

Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Policy code: | AG2117 |
| Policy owner: | Manager, Strategic Course Quality |
| Approval authority: | Dean, Quality, Accreditation and Partnerships |
| Approval date: | 05 May 2026 |
| Next review date: | 19 December 2028 |

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| Purpose | 1 |
| Scope | 2 |
| Academic Governance and Review | 2 |
| Course Quality Framework | 2 |
| Academic Governance in Course Review | 3 |
| Governance Responsibilities and Requirements | 3 |
| Legislative Context | 4 |
| Definitions | 4 |
| Actions: Higher Education course reviews | 5 |
| a) Course Review Establishment for All Higher Education Degrees by Coursework and HDR | 5 |
| b) Course Review Panel Requirements | 8 |
| c) Comprehensive Course Review Stages | 13 |
| d) Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Course Reviews | 18 |
| e) Course review Governance/Endorsement | 21 |
| Supporting Documents | 25 |
| Forms | 25 |
| Responsibility | 25 |
| Promulgation | 25 |
| Implementation | 25 |
| Records management | 25 |
| Appendix | 26 |

Purpose

This procedure ensures that all higher education courses at Federation University undergo formal reaccreditation, systematic review and engage in continuous improvement.

It supports compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (national standards) and aligns with Federation University's strategic priorities.

The procedure forms part of the Federation University Course [Quality Framework](#) and is implemented along with the following other university procedures:

- The [Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure](#) for interim monitoring, risk identification and assurance of course quality.

- The **Higher Education Quality Benchmarking Procedure** for internal and external referencing.
- The [Professional Accreditation of Courses Procedure](#) for alignment with external standards and bodies.
- The [Quality Framework](#) which outlines institutional mechanisms for compliance and enhancement.

This procedure supports compliance with the **Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021**, particularly sections 4.2, 5.3.1, 5.3.4, and 5.3.7.

Course reviews are designed to ensure that each course is fit for purpose and maintains quality, aligning with Federation's strategic directions, graduate, industry, and community needs, and best practice in curriculum design and accreditation.

Scope

This procedure applies to all Higher Education coursework, Higher Degree by Research HDR award and non-award enabling courses offered by Federation University.

It outlines the principles, governance expectations, and operational processes for course quality assurance across both coursework and research contexts. HDR reviews follow the same overarching quality assurance framework, while including adaptations specific to research training, supervision, and candidate support.

HDR-specific review requirements are detailed in the section titled **Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Course Reviews** and align with the **Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021**, particularly Sections 4.2 (Research Training), 5.3 (Quality Assurance), and 6.3 (Academic Governance).

Academic Governance and Review

This section outlines the course quality framework and associated academic governance principles and responsibilities that underpin course quality assurance at Federation University. It reflects the University's commitment to maintaining high standards in teaching, learning, and curriculum design through structured, evidence-based review processes.

Course Quality Framework

The following form the framework components included for monitoring and assessing course quality assurance at Federation University:

* Comprehensive course reviews

The Higher Education Standards Framework 2021 require course reaccreditation to occur every seven years as a minimum standard. Federation University exceeds this requirement, conducting reviews at least every five (5) years from the initial approval date. These reviews synthesise longitudinal data, benchmarking and stakeholder feedback to provide a holistic evaluation of course quality, strategic alignment, and stakeholder responsiveness.

* Annual monitoring

Annual, formalised monitoring of performance as outlined in the Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure for each active university higher education course. This diagnostic process supports evaluation of course performance to identify risks, track improvement actions, and inform continuous improvement.

* Benchmarking and academic calibration

Courses must be benchmarked internally and externally at least once per course review cycle. Academic calibration validates assessment standards and supports external referencing. These activities are mapped to the five EPSIS domains.

* Integration with professional accreditation cycles

Where applicable, course reviews are aligned with external accreditation timelines to streamline quality assurance and reduce duplication.

Together, these components ensure that all courses remain:

- Fit for purpose
- Responsive to student, staff, industry, and community needs
- Aligned with Federation University's strategic priorities and national standards

Annual monitoring generates the core evidence base and performance insights that inform and support the five-year review. The five-year review builds on this foundation to evaluate long-term trends, confirm quality and effectiveness, and provide a robust basis for re-approval decisions.

Academic Governance in Course Review

Active academic governance ensures that all award and non-award enabling Higher Education courses are reviewed in a manner that is:

- **Strategically aligned** with Federation University's priorities, including co-operative education, equity and inclusion, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.
- **Compliant** with the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
- **Transparent and accountable**, with decisions based on documented evidence and stakeholder input.
- **Consistent and impartial**, with clear roles, responsibilities, and conflict-of-interest protocols.

Governance Responsibilities and Requirements

* Review Cycle:

In accordance with Federation University policy and procedure, all courses must undergo a comprehensive course review every five years, in accordance with the University's Course Review Schedule. Courses that undergo major modifications but retain substantially the same name, purpose, or learning outcomes remain subject to the original review cycle.

* Academic Oversight:

The Learning and Teaching Quality Committee LTQC, Academic Board, and relevant Institute or School Boards are responsible for endorsing review outcomes and ensuring alignment with institutional priorities and national standards.

For Higher Degree by Research HDR courses, academic oversight includes a **dual reporting line** to LTQC and the **Research Committee**, ensuring that research training quality, supervision practices, and candidate outcomes are appropriately governed and aligned with institutional research priorities.

* EPSIS Model Alignment:

Governance bodies must evaluate course quality using the EPSIS framework:

- Student Experience

- Student Progress
- Student Success
- Course Integrity
- Course Sustainability

This model supports evidence-informed decision-making through both outcome-based indicators and input-based contributors.

*** Objectivity and Integrity:**

Course Coordinators must not chair review panels for their own courses. All panel members must declare conflicts of interest. Where feasible, panel chairs should be drawn from outside the discipline under review to support impartiality.

*** Support for Academic Teams**

Academic teams will be supported by the Quality and Accreditation (Q&A) team through the development and implementation of:

- Templates and guidance documents
- Benchmarking and calibration tools
- Governance Guidance Packs
- Panel member expectations checklists
- Timeline tracking
- EPSIS data provision

*** Governance Endorsement Tools**

The Governance Endorsement Checklist (in development) must be used to guide committee evaluation and decision-making. This checklist will be updated to reflect EPSIS domains and associated measures.

Legislative Context

- Federation University Australia Academic Regulations 2022
- [The Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021](#)

Definitions

| Term | Definition |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Academic Calibration | A structured peer review process to validate assessment standards and grading practices. It ensures alignment with discipline norms, Australian Qualification Framework levels, and supports external referencing. Distinct from moderation, calibration is embedded in benchmarking and review procedures. |
| ACGR | Australian Council of Graduate Research |
| ADLT | Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching. Responsible for academic oversight and support of course review processes within Institutes. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Benchmarking | A structured process for comparing course performance, design, delivery, and outcomes against internal standards or external comparators. Includes Tier 1 (internal), Tier 2 (external), and Tier 3 (academic calibration). |
| Course Coordinator | Responsible for preparing the Course Quality Review Report and leading continuous improvement activities. |
| Course Quality | The extent to which a course meets academic standards, supports student success, and remains relevant to industry and societal needs. |
| Course Quality Review Report | A reflective document prepared by the Course Coordinator, synthesising evidence of course performance, improvement actions, benchmarking, and stakeholder feedback over the review cycle. |
| Course Review Outcome Report | A formal document prepared by the Chair of the Course Review Panel summarising the findings of the comprehensive course review. It includes commendations, recommendations, identified risks, benchmarking and calibration outcomes, and a recommendation regarding course re-approval. The report is submitted to governance bodies for endorsement and informs strategic decisions about the course's future. |
| EPSIS Model | Federation University's framework for evaluating course quality across five domains: Student Experience, Student Progress, Student Success, Course Integrity, and Course Sustainability. |
| GRS | Graduate Research School |
| HE | Higher Education. Refers to all accredited coursework and research degrees offered by Federation University. |
| HDR | Higher Degrees by Research. Includes doctoral and research master's courses subject to adapted review processes |
| Institute/School Course Review Liaison | The designated staff member responsible for coordinating course review activities within the Institute or School and liaising with the Quality and Accreditation team. |
| LTQC | Learning and Teaching Quality Committee. Responsible for academic governance oversight of course reviews and endorsement of review outcomes. |
| PVCLT | Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) |
| Panel Chair | An independent academic appointed to lead the Course Review Panel. Must be external to the course team and preferably outside the discipline under review. |
| Q&A | The Quality and Accreditation department is responsible for scheduling, management, support and monitoring of course reviews. |

Actions: Higher Education course reviews

a) Course Review Establishment for All Higher Education Degrees by Coursework and HDR

| | Activity | Responsibility | Steps / notes |
|---|---|--|--|
| A | Course Review Schedule for all higher education degrees by coursework and HDR | Dean, Quality and Accreditation (shared access with the Academic Governance) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain a centralised course review schedule that includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Dates of past and upcoming reviews. b. Alignment with professional accreditation cycles where applicable c. Institute/School feedback and responses. d. Schedule of meeting dates for Institutes, LTQC and Academic Board and assigned reporting. e. Nominated deadlines for <24-month progress reports. 2. Review timing and alignment requirements are outlined in the Governance Purpose and Requirements section. 3. The schedule must be reviewed as updated annually by the Quality and Accreditation team, in consultation with Institutes and Schools and reported to the LTQC and Academic Board. 4. Panel size and scope must be determined prior to commencement of Review – see B) Course Review Panel Requirements for more details. 5. The schedule should be made available to academic staff via the internal course review portal or on request from the Q&A team. |
| B | Align with external accreditation cycles | Q&A team and Institute/School Course Review Liaison | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Align course review timing with professional accreditation cycles to reduce duplication and support streamlined reporting for applicable courses. |

| | | | |
|---|--|-----|--|
| | | | 2. Document any alignment decisions in the review schedule. |
| C | Notification of scheduling and deadlines | Q&A | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Quality and Accreditation (Q&A) team must notify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course Coordinators • Heads of Discipline • Institute Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching of scheduled course reviews at least 12 months in advance of the expected Academic Board decision date. 2. Formal notification must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Review timelines and key milestones. b. Required documentation and templates. c. Governance endorsement expectations d. Panel formation requirements and planning guidance 3. Include links to the Course Review Panel Planning Template, Course Quality Review Template, and Governance Guidance Pack. 4. Institutes/School must confirm panel formation and review planning no later than four (4) months before the scheduled review reporting deadline date. 5. Any changes to scheduling must be approved by Dean, Quality and Accreditation and documented in the central review schedule. |
| D | Issue Reminders | Q&A | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Send reminders to the Course Coordinator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 months prior to submission deadline • 2 months prior to submission deadline 2. Reminders should reinforce expectations and offer support |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| | | | options (e.g., Q&A consultation, benchmarking assistance). |
| E | Determine panel formation, size and scope | Q&A team, in consultation with Institutes/Schools Course Review Liaison | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Use the Panel Planning Template to plan panel structure and document decisions. 2. Ensure panel composition meets minimum requirements and reflects course complexity. (see section <i>b</i>) <i>Course Review Panel Requirements</i> below). |
| F | Approve changes to scheduling | Dean, Q&A in consultation with Chair, LTQC | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Any changes to the review schedule must be approved by Dean, Q&A and documented in the central schedule. 2. Changes should be justified based on strategic alignment, accreditation timing, or resourcing constraints. Consideration must also be given to any impact to approval workloads of work groups, the Institutes, LTQC or Academic Board that a deadline deferral may generate. |

b) Course Review Panel Requirements

This section outlines the minimum requirements, composition, responsibilities, and governance expectations for Course Review Panels convened as part of the comprehensive course review process. Panels play a critical role in providing independent, evidence-based evaluation of course quality and informing decisions about course re-approval.

| | Activity | Responsibility | Steps / notes |
|---|--------------------------|--|---|
| A | Define Panel Composition | Institute/School Course Review Liaison (in consultation with Q&A) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Panel size and scope must be determined prior to review commencement. Panels may be convened to review a single course or a suite of related courses. The scope must be documented in the review schedule. 2. The number of panel members should be scaled to the complexity of the review, |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>such as multi-campus or multi-disciplinary offerings. These decisions must be documented in the review schedule and confirmed with the Institute/School. Use the Panel Planning Template to document composition and rationale.</p> <p>3. Minimum requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Discipline (or equivalent) • A current student enrolled in the course or a closely related course, who: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in good academic standing • Has completed at least 75% of the course (adjusted for course length) • Course Coordinator • A Learning Designer • External Members <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A representative from the relevant professional community and/or industry • A professional practitioner or accrediting body representative (if applicable) • An academic from another higher education institution teaching in a similar course • A recent graduate (within 3 years) of the same course or directly equivalent version. • Additional Representation (as applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For HDR courses or courses with a major research component: a researcher active in the |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| | | | <p>discipline and qualified at or above the course level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For third-party delivery: a representative from each major third-party provider, ensuring balanced representation. • Course Review Panel for HDR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one current HDR candidate. • At least one HDR supervisor who meets eligibility requirements. • A research training leader or academic with oversight of HDR courses. • A representative from GRS. • An external academic or industry expert in the relevant discipline. |
| B | Appoint Panel Chair | Dean, Q&A, in consultation with Institute | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Panel Chair must be independent of the course team and, where feasible, drawn from outside the discipline under review. 2. The Chair coordinates the review process, ensures impartiality, and liaises with Q&A. 3. The Panel Chair is expected to have relevant current, or previous, experience as a Course Coordinator. |
| C | Provide Panel Expectations | Q&A team | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All panel members must receive a Panel Expectations Checklist outlining their responsibilities, preparation requirements, and expected conduct. 2. This includes reviewing documentation prior to the meeting and contributing to the Course Review Outcome Report. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| D | Ensure Governance Integrity | Course Review Panel | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All panel members must declare any conflicts of interest prior to the review. 2. Course Coordinators must not chair review panels for their own courses. 3. Critically assess the evidence presented in the Course Quality Review Report, confirming its accuracy, relevance, and completeness. Evaluate whether the findings are supported by data and stakeholder input, and determine how well they align with institutional standards, strategic priorities, and external benchmarks. |
| E | Outline Panel Responsibilities | Panel Chair and Members | <p>Panel members must:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review the Course Quality Review Report and supporting documentation. 2. Validate findings and assess alignment with institutional standards, strategic priorities, and external benchmarks. 3. Provide expert advice on course strengths, risks, and opportunities for enhancement. 4. Participate in interviews, site visits (where applicable), and stakeholder engagement activities. 5. Prepare or contribute to the Course Review Outcome Report, including commendations, recommendations, and a justified recommendation regarding course re-approval. |
| | Course Review Panel Purpose and Responsibilities | Panel Chair and Course Review Panel Step 6 - Panel Chair | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Course Review Panel is convened to provide independent, evidence-based evaluation of course quality and to make recommendations for improvement and re-approval. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>2. The panel's primary responsibilities are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review the Course Quality Review Report and supporting documentation. • Validate findings and assess alignment with institutional standards, strategic priorities, and external benchmarks. • Provide expert advice on course strengths, risks, and opportunities for enhancement. • Participate in interviews, site visits (or approved alternatives), and stakeholder engagement. • Contribute to the Course Review Outcome Report. <p>3. The panel must consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Curriculum coherence and AQF alignment. • Assessment integrity and moderation practices. • Student experience and outcomes, including equity group performance. • Industry relevance and stakeholder engagement. • Benchmarking and academic calibration outcomes. • Risk identification and mitigation strategies. • Use the Panel Report Template and Governance Guidance Pack for structured evaluation. <p>4. Governance expectations for panel conduct, impartiality, and conflict of interest are outlined in the Governance Purpose and Requirements section.</p> <p>5. Detailed review criteria and prompts are provided in the Course Review Panel Report Template.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| | | | 6. The Panel Chair is responsible for coordinating the review process, ensuring impartiality, and liaising with the Q&A team. The Course Review Panel is convened to provide independent, evidence-based evaluation of course quality and to make recommendations for improvement and re-approval. |
| F | Confirm HDR Panel Requirements | Graduate Research School GRS | <p>For Higher Degree by Research HDR courses, panels must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one current HDR candidate. • At least one HDR supervisor who meets eligibility requirements. • A research training leader or academic with oversight of HDR courses. • A representative from the Graduate Research School (GRS). • An external academic or industry expert in the relevant discipline. • Ensure representation across campuses, disciplines, and enrolment types. |

c) Comprehensive Course Review Stages

| | Activity | Responsibility | Steps / notes |
|----------|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| A | Formation of Course Review Panel | Course Coordinator. ADLT or equivalent for GRS | 1. A Course Review Panel must be established at least six months prior to the scheduled review date – see Action b) Course Review Panel Requirements for more details. |
| B | Preparing for the Course Review Panel | Course Coordinator. ADLT or equivalent for GRS | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Invite panel members and confirm availability. 2. Inform them of panel meeting timelines, processes and responsibilities. |

| | | | |
|----------|--|--------------------------------|--|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Distribute pre-reading materials and agenda at least 6 weeks prior to the panel meeting. 4. Provide a Panel Expectations Checklist to ensure members are prepared. |
| C | Prepare the Course Quality Review Report | Course Coordinator Q&A team | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Course Quality Review Report must synthesise annual performance data collected through the Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure collected over the five-year review cycle, structured around the EPSIS model of course quality. This synthesis should demonstrate longitudinal trends, responsiveness to stakeholder feedback, and alignment with institutional priorities. 2. It must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual dashboard data and attainment categorisation from the Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure, mapped to EPSIS domains. • Evidence of progress on previously identified risks or recommendations. • Quantitative and qualitative feedback from students, staff, and industry, aligned with relevant EPSIS domains • Academic performance data (e.g. progression, attrition, completions), benchmarked against internal and external comparators. • Benchmarking activities must be conducted in accordance with the Higher Education Quality Benchmarking Procedure. This includes internal comparisons, external referencing, and academic |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>calibration. Outcomes must be documented in the Course Quality Review Report and used to support governance decisions - Refer to the Higher Education Quality Benchmarking Procedure for detailed guidance on benchmarking expectations and calibration processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of course learning outcomes to graduate attributes (FedTASKs) and AQFlevels. • Evidence of curriculum and assessment integrity, and strategic alignment with university priorities, including co-operative education and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. • A summary of contributors and indicators used to evaluate course quality, with commentary on trends, risks, and opportunities for enhancement. <p>3. This report forms the basis for governance endorsement and course re-approval, demonstrating a holistic and evidence-informed view of course performance.</p> <p>4. The Course Quality Review Report must demonstrate how the course aligns with the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, with reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard 1.4: Mapping of learning outcomes to AQF levels and graduate attributes (FedTASKs). • Standard 5.3: Evidence of continuous improvement, benchmarking, and stakeholder engagement. • Standard 6.3: Academic governance oversight and |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|----------|---|---------------------|---|
| | | | <p>integrity of review processes.</p> <p>5. The report must also explicitly reference the EPSIS domains, using both indicators and contributors to evaluate course performance across the five dimensions of quality. This ensures that the review is both compliant and strategically aligned with Federation University's vision and values.</p> |
| D | Course Review Panel assessment activities | Course Review Panel | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Chair of the Review Panel will liaise with Q&A during the commencement phase to coordinate interviews, obtain support materials, or coordinate the physical site visit, if required. 2. The Review Panel will undertake each the following tasks: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Conduct a physical site visit. In the instance where site visits are not feasible (particularly for fully online or third-party delivered courses) alternative validation methods may be submitted to the Dean Q&A for approval. b. Consider the Course Quality Review Report, additional reference material and feedback received. c. Meet with or interview relevant staff, students and stakeholders. d. Evaluate curriculum coherence, assessment integrity, equity outcomes, industry relevance, and benchmarking. e. Explore any other matters of interest within the scope of the review. 3. HDR and other research training courses need to be |

| | | | |
|----------|--|-------------|--|
| | | | <p>evaluated with the following considerations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Research training quality. b. Supervision practices. c. Completion rates and time to completion. d. Graduate outcomes and career readiness. |
| E | Prepare the Course Review Outcome Report | Panel Chair | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Panel findings must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any identified key strengths and areas of excellence. b. Identified risks and mitigation strategies. c. Evidence-based improvement opportunities. d. Strategic alignment and stakeholder responsiveness. 2. Course Quality Review Outcome Report must include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Benchmarking data. b. Academic calibration outcomes. c. Annual assessment data. d. Professional accreditation feedback. e. Identified risks to educational quality and proposed mitigation strategies. f. A Stakeholder Engagement Log must be appended to the Report, documenting consultation with students, staff, industry, and other relevant stakeholders. 3. Prepare a strategic case for course re-approval, demonstrating alignment with university priorities, responsiveness to stakeholder needs, and evidence of continuous improvement. Include evidence of |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | improvement and stakeholder feedback. 4. Prepare for submission for internal course re-approval in accordance with Federation University's obligations as a self-accrediting authority. |
|--|--|--|--|

d) Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Course Reviews

HDR courses are subject to the same quality assurance principles and governance expectations as coursework degrees, with adaptations to reflect the distinct nature of research training. Reviews of HDR courses must ensure that research education is rigorous, well-supported, and aligned with institutional and national standards.

| | Activity | Responsibility | Steps / notes |
|---|-------------------|----------------|---|
| A | Review Principles | GRS | 1. HDR reviews must demonstrate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alignment with the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, particularly Sections 4.2 (Research Training), 5.3 (Quality Assurance), and 6.3 (Academic Governance). • Strategic alignment with Federation University's research priorities and graduate outcomes. • Evidence of continuous improvement in research training quality, supervision practices, and candidate support. • Consideration of national/ international priorities and Cooperative University principles (co-design, co-supervision, co-funding). • Reference to Sector Standards: Reviews should also consider national good practice principles, such as those published by the ACGR Good Practice Framework - to ensure alignment with sector-wide |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | | expectations for research training quality and integrity. |
| B | Review Cycle | Q&A | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HDR courses follow the same five-year review cycle as coursework courses, from the initial approval. 2. Reviews may be aligned with external accreditation or research quality assessment cycles where applicable. 3. All HDR reviews must include external input, either through an external reviewer or a panel comprising internal and external experts, to ensure independent evaluation and sector benchmarking. |
| C | Panel Composition | GRS | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HDR Course Review Panels must include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one current HDR candidate. • At least one HDR supervisor who meets eligibility requirements. • A research training leader or academic with oversight of HDR courses. • A representative from the Graduate Research School GRS. • An external academic or industry expert in the relevant discipline. • Panel meetings must include engagement with representative groups of candidates and supervisors across campuses, disciplines, and enrolment types (e.g., domestic/international, part-time/full-time). |
| D | Review Criteria | Course Review Panel | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HDR reviews must evaluate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and consistency of supervision practices. • Research training environment and infrastructure. |

| | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate progression, completion rates, and time to completion. • Graduate outcomes, including career readiness and research impact. • Stakeholder feedback from candidates, supervisors, and industry partners. • Performance metrics including, but not limited to, commencements, enrolments, completion, attrition, and results, benchmarked against like institutions. • Effectiveness of orientation, researcher skills development, and support services. • Adequacy of resources, facilities, and financial support. • Risk identification including supervisory capacity, infrastructure, and compliance. |
| E | Governance and Reporting | School and LTQC | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. HDR review outcomes must be endorsed by the GRS Board, Research Committee and the Learning and Teaching Quality Committee LTQC, and submitted to Academic Board for final approval and the Research Committee for noting. 2. The Course Quality Review Report must include HDR-specific data and commentary, mapped to EPSIS domains where applicable. 3. A Stakeholder Engagement Log must document consultation with HDR candidates, supervisors, and research leaders. 4. The Review Report must summarise strengths, weaknesses, required actions, and opportunities for improvement, and assess |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | | provision against national best practice. 5. A structured data pack including longitudinal and benchmarking data must be provided to the panel at least two weeks prior to stakeholder meetings. |
|--|--|--|---|

e) Course review Governance/Endorsement

Endorsement of Course Review Panel Reports by Institute/School Boards, LTQC and Research Committee must be based on documented evidence aligned with the procedure's stated purpose, including assurance of academic standards, teaching quality, student experience and outcomes, and continuous improvement. Institute Boards and LTQC must use the Governance Endorsement Checklist in the "**Governance Guidance Pack: Course Review Endorsement**" to guide their evaluation of Course Review Panel Reports.

The following criteria guide committee evaluation and endorsement.

| | Activity | Responsibility | Steps / notes |
|----------|--|--|---|
| A | Evaluate Course Review Outcome Report submitted to Institute Board | Panel Chair Institute Board GRS Board ADLT or equivalent in GRS | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Review Panel will submit a Course Review Panel Report to the Institute which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses the scope of the review. • Provides commendations and recommendations; and • Provides a justified recommendation for course re-approval. 2. Prior to submission to the Institute Board, the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching (ADLT) or equivalent for GRS should review the report to ensure it meets academic quality expectations and is ready for governance consideration. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ADLT (or equivalent for GRS) may provide feedback or request clarification to strengthen the report before it progresses. 3. Once reviewed, the report is placed on the appropriate agenda for the Institute/School Board. |

| | | | |
|----------|--|------|---|
| | | | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The Institute/School Board is responsible for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewing the report to ensure it addresses the full scope of the course review. • Confirming that the report includes commendations, recommendations, and a clear recommendation regarding course re-approval. • Making recommendations for improvement or clarification, where necessary. • Ensuring course teams are notified of any concerns and given the opportunity to respond prior to final endorsement. 5. In evaluating the report, the Institute Board must consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic alignment with university priorities. • Resource implications and sustainability. • Viability of the course or suite of courses. • Evidence of stakeholder engagement and responsiveness. 6. Once satisfied, the Institute/School Board submits the endorsed report to Academic Governance for inclusion at Learning and Teaching Quality Committee LTQC for endorsement. 7. The Course Review Register is updated upon receipt of an endorsed Course Quality Review Report to note the submission date. |
| B | Course Quality Review Report endorsement | LTQC | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LTQC evaluates course reviews against academic quality indicators including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Curriculum alignment with AQF. |

| | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Assessment integrity and moderation practices. c. Student experience and outcomes, including equity group performance. d. Evidence of continuous improvement and responsiveness to feedback. e. Benchmarking, academic calibration outcomes and external referencing. f. Alignment with professional accreditation requirements (where applicable). <p>2. LTQC may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Endorse the report and submit to Academic Board for final approval. b. Request revision and resubmission if academic quality indicators are not met or evidence is insufficient. c. Escalate to ACPC or Vice-Chancellor's Senior Team (VCST) if systemic issues, unresolved risks, or accreditation concerns are identified. |
| C | Final Approval | Academic Board | <p>1. When satisfied, LTQC will submit the endorsed report to Academic Board. Approval by the Academic Board confirms that the course meets institutional standards for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • academic quality • strategic alignment • and continuous improvement. |
| D | Implementation and monitoring | Course Coordinator Q&A Institute Board GRS Board | <p>1. The Course Coordinator prepares a 2-year progress report on response to the recommendations in the Course Review report. The 2-year progress report must include examples of changes</p> |

| | | | |
|----------|---------------------------------------|------|--|
| | | LTQC | <p>made in response to feedback or review outcomes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Q&A monitors progress and escalates compliance risks as required. 3. Institute/School Board will endorse and submit to LTQC. 4. LTQC will then endorse and submit to Academic Board. 5. Academic Board approval confirms that the course meets institutional standards for academic quality, strategic alignment, and continuous improvement. 6. Additional annual reports may be requested by LTQC or Academic Board if implementation exceeds 2 years. |
| E | Recognition and Good Practice Sharing | LTQC | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the event that, based on evidence presented in the Course Quality Review Panel Report, LTQC identifies a high-performing course and exemplary practices, the Chair prepares a formal communication to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) (PVCLT). The communication will summarise: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The performance of the course. b. Commendations and exemplary practices. c. Recommendations for institutional recognition or dissemination. 2. The PVCLT may issue a formal commendation and/or initiate broader sharing of good practice across the University. 3. Recognised practices may be included in LTQC agendas, professional development sessions, or academic leadership forums. |

Supporting Documents

- [Academic Governance Policy](#) (Section 1,3)
- Higher Education Quality Benchmarking Procedure
- [Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure](#)
- Guidance Pack for Course reviews
- Course Review Panel Member Guidelines / Panel Expectations Checklist
- Higher Education Course Review Register

Forms

- Governance Guidance Pack: Course Review Endorsement
- Course Quality Review Template (including Stakeholder Engagement Log)

Forms.

- [Course Review - Data Sources Input Summary](#) (DOCX 206.5kb)
- [Course Review Flowchart - Updated](#) (DOCX 219.3kb)
- [Course Review Panel Report Template](#) (DOCX 368.6kb)

Responsibility

- Dean, Quality, Accreditation and Partnerships, as the Approval Authority, is responsible for monitoring the implementation, outcomes and scheduled review of this procedure.
- Manager, Strategic Course Quality, as Document Owner, is responsible for maintaining the content of this procedure.

Promulgation

This procedure will be communicated throughout the University through:

1. An announcement on the FedNews website;
2. The 'What's New' page on the [Policy Central Website](#).

Implementation

This procedure will be implemented through:

1. An announcement on the FedNews website;
2. The 'What's New' page on the [Policy Central Website](#);
3. A memo to the Executive Deans/Dean, GPS/Dean, Graduate Studies and Institute Boards/School Boards;
4. An agenda item at LTQC and Academic Board.

Records management

| Document Title | Location | Responsible Officer | Minimum Retention Period |
|----------------|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---------|
| Course Review Schedule | Academic Governance Institute/Schools | Chair, LTQC/Dean, Quality and Accreditation/ nominee Course Coordinator | 7 years |
| Course Review Outcome Report to LTQC | Institute/School | Executive Officer, Institute Board/ School Board | 7 years |
| Course Quality Review Report | Institute/School | Executive Officer, Institute Board/ School Board | 7 years |

Appendix

Forms.

- [Course review flowchart](#) (DOCX 41.4kb)