



## COURSE AND SUBJECT REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURE

### Purpose

The purpose is to provide a framework for reviewing courses and subjects.

### Scope

All AIB courses and their component subjects.

### Definitions

Unless otherwise defined in this document, all capitalised terms are defined in the [glossary](#).

**Internal Review Committee** – course (and subject) review committee supporting major reviews or conducting minor reviews, consisting of members internal to AIB.

**Course Review Committee** - course (and subject) review committee for major reviews, consisting of members both internal and external to AIB.

### Rationale

This policy helps ensure a robust approach to the review of AIB courses and subjects. AIB courses and subjects must align with the criteria for relevant levels in the Australian Qualifications Framework and are subjected to regular (including external) review to ensure ongoing alignment. Recognising the need for ongoing development and change, all AIB courses and subjects are formally and systematically reviewed on a regular basis.

The principles guiding the course and subject review are that AIB courses and subjects should be engaging, relevant and contemporary, should enable students to demonstrate their learning at the appropriate level, and are of high standard in compliance with regulations.

### Details

#### 1. Major reviews of courses

- 1.1 A major review of all AIB courses is undertaken by a Course Review Committee every four years from the previous major review.
- 1.2 An Internal Review Committee comprising the Academic Director and at least one other academic staff member and the Director Quality or nominee will gather relevant information (as detailed in section 1.4 below) about the course(s) being reviewed and nominate members of the Course Review Committee, for approval by Academic Board. Sub-committees may be appointed in a similar manner to support the work of the Course Review Committee.
- 1.3 The Course Review Committee is appointed by Academic Board and will comprise:

- (a) a chairperson, who is either a member of the Academic Board, or a person external to AIB,
  - (b) at least one member external to AIB from a relevant academic or professional background,
  - (c) at least one member external to AIB representing a relevant employer, employer group, or professional body,
  - (d) one or more AIB staff members who are familiar with the course,
  - (e) one student representative and/or one recent graduate of the course, and
  - (f) other persons as appropriate.
- 1.4 In respect of each course, the Course Review Committee will review and consider a variety of information about its overall quality course and its ongoing relevance, value, viability and sustainability, including:
- (a) the design, academic content, expected learning outcomes, the methods of assessment of those outcomes, the extent of students' achievements of learning outcomes, and the graduate outcomes,
  - (b) emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study,
  - (c) the quality of teaching and supervision of research students,
  - (d) feedback from students, graduates, academic staff, employers and professional associations,
  - (e) time series data on enrolments, completions, progress rates and attrition rates including benchmarked data with external comparable courses of study,
  - (f) adequacy of staff, physical and electronic resources and infrastructure, and
  - (g) evidence of relevant external referencing or benchmarking activities particularly with respects to course design and delivery, assessment and student progression.
- 1.5 On completion of the review, the Course Review Committee will submit a report to the Internal Review Committee.
- 1.6 The Internal Review Committee will prepare an implementation plan and submit the Course Review Committee report and the implementation plan to the Teaching & Learning Committee (for coursework courses) and the and Research and Higher Degrees Committee (for research courses) and subsequently to Academic Board for review and approval. Academic Board may choose to accept, amend or reject the report and recommendations in whole or in part.
- 1.7 The Academic Director will report on the implementation of recommendations accepted by Academic Board until such implementation is complete.

## **2. Minor reviews of courses**

- 2.1 Midway between two major reviews of coursework and research degree courses an internal review is undertaken, initiated and overseen by the Academic Director. The reviews are based on analysis of feedback from a variety of sources including students, academic staff, advisory committees as well as student performance and external referencing data.

- 2.2 The Academic Director will present a report to the Teaching & Learning Committee and the Research and Higher Degrees Committee (as appropriate) for each course or group of courses with recommendations for improvement where required. These reports are forwarded to Academic Board for review and discussion.
- 2.3 Academic Board may choose to accept, amend or reject the report and recommendations in whole or in part.
- 2.4 The Academic Director will report on the implementation of recommendations accepted by Academic Board until such implementation is complete.

### **3. Peer reviews of subjects and assessment**

- 3.1 While subjects are reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis, a 6-monthly formal peer review process ensures that each subject (and related assessment) in the AIB courses is reviewed externally at least once in four years.
- 3.2 The formal peer reviews will be initiated and overseen by the Academic Director working closely with the relevant Head(s) of Discipline.
- 3.3 Appropriateness and quality of subjects, assessment and marking is assessed by external reviewers and discussed in a reflective peer discussion of reviewers and the AIB teaching team. On completion of this process the external reviewers present AIB with a final peer review report with recommendations.
- 3.4 The relevant Head(s) of Discipline and the Academic Director will prepare an implementation plan and submit both the final peer review report and the implementation plan to Teaching and Learning Committee or Research and Higher Degree Committee (as appropriate) and subsequently to Academic Board for review and approval.
- 3.5 The relevant Head(s) of Discipline will report to the relevant academic committees on implementation of recommendations until implementation is complete.

### **4. Course and subject improvement on an ongoing basis**

- 4.1 The Heads of Discipline, Academic Director, the Teaching and Learning Committee, the Research and Higher Degrees Committee and Academic Board monitor course and subject feedback and performance data.
- 4.2 The Academic Director ensures that academic engagement with industry and/or relevant professions through one or more course advisory committees in relevant discipline areas takes place at least once every two years and that a summary of course advisory committee discussions is forwarded to Teaching and Learning Committee (or Research and Higher Degrees Committee) for consideration.
- 4.3 Teaching and Learning Committee and the Research and Higher Degrees Committee recommends course improvements to Academic Board where required.

**Related Forms:**

Nil

**Related Policies:**

Assurance of Learning Policy

Course and Subject Development and Approval Policy

**Responsibility:**

Academic Director

<b>Current Status</b>	<b>Version 7</b>
<b>Approved By:</b>	Academic Board
<b>Date of Approval:</b>	21 June 2017
<b>Previous versions:</b>	26 April 2017
	9 September 2016
	12 August 2015
	13 July 2015
	1 July 2011
	9 December 2008
<b>Date of Next Review:</b>	21 June 2019