Unit Description.
 - 4.9.5. staff feedback. Deans of Faculty maintain regular contact with lecturers throughout the semester and this provides opportunity for any informal feedback provided to lecturers by students throughout the semester to form part of the ongoing discussions about study materials, assessment, student progress, intervention and support. This dynamic conversation enables informal feedback to be included in the considerations of the revised unit preparation for the following offering.
- 4.10. If the review processes highlight any areas of concern that may extend beyond the boundaries of a single faculty, these are brought to the Scholarship Committee for consideration and advice. Members discuss strategies, share best practice, and revise procedures where appropriate.
- 4.11. The major course review is provided to the Course Quality Committee and then the Academic Board for their review.
- 4.12. Once the Academic Board has reviewed the major course review, the Head of Program will develop a proposal for reaccreditation of the course.
- 4.13. The Head of Program will follow 4.3-4.14 of the Course Design and Approval Policy (**Full Course Proposal**) to develop this proposal.
- 4.14. In developing the first draft of the course submission documentation, the Course Design Team considers and includes in the course redesign:
- 4.14.1. how the content and learning activities of the course engage with advanced knowledge and inquiry consistent with the level of study and the expected learning outcomes, including:
 - 4.14.1.1. current knowledge and scholarship in the relevant academic discipline(s);

- 4.14.1.2. study of the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the academic discipline(s) or fields of education or research represented in the course;
- 4.14.1.3. emerging concepts that are informed by recent scholarship, current research findings and, where applicable, advances in practice; and
- 4.14.1.4. where a course requires professional accreditation, any requirements for graduates to be eligible to practice be included in the course learning outcomes and/or course completion requirements in order for the course to be accredited and continue to be accredited by the relevant professional body
- 4.14.2. input from industry experts, academics and graduates and students along with inter-faculty conversations;
- 4.14.3. evidence that the teaching and learning activities and course design enable the achievement of the expected learning outcomes regardless of a student's place of study or mode of the delivery; and
- 4.14.4. evidence that there are sufficient resources to support the learning of students who undertake the course, and/or that there is a plan in place to acquire such resources and make these available to students when needed.
- 4.15. The course reaccreditation proposal documentation must undergo review by an external discipline expert. The Chief Academic Officer, working with the Course Review Panel, identifies experts with the relevant disciplinary expertise, in line with TEQSA's *Independent Experts engaged by providers* guidance, to conduct the review.
- 4.16. Feedback from the external academic expert will be included in a penultimate draft which is provided for review and approval to the Course Quality Committee and then the Academic Board.
- 4.17. Where professional accreditation of a course of study is required by graduates to practise, the course accreditation by the relevant professional body must be maintained throughout the course's accreditation period.

Course discontinuation

- 4.18. If a course is to be removed from offer, any students within that course must be supported to either complete the course within the designated 'teach-out' period, or transitioned to another course of a similar nature. See the College's Course Closure Policy.

Responsibilities

- 4.19. The Chief Academic Officer manages the processes for course review and reaccreditation by:
 - 4.19.1. working alongside the Deans of the Faculty, reviewing and responding to responses from the Course Advisory Panel on the outcomes of interim course reviews;
 - 4.19.2. ensures a Course Review Panel is convened to undertake comprehensive course reviews, upon endorsement by the Dean of Faculty; and
 - 4.19.3. support the Course Review Panel during the independent review process
- 4.20. The Chief Academic Officer also have responsibilities for course discontinuation, including a teach-out/transition plan, and ensure students are supported during the course teach-out period.
- 4.21. The Chief Academic Officer reports to the [Academic Quality Assurance Committee](#), [Scholarship Committee](#), the Course Advisory Panel (where appropriate), and, ultimately, the Academic Board.

5. Definitions

See [Global Definitions](#)

6. Communication and Training

- 6.2 The Chief Academic Officer will provide the necessary training for conducting a course review to the Review Panels and Course Advisory Panels as required and appropriate.
- 6.3 This policy will be made available on Tabor's website.

Appendix A – Changes in Course of Study Checklist

In accordance with its Guidance Note: *Changes in Courses of Study that may lead to Accreditation as a New Course*, TEQSA requires that accredited providers such as Tabor, identify:

... the major factors that it may have regard to in reaching a decision on whether accreditation of a course can be renewed under its existing identity or whether it needs to be accredited as a new course of study.

Such proposed changes are required to be discussed with TEQSA to help resolve whether they constitute a fundamental change to the course of study such that it requires accreditation as a new course.

Minor changes to courses are expected as a course evolves over time and improvements are made as part of Tabor's quality assurance processes. The following checklist is to be referred to by Deans of Faculty, Heads of Program / Course Coordinators, and teaching staff, when considering changes to a course of study. The checklist outlines the major factors that may require a course to be accredited as a new course of study.

Material Change Checklist

Major course changes that should be discussed with TEQSA, and which may require the course to be accredited as a new course	
Representation of the Course of Study	Changing the structure of a course to accommodate new technologies, emerging opportunities or innovations. For example, Bachelor of Science (BSc) to BSc (Environmental Sciences) or BSc (Emerging Technologies).
	Changing a Course title to one which is likely to suggest that the course may lead to markedly different employment prospects or opportunities for further study, or which may cause confusion with existing courses and/or may be misleading and negatively impact reputation.
	Broadening or narrowing a field of education. For example, changing a Masters of Business Administration (MBA) to an MBA (Health Management).
Level / type of Qualification	Changing a course to lead to a different qualification at the same AQF level. For example, Bachelor (Hons) to a Graduate Diploma at Level 8, or Bachelor to a Masters Degree.
	Changing a postgraduate course from predominantly coursework to a research degree.
Learning outcomes	Marked changes in the expected learning outcomes of a course. For example, learning outcomes are changed to provide training for a different scope of professional practice such as a new major addressing forensic accounting instead of management accounting.
Course duration / volume of learning	Making a marked reduction in the volume of learning without corresponding changes to other factors including: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• level or qualification type• scope of the expected learning outcomes

Please take note: Once PRINTED, this is an UNCONTROLLED DOCUMENT. The current version of this document is kept on the Tabor Corporate Document Repository.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • prerequisites or other aspects of academic preparedness • course design • delivery methods
	Making a marked and unsubstantiated departure from the broad guidance of the AQF.
Entry requirements	<p>Changing entry requirements that are likely to change the consequent type and level of learning experiences. For example, changing from undergraduate entry to graduate entry.</p> <p>Requiring new and substantial requirements for prerequisite professional or workplace experience that is expected to be advanced during study.</p> <p>Changing entry requirements that may require additional support. For example, admitting an educationally disadvantaged cohort, without changing the fundamental nature of the course or its outcomes.</p>
Course design / delivery	<p>Fundamentally changing the design and delivery of a course to engender markedly different graduate capabilities and/or capacity to meet new community expectations. For example, introducing an unprecedented predominance of 'best practice' work-integrated learning.</p> <p>NB: adopting a solely online mode of delivery would require a material change notification, but may not necessarily change the course to such an extent that it requires accreditation as a new course.</p>
Research and research training	Changing a course to a research degree will require accreditation as a new course of study, and the course will need to meet HESF for both Research and Research Training.
Institutional quality assurance	<p>Making changes to a course that requires capabilities that have not previously been demonstrated.</p> <p>For example, incorporating new fields of education into a course for which it has not previously demonstrated a capacity for sufficient academic leadership, staff expertise, learning resources or dedicated expertise in institutional quality assurance (eg, in the Academic Board), such as adding significant STEM content to a humanities program.</p>
Delivery partners	<p>Changing the design of a course to accommodate a delivery arrangement with a partner.</p> <p>NB: a new delivery partner or change of delivery partner will require a material change notification to be made.</p>
International students	Changing a course of study in order to meet the needs of international students (whether onshore or offshore)

NOTE: Where one or more of the above major factors are identified as part of proposed changes for a Tabor course of study, please contact the Chief Academic Officer and/or the Office of the Registrar for support.

Appendix B – Procedures for Approval of New Units

1. A new unit (with a new unit code) must be approved by the Academic Board (AB).
 - 1.1. The unit accreditation details as presented in the Unit Outline (SO) must comply with the current iteration of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and with the course's graduate outcomes.
 - 1.2. A rationale for adding the unit to the list of accredited units must be made. This should include additional explanation if the unit is being added to the core or as a required unit within a major/minor.
 - 1.3. To ensure there is no unnecessary duplication of accredited units it is recommended that the new unit be discussed with the other faculties.
 - 1.4. Units must demonstrate that content and assessment tasks will achieve the learning outcomes.
2. If the rewriting of a unit requires **any** change in the learning outcomes or involves a **major** change (rule of thumb: 33%) in content or assessment it will require the approval of the Academic Board.
3. If the rewriting of a unit does **not** require a change to the learning outcomes and it does **not** constitute a major change in content or assessment then it can be approved by the Dean of Faculty.
4. Submission process:
 - 4.1. Send a draft copy of the rationale and SO to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee. (The AQAC is a sub-committee of the AB.) The necessary information (see above) is to be provided.
 - 4.2. The AQAC will review the SO and recommend the unit to the next AB meeting if it is **compliant** and **appropriate**.
 - 4.3. Copies of the newly approved details go to the Office of the Registrar.