

## COURSE AND SUBJECT REVIEW POLICY AND PROCEDURE

### Purpose

The purpose is to provide a framework for reviewing AIB's 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](#).

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

**Review Steering Committee** – committee supporting major reviews, consisting of members internal to AIB.

### Rationale

AIB courses and subjects are subjected to regular (including external) review

- in recognition of the need for ongoing development and change, and
- to align with the Australian Qualifications Framework and relevant Threshold standards.

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

### Details

#### 1. Major reviews of courses

- 1.1 A major review of all AIB courses is undertaken by a Major Course Review Committee every four years.
- 1.2 A Review Steering Committee comprising the Academic Director and at least one other academic staff member (including a Head of Discipline) and the Head of Quality, Risk and Compliance will gather relevant information (as detailed in section 1.4 below) about the course(s) being reviewed and will nominate members of the Major 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 Major 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 academic staff members who are familiar with the course (including a Head of Discipline),
  - (e) one student representative and/or one recent graduate of the course, and
  - (f) other persons as appropriate.
  
- 1.4 In respect to the quality and relevance of each course, the Major Course Review Committee will review and provide an assessment on:
  - (a) the course 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 or locations of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study;
  - (c) evidence of regular monitoring and benchmarking and external referencing relating to:
    - i. the quality of teaching and of supervision of research students, student progress and subject delivery
    - ii. time series data on enrolments, completions, progress rates and attrition rates
    - iii. assessment methods and marking practices.
  - (d) use of feedback from students, graduates, employers and professional associations to improve the course;
  - (e) use of feedback about teaching and staff performance and the availability of relevant professional development to improve teaching practice;
  - (f) evidence of implementation of outcomes and recommendations from recent relevant reviews and benchmarking activities to improve the course; and
  - (g) any additional matters deemed relevant by the Major Course Review Committee.
  
- 1.5 On completion of the review, the Major Course Review Committee will submit a report to the Academic Director for presentation to Academic Board.
  
- 1.6 The Steering Committee, together with Heads of Discipline, will discuss the report and recommendations, identify appropriate actions and develop a draft implementation plan. The Course Review Committee report and the draft implementation plan are presented to the Teaching & Learning Committee (for coursework courses) and the Research & Higher Degrees Committee (for research courses) for discussion. The original report and final implementation plan(s) are presented to Academic Board for review and approval. Academic Board may choose to accept, amend or reject the report's recommendations in whole or in part.
  
- 1.7 The Academic Director will report on the implementation of actions approved 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 in consultation with the Heads of Discipline. The minor reviews are based on analysis of feedback from a variety of sources including students, Heads of Discipline, 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 & 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 & Learning Committee or Research & 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 & Learning Committee, the Research & 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 & Learning Committee (or Research & Higher Degrees Committee) for consideration.
- 4.3 Teaching & Learning Committee and the Research & 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 8</b>
<b>Approved By:</b>	Academic Board
<b>Date of Approval:</b>	26 April 2018
<b>Previous versions:</b>	21 June 2017
	26 April 2017
	9 September 2016
	12 August 2015
	13 July 2015
	1 July 2011
	9 December 2008
<b>Date of Next Review:</b>	26 April 2020