

Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure

Policy code:	AG2117
Document owner:	Dean, Quality and Accreditation
Approval authority:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Global, Engagement and Quality)
Approval date:	
Next review date:	

STATUS: For Uni-wide Comment 31-10-2025

NOTES: UWC period extended 3-14/11/2025 as per request. (AR)

Table of Contents

Purpose	1
Scope	2
Governance Framework and Review Principles	3
Legislative Context	4
Definitions	4
Actions	5
a) Course Review Establishment for All Higher Education Degrees by Coursework and HDR	6
b) Course Review Panel Requirements	8
c) Comprehensive Course Review Stages	13
d) Higher Degree by Research (HDR) Course Reviews	17
e) Course review Governance/Endorsement	20
Supporting Documents	24
Forms	24
Responsibility	24
Promulgation	24
Implementation	24
Records management	25
Appendix	25

Purpose

This procedure ensures that all accredited Higher Education coursework and Higher Degree by Research (HDR) courses at Federation University undergo systematic review and continuous improvement. It supports compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework national standards, and aligns with Federation University's strategic priorities, including cooperative education, equity and inclusion, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals.

The procedure integrates Federation University's academic quality assurance framework and complements related processes, including:

- The **Course Quality Annual Assessment Procedure** for interim monitoring, risk identification and assurance of course quality. The **Academic Quality Benchmarking Procedure** for internal and external referencing.

- The **Professional Accreditation Procedure** for alignment with external standards and bodies.
- The **Quality Framework – Governance and Continuous Improvement**, which outlines institutional mechanisms for compliance and enhancement.

It 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 - aligned with Federation's strategic directions, graduate, industry, and community needs, and best practice in curriculum design and accreditation.

Scope

This procedure applies to all accredited Higher Education coursework degrees and Higher Degree by Research (HDR) courses offered by Federation University.

Note: 'Accredited' refers to courses approved under Federation University's self-accrediting authority, as recognised by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA).

It outlines the principles, governance expectations, and operational processes for course quality assurance across both coursework and research contexts. While HDR reviews follow the same overarching quality assurance framework, they include 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).

This procedure encompasses the following core components of course quality assurance at Federation University:

* Comprehensive course reviews

Conducted every five years from the initial approval date, unless aligned with professional accreditation cycles. These reviews provide a holistic evaluation of course quality, strategic alignment, and stakeholder responsiveness.

* Annual monitoring

Ongoing assessment of course performance using the EPSIS model, as outlined in the Course Quality Annual Assessment Procedure. This process supports continuous improvement.

* Benchmarking and academic calibration

Courses must be benchmarked internally and externally at least once per 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.

Relationship Between Annual Monitoring and 5-Year Reviews

Federation University's course quality assurance operates across two interrelated processes:

- **Annual Monitoring:** A yearly diagnostic process that evaluates course performance using the EPSIS model. It identifies risks, tracks improvement actions, and informs continuous enhancement.
- **Comprehensive 5-Year Review:** A holistic evaluation conducted every five years (or aligned with professional accreditation cycles), synthesising longitudinal data, benchmarking, stakeholder feedback, and strategic alignment.

Relationship

Annual monitoring provides the foundational data and improvement tracking that feed into the 5-year review. The 5-year review builds on this evidence to assess long-term trends, validate quality, and support re-approval decisions.

Governance Framework and Review Principles

This section outlines the 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.

Purpose of Governance in Course Review

Governance ensures that all accredited Higher Education coursework and HDR 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, particularly Standards 1.4 (Learning Outcomes and Assessment), 4.2 (Research), 5.3 (Quality Assurance), and 6.3 (Academic Governance).
- **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:

All accredited coursework courses must undergo a comprehensive course review every five years, and 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 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.

*** Stakeholder Engagement:**

Governance bodies must ensure that course reviews incorporate feedback from students, staff, industry, and professional bodies. Stakeholder input must be mapped to relevant EPSIS domains and used to inform review outcomes.

*** 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 through:

- Templates and guidance documents
- Assistance from the Quality and Accreditation (Q&A) team
- Benchmarking and calibration tools
- Governance Guidance Packs
- Panel member expectations checklists

*** Governance Endorsement Tools**

The Governance Endorsement Checklist 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](#) – section 1.4.1

Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Calibration	A structured peer review process to validate assessment standards and grading practices. It ensures alignment with discipline norms, AQF levels, and supports external referencing. Distinct from moderation, calibration is embedded in benchmarking and review procedures.

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).
CC	Course Coordinator. Responsible for preparing the Course Quality Review Report and leading continuous improvement activities.
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.
Course Quality	The extent to which a course meets academic standards, supports student success, and remains relevant to industry and societal needs. Federation University courses are assessed against five EPSIS domains: Student Experience, Student Progress, Student Success, Course Integrity, and Course Sustainability.
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
LTQC	Learning and Teaching Quality Committee. Responsible for academic governance oversight of course reviews and endorsement of review outcomes.
Q&A	The Quality and Accreditation department is responsible for scheduling, management, support and monitoring of course reviews.
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.

Actions

Higher Education award 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	1. Maintain a centralised course review schedule that includes: a. Dates of past and upcoming reviews. b. Alignment with professional accreditation cycles where applicable c. Institute/School feedback and responses. d. Academic Board reporting and approval cycles. e. 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 and updated annually by the Quality and Accreditation team, in consultation with Institutes and Schools. 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	Determine panel size and scope	Q&A team in consultation with Institutes/Schools	1. Panel composition must be scaled to the complexity of the review (e.g., single course vs suite; multi-campus or multi-disciplinary offerings). 2. Decisions must be documented in the review schedule and confirmed with the Institute. • Refer to the Panel Requirements section and use the Panel Planning Template to guide decisions.

C	Align with external accreditation cycles	Q&A team and Institute/School Course Review Liaison	- Where applicable, align course review timing with professional accreditation cycles to reduce duplication and support streamlined reporting. - Document any alignment decisions in the review schedule.
D	Notification of scheduling and deadlines	Q&A	- The Quality and Accreditation (Q&A) team must notify Course Coordinators of scheduled course reviews at least 12 months in advance of the expected submission date. - Formal notification must include: - Review timelines and key milestones. - Required documentation and templates. - Governance endorsement expectations - Panel formation requirements and planning guidance - Include links to the Course Review Panel Planning Template, Course Quality Review Template, and Governance Guidance Pack. - Institutes/School must confirm panel formation and review planning no later than six months before the scheduled review deadline date. - Any changes to scheduling must be approved by Dean, Quality and Accreditation and documented in the central review schedule.
E	Issue Reminders	Q&A	- Send reminders: 6 months prior to submission deadline 2 months prior to submission deadline - Reminders should reinforce expectations and offer support options (e.g., Q&A

			consultation, benchmarking assistance).
F	Confirm panel formation and review planning	Institute/School Course Review Liaison	1. Confirm panel membership and review planning no later than 6 months before the scheduled review date. 2. Use the Panel Planning Template to document decisions. 3. Ensure panel composition meets minimum requirements and reflects course complexity.
G	Approve changes to scheduling	Dean, Q&A	1. Any changes to the review schedule must be approved by Dean, Quality and Accreditation and documented in the central schedule. 2. Changes should be justified based on strategic alignment, accreditation timing, or resourcing constraints.

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)	1. Panel size and scope must be determined during prior to review commencement. Panels may be convened to review a single course or a suite of related courses. The number of panel members should be scaled to the complexity of the review, 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. 2. Minimum requirements include: • Internal Members

			• Head of Discipline (or equivalent) • A current student enrolled in the course or a closely related course, who: • Is in good academic standing • Has completed at least 75% of the course (adjusted for course length) • Course Coordinator • External Members • 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) • For HDR courses or courses with a major research component: a researcher active in the discipline and qualified at or above the course level • For third-party delivery: a representative from each major third-party provider, ensuring balanced representation. • Course Review Panel for HDR: • 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	Chair LTQC (in consultation with Institute)	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 Quality and Accreditation (Q&A).
C	Provide Panel Expectations	Q&A team	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	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	Panel members must:

			1. Review the Course Quality Review Report and support 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	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. 2. The panel's primary responsibilities are to: • 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. 3. The panel must consider:

			• 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. 4. Governance expectations for panel conduct, impartiality, and conflict of interest are outlined in the Governance Purpose and Requirements section. 5. Detailed review criteria and prompts are provided in the Course Review Panel Report Template. 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)	For Higher Degree by Research (HDR) courses, panels must include: • 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	1. Invite panel members and confirm availability. 2. Inform them of panel meeting timelines, processes and responsibilities. 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	1. The Course Quality Review Report must synthesise annual performance data collected through the Course Quality Annual Assessment 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: • Annual dashboard data and attainment categorisation from the Course Quality Annual Assessment

			Procedure, mapped to EPSIS domains. • Improvement Action Plans and 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 Academic Quality Benchmarking Procedure. This includes internal comparisons, external referencing, and academic calibration. Outcomes must be documented in the Course Quality Review Report and used to support governance decisions - Refer to the Academic Quality Benchmarking Procedure for detailed guidance on benchmarking expectations and calibration processes. • Mapping of learning outcomes to graduate attributes (FedTASKs) and AQF levels. • Evidence of curriculum coherence, 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.
--	--	--	--

			3. This report forms the basis for governance endorsement and course re-approval, demonstrating a holistic and evidence-informed view of course performance. 4. The Course Quality Review Report must demonstrate how the course aligns with the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, with reference to: • 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 integrity of review processes. 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.
D	Course Review Panel assessment activities	Course Review Panel	1. The Chair of the Review Panel will liaise with Q&A to coordinate interviews, obtain support materials, or coordinate the physical site visit, if required. 2. The Review Panel will undertake each the following tasks: a. Conduct a physical site visit, where site visits are not feasible, alternative validation methods may be approved by LTQC, particularly for fully online

			or third-party delivered courses. 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 evaluated with the following considerations: 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	1. Panel findings must include: 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 review final report must include: 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: - 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 Australian Council of Graduate Research (ACGR) - ACGR Good Practice Framework - to ensure alignment with sector-wide expectations for research training quality and integrity.
B	Review Cycle	Q&A	1. HDR courses follow the same five-year review cycle as course 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	School	1. HDR Course Review Panels must include: • 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	1. HDR reviews must evaluate: • Quality and consistency of supervision practices. • Research training environment and infrastructure. • 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 commencements, enrolments, completions, attrition, and SEPP/PRES 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	1. HDR review outcomes must be endorsed by the GRS Board 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 and LTQC 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	1. The Review Panel will submit a Course Review Panel Report to the Institute which: • 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. • 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. 4. The Institute/School Board is responsible for: • 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: • 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 Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC) for further consideration.
--	--	--	--

B	Course Review endorsement	LTQC ACPC / VCST	1. LTQC evaluates course reviews against academic quality indicators including: a. Curriculum coherence and alignment with AQF. 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). 2. Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC) may: a. Endorse the report and submit to Academic Board for final approval. b. Request revision if academic quality indicators are not met or evidence is insufficient. c. Escalate to Academic Course Planning Committee (ACPC) or Vice-Chancellor's Senior Team (VCST) if systemic issues, unresolved risks, or accreditation concerns are identified. 3. Academic Board is the final approval authority. It confirms that the course meets institutional standards for academic quality, strategic alignment, and continuous improvement. 4. Governance bodies must use the Governance Endorsement Checklist to guide their evaluation and decision-making.
----------	---------------------------	-------------------------	---

C	Final Approval	Academic Board	1. Academic Board is the final approval authority. 2. It confirms that the course meets institutional standards for: • Academic quality • Strategic alignment • Continuous improvement
D	Implementation and monitoring	Course Coordinator Q&A Institute Board GRS Board LTQC	1. Prepare 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 made in response to feedback or review outcomes. 2. Q&A monitor's progress and escalates compliance risks as required. 3. Endorse and submit to Academic Board. Academic Board endorsement confirms that the course meets institutional standards for academic quality, strategic alignment, and continuous improvement. 4. Additional annual reports may be requested if implementation exceeds 2 years.
E	Recognition and Good Practice Sharing	LTQC	1. LTQC identifies high-performing courses and exemplary practices during the endorsement process, based on evidence presented in the Course Review Panel Report. 2. LTQC prepares a formal communication to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) (PVCLT), summarising: a. The performance of the course. b. Commendations and exemplary practices. c. Recommendations for institutional recognition or dissemination. 3. The PVCLT may issue formal commendation and/or initiate

			broader sharing of good practice across the University. 4. Recognised practices may be included in LTQC agendas, professional development sessions, or academic leadership forums.
--	--	--	--

Supporting Documents

- [Academic Governance Policy](#) (Section 1,3)
- Academic Quality Benchmarking Procedure
- Course Quality Annual Assessment Procedure
- Guidance Pack for Course reviews
- Course Review Panel Member Guidelines / Panel Expectations Checklist
- Higher education course review registers
- Course Quality Framework

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

- Deputy Vice Chancellor (Global, Engagement and Quality), as the Approval Authority, is responsible for monitoring the implementation, outcomes and scheduled review of this procedure.
- Dean, Quality and Accreditation, as Document Owner, is responsible for maintaining the content of this procedure.
- Manager, Strategic Course Quality (as the Subject Matter Expert) is responsible for coordinating with the Policy team and updating the procedure on behalf of the Document Owner.

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 CentralWebsite](#).

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 Secretariat 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)