

## 1. Purpose

This policy provides a framework for the systematic internal and external review of curriculum and course processes for the Bachelor of Music in Jazz Performance.

The intent of this policy is to ensure that course curriculum and processes for the Bachelor of Music in Jazz Performance are reviewed in a systematic and transparent way to ensure the course's relevancy to international industry standards and compliance with the Higher Education Threshold Standards and AQF Qualifications Framework.

## 2. Scope

This policy applies to all members of the Institute's higher education faculty, executive management, corporate and academic governance bodies and external stakeholders.

This policy includes information on continual reviews of subjects as well as circumstances where a full review is conducted for subjects or courses. However, it does not include the development of new courses.

It is recognised that academic staff may update subjects on an ongoing basis, as good practice, where there are no changes to the learning outcomes or overall aims of the subject. Issues arising that have been identified via teacher evaluations will be acted upon via the teacher evaluation process. Reviews of individual subjects will take into account whether improvement is required as a result of a systemic issue, or whether it is a result of a specific teacher or class situation.

This policy does not focus on the teaching capacity of individual teachers.

## 3. Objectives

The Institute is committed to the following principles that underpin this policy.

- To ensure the highest of quality in relevant course curriculum at an international standard of excellence in higher education
- To ensure high quality learning outcomes and the development of graduate attributes through rigorous and reliable assessment
- To ensure the provision of appropriate learning resources to support students' learning
- To ensure that the review of course curriculum and processes is systematic, thorough, transparent and promotes continual improvement

## 4. Implementation

Regular systematic review and periodic external renewal of course accreditation provides opportunities for continuous improvement that will incorporate input from all major stakeholder groups. Courses will be reviewed in terms of relevance, demand, quality and deliverability. Courses and subjects are regularly reviewed as a result of internal review processes such as feedback received from lecturers, students, administrative staff and external stakeholders.

Key activities of the academic review process are the collection of data on student learning, interpretation of that data, and monitoring emerging trends according to key indicators of student performance. JMI is committed to ensuring that input is sought from a diverse group of people in the conduct of academic reviews. The academic committees responsible for

conducting reviews and assessing data collected are prescribed in the Academic Governance terms of reference for each committee.

The Academic Board may, from time to time, seek additional expertise to assist with the provision of feedback on the courses, or to assist with assessing feedback. The terms of reference for the Board of Studies and Course Advisory Committee provide details of roles and responsibilities.

Academic reviews are conducted for entire courses and individual subjects. These reviews are conducted internally on an ongoing basis as part of the continuous improvement process, together with regular external reviews of entire courses or partial reviews. The Course Review Criteria for all types of review is provided in Appendix 1.

The Board of Studies is responsible for the ongoing monitoring of higher education courses under delegation from the Academic Board. The collection of data will be in accordance with the data itemized under each type of academic review process. Course data will be examined based on trends over time and interpreted in the context of each individual course, where relevant. Feedback via various mechanisms will be aggregated and used as evidence to inform changes to effect continuous improvement in all aspects of the curriculum.

Academic teaching staff will contribute to the monitoring process via their input at staff meetings, reporting to the Board of Studies on trends and issues and providing specific input when requested.

The Curriculum Change Register will document key details of changes made to the course and individual subjects as a result of the academic review process. The Curriculum Change Register is a key document that provides the history of all changes made as part of the continuous improvement process that will feed into the renewal of accreditation process.

## 4.1 Course reviews

The following provides an overview of the types of course review processes:

1. Major changes - Any proposal to make a major/material change to a higher education course structure, content or delivery requires a course change proposal to be approved by the Academic Board; Board of Directors and the external accrediting authority
2. Minor changes – Minor changes to courses and subjects that constitute continuous improvement, whilst maintaining coherency of the course, only require internal approval by the Academic Board after consideration and recommendation from the Board of Studies, or Course Advisory Committee
3. New courses – should a course review process result in a recommendation to develop a new course, it should be accompanied by a business proposal in the first instance, to determine if the proposed course is viable. The Board of Directors will be responsible for approving the business proposal. Once viability is established, curriculum development would proceed via the appointment of a Course Advisory Committee

JMI implements regular review processes taking account of the academic review objectives of this policy. A variety of academic review mechanisms are available such as:

- internal partial course and subject review
- external full course review
- external audit/assessment/accreditation

## 4.2 Types of Review

### *Ongoing Reviews*

JMI conducts regular internal reviews of subjects on an ongoing basis, and an external review process will be conducted every three years. At the end of each accreditation period (generally between five and seven years), an external review process will be conducted for the renewal of course accreditation and submission to TEQSA. For each type of review process, a range of data will be collected to inform the academic review process and effect continuous improvement of JMI's higher education courses.

TEQSA states that changes of more than 30% constitute a material change. Any proposal to make a material change to an approved higher education course structure, content or delivery, which constitutes a 'material change' requires a course change proposal to be approved by the Academic Board and the external accrediting authority.

The Academic Board shall have regard for the nature and extent of the changes recommended, and if deemed to be material changes requiring approval by TEQSA, then a submission shall be prepared to seek approval from TEQSA before implementing the changes.

### *External Review – accreditation:*

All non self-accrediting institutions wishing to offer higher education courses in Australia are subject to external assessment for registration of the organisation and accreditation of its higher education courses by the Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA). Renewal of approval occurs every seven years as a general rule, but the interval may be altered by TEQSA.

The Academic Board will initiate a review of JMI's higher education courses in sufficient time for submission to TEQSA. The Academic Board may appoint a Course Advisory Committee to undertake an internal and external review of the courses due for renewal of accreditation. The external review process for renewal of accreditation will be conducted based on the same process for the external course review ongoing. However, for renewal of accreditation, JMI will conduct a more in-depth review of the courses, including benchmarking against higher education institutions. JMI will ensure that the process takes account of all requirements of the accrediting authority in the revision of the higher education courses.

The revised curriculum, once approved by the Academic Board and Board of Directors, will be forwarded to TEQSA for assessment.

### *Benchmarking activities:*

Benchmarking activities will be conducted with senior academic representatives of comparable institutions nationally and internationally. This will involve senior academic representatives reviewing the course curriculum in comparison to the curriculum at the other higher education institution. Benchmarking activities will be engaged with one of the institutions listed below once per year. Feedback and recommendations are collected from the benchmarking institution and presented to the Academic Board at their next meeting for consideration. Refer to the Benchmarking Policy for further details of the process and activities. Institutions identified for engaging in benchmarking activities include:

- Griffith University – Queensland Conservatorium of Music
- University of Sydney – Sydney Conservatorium of Music
- University of Adelaide – Elder Conservatorium of Music
- California State University – Bob Cole Conservatory of Music
- Jazz at Lincoln Center, New York
- Manhattan School of Music, New York

## *Visiting Artists Program*

The Institute will seek to gather external feedback on the course curriculum and operations from visiting artists who are reputable and distinguished jazz industry professionals as both performers and educators. There are two visiting artists that deliver workshops to the student body per semester. Visiting artists are chosen according to two simple criteria; their current standing as national or international performing jazz artists, and their standing as jazz educators at reputable higher education institutions offering similar courses in music performance.

Each visiting artist will be given a copy of the course curriculum for consideration and feedback. A report is then requested of the visiting artist on the operations and course curriculum at JMI and any recommendations for improvements. The report, including any recommendations for improvements, is presented to the Academic Board at their next meeting for consideration.

### **4.3 Key Performance Indicators**

The criteria to measure and evaluate course performance will be consistent and vigorous. Course quality will be reflected in course design, delivery, assessment and management. The key performance indicators set out in JMI's Strategic Plan and Teaching and Learning Policy and Teaching and Learning Plan will be used to measure performance, taking account of the course review objectives.

The underlying principles in achieving course review objectives are that processes are to be:

1. Evidence based
2. Efficient (particularly in its use of staff time)
3. Rigorous
4. Transparent
5. Objective
6. Inclusive of staff at all levels

### **4.4 Recommendations/Reports**

A Course Review Report will be developed for each full course review, which will include all data that has been collected, and will measure course performance against stated KPIs. It is expected that an evidence-based approach will be undertaken that will reference external standards and benchmarking, where possible.

#### **Report details**

Reports will include the following:

- a. Review processes focusing on course performance and development possibilities and taking account of strategic priorities of the Institute and impact on students
- b. A brief review report is written that includes an action plan identifying issues that need to be addressed at the course level, and across the Institute

- c. The course review report informs the relevant stakeholders across the Institute including academic staff and academic committees
- d. The report outlines development and re-development priorities based on the issues identified that need to be resolved
- e. Issues identified for action are referred to the appropriate personnel for action; are appropriately resourced; and outcomes communicated back to the Head of School and relevant members of staff and academic committees
- f. Processes for external re-accreditation of the course are undertaken as required by the relevant external accreditation body, and where feasible, aligned with internal course review processes

If the report recommends discontinuance of a course, then detailed information regarding the impact on students, and teach out plans must be included. This should only progress under extenuating circumstances and after careful consideration.

If the report recommends discontinuance of a subject, then details of a replacement subject and the impact on students must be included.

Subject Review Reports focus on specific units of study, but recognises that a Subject is embedded in a Course. It seeks to examine all aspects of the student's experience including those that are often outside of the teacher's control. Aspects out of the teacher's control that are to be examined can include: the learning outcomes for the subject, mode of delivery, subject content, assessment tasks, and course resources.

Subject Review Reports will be developed as required, and as part of the Course Review Report and similarly for the five to seven yearly reviews for external renewal of accreditation.

## 4.5 Student Impact

The Academic Board is responsible for ensuring that any proposed changes do not unduly disadvantage students. This includes students' ability to complete core subjects. When a proposed change removes or replaces core subjects; affects the credit points; or changes the structure in any way that may affect students, transitional arrangements must be prepared to demonstrate that students will not be unduly disadvantaged, so that they can continue and complete the course within a reasonable time period.

For major changes, a clearly defined mapping document will be provided to demonstrate articulation from the obsolete course to the new course structure. If an entire course is to be discontinued, then contingency arrangements must be made to assist students with finding another course.

Students should be consulted on proposed changes that may have an impact on students, and then notified in writing within 14 days, if the proposal is approved. Minor subject improvements do not require written notification to students. The written notification should include:

- Effective date of the change
- Details of the change
- Transition arrangements and options for completing the course within a clearly defined period of time
- Name of contact persons to provide academic advice to students

No new enrolments will be accepted into a discontinued course. For any pending

applications or enrolments, students must be notified and where possible transferred to an alternative JMI course, or other course.

All students enrolled in a course at the time of discontinuation should be allowed the opportunity to complete the course under the advertised structure and timeframe at the time of their enrolment, wherever possible. Students will not be permitted to defer their studies.

## **Staff**

All higher education staff must be notified of approved changes to courses and/or subjects as soon as practical, including discontinuation of courses or subjects.

## **4.6 Material changes**

Recommended changes arising from Subject Review Reports or Course Review Reports that constitute a major/material change to a subject or course, as per the following extract from the *Revised TEQSA material change notification policy and process*, will need to be submitted to TEQSA for approval, after approval from the Academic Board. Additional information may need to be prepared based on TEQSA's requirements.

*There is no longer a TEQSA form available for notifications of material changes. Notifications can occur via an email, a letter or phone call.*

*Providers subject to the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (the ESOS Act) and National Code should be mindful of any notification requirements arising from changes in circumstances under the ESOS Act.*

### **Possible notification required**

*TEQSA has identified four key kinds of changes that over time have been shown to be most likely to have a **significant impact** on a provider's ability to meet the Threshold Standards. These are outlined below. Providers are encouraged to contact their Case Manager if they are in doubt about whether a particular event warrants a material change notification.*

<p><b>Changes that may impact on provider governance and status</b></p>
---

<p><i>These may include (but are not limited to): ownership or shareholding, legal status or control.</i></p>
---

<p><b>Changes that may impact on good standing</b></p>
--

<p><i>These may include (but are not limited to): incidents of alleged fraud and/or mismanagement, conviction of, or proceedings against, a member of the governing body or key personnel, allegations of research misconduct under the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research, and any other adverse allegations against a provider or involving staff of the provider.</i></p>
---

<p><b>Changes that may impact on financial viability</b></p>
--

<p><i>These may include (but are not limited to); appointment of an external administrator, liquidator or receiver, and/or events that may have a significant impact on a provider's ability to continue operating.</i></p>
---

<p><b>Changes that may impact on students</b></p>
---

<p><i>These may include (but are not limited to): a significant change of premises, changes to or issues with third party arrangements, and significant changes to TEQSA accredited courses (not courses accredited by providers with Self-Accrediting Authority) and CRICOS-registered courses including to titles of courses.</i></p>
---

### **No notification required**

*There are a range of circumstances in which a provider is not required to notify TEQSA of a likely or actual change, unless they are deemed by the provider to significantly affect their ability to meet the Threshold Standards. These include:*

- *changes to membership of governing body and key academic governance bodies (ie no fit and proper person declaration is required until the next renewal of registration application)*
- *significant changes to key academic policies and procedures - if renewal of registration or accreditation is within 12 months*
- *changes to terms of reference for corporate and academic bodies*
- *changes to key personnel*
- *course changes (for providers without self-accrediting authority):*
  - *course duration or volume of learning resulting in a notable reduction or increase in student contact hours - if renewal of accreditation is due within 12 months, or there are no changes to learning outcomes*
  - *curriculum content, curriculum design; content, such as substitution or deletion of existing subjects - if no change to learning outcomes; or no change to narrow field of education (FoE); or renewal of accreditation is within 12 months.*

## 4.7 Feedback mechanisms and processes

### Internal Review Monitoring

Data analysis personnel will analyse the following data collected from surveys and other data collection mechanisms:

- Student feedback on the course and subjects
- Student feedback on teaching
- Staff feedback on all aspects of the course, subjects and delivery
- Enrolment, entry requirements and student attrition data
- Student progression data including grade distributions and moderation outcomes
- Student/staff ratios
- Articulation pathway data

JMI will ensure that feedback mechanisms obtain information that will provide responses to the following key questions. The Board of Studies and Academic Board will have regard for ensuring that the following key questions are answered when reviewing and approving minor changes to subjects.

1. Will the proposed change alter the learning outcomes? If so, will the proposed changes keep the subject outcomes consistent with the course outcomes?
2. Do the learning and teaching activities of the subject ensure that learning outcomes are met in accordance with the objectives of the Teaching and Learning Plan?
3. Are the assessment tasks aligned to the stated learning outcomes?
4. Will the changes impact on the workload of the course?
5. Will the proposed changes be appropriate for the delivery methods of the subjects?
6. Will the proposed changes constitute a 'material change' as defined by TEQSA? If so, see the section on Material Changes.

## External Course Review Monitoring

Data analysis personnel will analyse the following student data collected by JMI from surveys and other data collection mechanisms:

- Student feedback on the course and subjects
- Student feedback on teaching
- Staff feedback on all aspects of the course, subjects and delivery
- Enrolment, entry requirements and student attrition data
- Student progression data including grade distributions and moderation outcomes
- Student/ staff ratios
- Articulation pathway data
- Feedback from the Institute's community
- Feedback from external stakeholders
- Benchmarking

JMI will ensure that feedback mechanisms obtain information that will provide responses to the following key questions. The Academic Board will have regard for ensuring that the following key questions are answered when conducting a full external higher education course review.

1. Are the stated learning objectives consistent with the JMI's strategic direction, values, plans and policies?
2. Are the teaching and learning activities designed for the course designed to achieve the learning outcomes, especially the core graduate attributes, in accordance with the objectives of the Teaching and Learning Plan?
3. Are the course assessment processes and practices consistent with the stated learning outcomes?
4. What are the key trends relating to student entry, progression and success in the course, and what improvements have already been made, or are planned to be made?
5. What are the key issues that need to be addressed in the next accreditation cycle for the course?
6. Has the course been benchmarked against a comparable course nationally and/or internationally?
7. Does the course meet the requirements of the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)?
8. Will the proposed changes constitute a 'material change' as defined by TEQSA? If so, see the section on Material Changes.

## Feedback surveys and data analysis

It is imperative that quality student feedback is captured regarding the course curriculum content, processes and delivery. Surveys will be administered to the student cohort seeking feedback on these areas. Surveys will be designed in a 5 point Likert-scale system, where participants can give a rating of 1 to 5 for quantitative statements, 1 being "strongly disagree" and 5 being "strongly agree".

Teacher Evaluation Survey and Subject Content Survey will be administered twice per year, at the end of each semester. The Course Evaluation Survey will be administered once per year, at the end of the second semester.

## **Analysis of data**

Quantitative data will be analysed by identifying responses that receive a dissatisfied rating. A dissatisfied rating is defined as a response of either “strongly disagree” or “disagree”. Survey questions that receive more than 5% dissatisfied rating will be flagged and identified as an area for improvement.

All qualitative data is analysed for identified trends amongst the total student cohort. Trends are identified as 5% of responses regarding the same or similar issue. Identified trends will then be flagged and identified as an area for improvement

All questions that have been identified as an area for improvement will be analysed and discussed with the Institute’s senior academic staff to identify how these areas can be improved. As a result of these discussions, any changes proposed to course curriculum, process or delivery are sent to the next available Academic Board meeting for approval by the Board.

## **Distribution of data and changes**

All teaching staff receive an extract of the student survey feedback data relating directly to their teaching performance or subject content. This is to ensure that teaching staff are aware of their individual performance and take on board suggestions made by their students for improvement.

Any changes to course curriculum, process or delivery will be communicated with the student cohort, identified as changes as a result of student feedback. This is to ensure that students understand their feedback is being used in a systematic and transparent manner, and that their feedback is valuable.

## **Responsibilities**

The academic administrator is responsible for the administration of the surveys, the recording of survey data and analysis of data.

## **Staff Feedback**

Teaching staff are asked to give feedback on the performance of the course curriculum, processes and delivery, as well as the performance of executive management in providing adequate facilities and support for higher education purposes. Feedback is sought through a simple survey with questions regarding the operations of the Institute and areas for improvement in curriculum content and delivery.

Each staff member engages in an end of year review with an external consultant. In this review, the external consultant goes through the staff survey responses on JMI operations and gathers further qualitative responses to enable continuous improvement of operations at JMI. Survey data on teacher evaluation and subject evaluation by students is also discussed with staff to effect continuous improvement of teaching and learning, course curriculum and delivery.

## **Analysis of staff feedback**

Data captured in this process is analysed by the external consultant who conducted the staff reviews. The external consultant will then report the findings of the staff feedback for consideration by executive management. The report will contain recommendations for improvement which will be considered and tabled to the appropriate governing body

depending on the area of recommended improvement.

## 5. Definitions

A glossary is provided at Appendix 5.

## 6. Related policies and procedures

The following policies and procedures are related to this policy:

- Course Review and Continual Improvement Policy
- Curriculum Change Register
- Teaching and Learning Policy
- Teaching and Learning Plan
- Benchmarking Policy
- Assessment Policy
- Admissions Policy
- JMI Student Handbook
- Governance Charter
- Terms of Reference for each Board and Committee

## 7. Review

Three years from last review.

## 8. Accountabilities

The Academic Board is responsible for review and approval of this policy.

The policy is to be implemented via induction and training of staff and distribution to students and the Institute's community via the website and other publications.

## 9. Version Control

<b>Document</b>	Course Review and Continual Improvement Policy	<b>Author</b>	JMI Executive Management
<b>Approver</b>	JMI Academic Board	<b>Approved</b>	24 January 2018
<b>Version No.</b>	3		
<b>Reviewer</b>	JMI Academic Board	<b>Due for Review</b>	2020

## Appendix 1 Course Review Criteria

<b>Purpose and function</b>	The purpose of Course Reviews is to provide quality assurance through regular internal and external reviews and to facilitate quality improvement with respect to courses offered by JMI.
<b>Criteria</b>	<p>The committee will examine the data and evidence collected, and make recommendations regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The relevance and currency of the curricula in meeting the needs of students, the profession and employers.</li> <li>2. The current and likely future demand for the course areas and their viability with respect to students, employers, professions and partner organisations, and plans for future course developments (including prospective partnerships and the creation or closure of courses).</li> <li>3. The alignment of the curricula, teaching, learning and assessment processes with the aims and stated learning outcomes of the courses including generic skills, and with the JMI's strategic directions and teaching and learning objectives.</li> <li>4. The alignment of the curricula with the relevant level of the Australian Qualifications Framework and the ability to meet the standards of the relevant regulatory authorities.</li> <li>5. The relationship between higher education and other courses across JMI.</li> <li>6. The adequacy of learning resources (including library, IT and infrastructure support) and the level of student learning support.</li> <li>7. The effectiveness of quality assurance processes for courses and subjects including processes for benchmarking and obtaining student and employer feedback and the use of appropriate performance indicators.</li> <li>8. The adequacy of the level (for example, numbers, classification, qualifications, experience) of teaching staff (including sessional staff) and the quality of staff development and support provided for teaching staff.</li> <li>9. Any additional matter of relevance.</li> </ol>
<b>Committee Membership</b>	The Board of Studies for ongoing reviews. The Course Advisory Committee for 5 yearly external reviews.
<b>Method of appointment</b>	All members are appointed in accordance with the relevant committee's terms of reference.
<b>Secretariat</b>	As per the relevant committee's terms of reference.
<b>Schedule of meetings</b>	<p>The duration of the Course Review meeting will be determined by the relevant committee, and will be determined depending on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the quantity of information to be considered; and</li> <li>• whether the review forms part of the renewal of accreditation submission to the external accrediting authority</li> </ul>

## Appendix 2 Internal Course Review Process

The internal review process for a course and for individual subjects will consist of the following stages:

Stages of individual subject reviews	Timeframe	Responsibility
Distribution of surveys to staff and students	2 weeks before the end of each 6 month period of the course.	Subject & Course Coordinators
Analysis of internal data collected from enrolments, assessments and survey data	Commence within 1 week of the end of each 6 month period of the course (or semester).	Data analysis personnel
Production of Report containing suggested changes to subjects, consideration of whether it constitutes a material change, and overall impact on the course prepared by Course Coordinators together with a proposed Subject Change Plan submitted to Head of School for endorsement and forwarding to Board of Studies for consideration and approval.	Within 4 weeks of end of each 6 month period of the course.	Head of School
The Board of Studies submits approved Report and Subject Change Plans to Academic Board for consideration and approval.	Within 4 weeks of receipt of report.	Board of Studies
Academic Board considers recommendations and denies or approves changes for implementation, together with direction to prepare a material change application to TEQSA, if applicable.	Within 4 weeks of receipt of report.	Academic Board
If approved, changes are to be implemented, recorded and monitored.	As per approved timeframes.	Head of School, relevant academic staff and committees
<b>Note:</b> The Course Review process is the same as for individual subjects, except administered annually with a focus on the overall course.		

## Appendix 3 External Course Review Process

The external review process of an entire course will consist of the following stages:

Stages	Timeframe	Responsibility
Production of a self-review report for each course (utilizing internal data and feedback, and details of improvements already made).	1 month before the review meeting, at end of each cohort.	Head of School
Request for interested parties from the JMI's community, including external stakeholders, to provide comment.	2 months before the review meeting.	Chair, Academic Board
Consideration of additional expertise to form a Course Advisory Committee (CAC), by the Chair of the Academic Board.	At least 1 month before the review meeting.	Chair, Academic Board
Board of Studies or Course Advisory Committee special meeting to discuss submissions and data, talk to stakeholders and develop recommendations.	Panel members will need adequate time to review the material.	Board of Studies or CAC
Preparation of a Course Review Report by the Board of Studies or Course Advisory Committee, including a Course Amendment Implementation Plan developed by the Head of School, and consideration of material change requirements.	Completed within 1 month of the panel meeting, where possible.	Secretary BoS or Secretary, CAC and Head of School
The Board of Studies submits Course Review Report and Course Amendment Implementation Plan to Academic Board for consideration and approval.	Submitted to the Academic Board	Chair, BoS
Academic Board considers recommendations and denies or approves changes for implementation, together with direction to prepare a material change application to TEQSA, if applicable.	Within 1 month of receipt of report.	Academic Board
If approved, changes are to be implemented, recorded and monitored.	As per approved timeframes.	Head of School, relevant academic staff and committees
<b>Note:</b> An external accreditation process is the same as above, except that the Self Review Report will include benchmarking against other higher education institutions and taking account of TEQSA's requirements. It will be a more in-depth process usually requiring the formation of a Course Advisory Committee and preparation of a Course Accreditation Renewal submission once approved by the Academic Board.		

## Appendix 4 Course Review Implementation Plan

Issue	Frequency	Timeframe	5 year timeline	Action Steps	Responsibility
<b>Bachelor</b>					
<b>Course Review</b>					
<i>Internal</i>	Annual	2 months	End of Year 1, 2, 3, 4,5	Review current year	Head of School
External ongoing	3 yearly	3 months	End of Year 3 and 6	Review full cohort	Head of School
External accreditation	5-7 yearly	6 months	End of Year 4-6	Review all changes over accreditation period	Academic Board
<b>Subject Review</b>	Every 6 months/ semester	1 month	Every 6 months/ semester, Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5	Review current teaching period. All subjects for first cohort and sample thereafter.	Course Coordinator/ Head of School
Part of external ongoing	3 yearly	2 months	Considered with mini external review	Review subjects as part of course review	Course Coordinator/ Head of School
Part of external accreditation	5-7 yearly	6 months	Considered with full external review	Review subjects as part of renewal of course accreditation	Course Coordinator/ Head of School

## Appendix 5 - Glossary

**Articulation** – a defined pathway that enables a student to progress from a completed course of study to another course of study with admission and/or credit.

**Attrition** – is the proportion of students commencing a course of study in a given year who neither complete nor return in the following year. It does not identify those students who defer their study or transfer to another institution. TEQSA

**Benchmarking** – Benchmarking is recognised as a means by which an entity can: demonstrate accountability to stakeholders; improve networking and collaborative relationships; generate management information; develop an increased understanding of practice, process or performance; and garner insights into how improvements might be made. In the context of course accreditation, benchmarking involves comparing performance outcomes and/or processes of similar courses of study delivered by other providers. ‘internal benchmarking’ against other relevant courses offered by the provider may also be undertaken.

**Course** – a single course leading to an Australian higher education award.

**Grade distributions** – are set by each higher education provider and involve analysing the aggregation of final grades using data by subject, course of study, student cohort or other grouping.

**Graduate attributes** – generic learning outcomes that refer to transferable, non-discipline specific skills that a graduate may achieve through learning that have application in study, work and life contexts.

**KPIs (Key Performance Indicators)** - A set of quantifiable measures used to gauge or compare performance in terms of meeting strategic and operational goals.

**Learning outcomes** – learning outcomes are the expression of the set of knowledge, skills (both cognitive and physical) and the application of the knowledge and skills a person has acquired and is able to demonstrate as a result of learning.

### Qualitative Data

Information which does not present itself in numerical form and is descriptive, appearing mostly in conversational or narrative form.

### Quantitative Data

Quantitative data refers to the numerical facts and figures that are collected. The data and or observations are then analysed and used to interpret a situation or event. Data is measured on a numerical scale such as a histogram, chart etc.

**Student progression rates** – is the equivalent full- time student load (eftsl) passed as a percentage of the eftsl attempted (comprising subjects passed, failed and withdrawn and excluding work experience in industry load)

**Student/staff ratio** – is calculated by dividing the student load by the associated teaching staff effort where:

- student load is expressed as equivalent full-time student load (eftsl) and
- teaching staff effort is the number of teachers expressed as full-time equivalents (FTE).

**Subject** - A subject is a discrete unit of study and a combination of subjects make up a

# Course Review and Continual Improvement Policy



course of study.