

Higher Education Course Quality Annual Monitoring Procedure

Policy code:	AG2116
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
Legislative context	2
Definitions	2
Actions	3
Course Quality Annual Monitoring	3
Governance oversight	6
Supporting Documents	7
Responsibility	7
Promulgation	8
Implementation	8
Records management	8

Purpose

This procedure establishes a framework for the systematic, evidence-based monitoring of course quality at Federation University. Its primary purpose is to ensure that all coursework courses consistently meet academic standards, support student success, and remain relevant to industry university strategic goals.

The annual assessment process enables:

- Continuous improvement of academic courses through timely analysis and feedback, identifying course strengths and mitigating future risks.
- Support for postgraduate research courses delivered via coursework through annual monitoring of research training quality, supervision practices, and candidate outcomes.
- Alignment with regulatory requirements, including the University's [Higher Education Current Award Courses Register](#) and [Higher Education Non-award Courses Register](#) enabling courses.
- Strategic oversight and informed decision-making by governance and management bodies to fulfil Academic Governance requirements.

This procedure supports the implementation of the Regulation 13 and 14 of the Federation University Academic Regulations 2022 and the [Academic Governance Policy](#), which outline the requirements for course establishment, including course specifications and governance oversight, comprehensive course and unit reviews and interim monitoring processes.

Framing and Engagement

This procedure is designed to support a positive culture of continuous improvement across the University. It is a developmental tool that enables staff to reflect on course performance, celebrate strengths, and identify areas for enhancement. It is not intended as a compliance burden.

The annual assessment process complements existing quality assurance activities and provides a structured, evidence-informed foundation for improvement, planning, and recognition.

Scope

This procedure applies to all coursework Higher education award courses offered by Federation University, including undergraduate and postgraduate coursework courses with a research component. This procedure excludes higher degrees by research (HDR) delivered with no coursework component.

Courses in teach-out may be included where there is an identified risk to meeting the EPSIS domains, or where other considerations—such as the duration of the teach-out period or the volume of enrolled students—indicate a potential compliance or quality risk.

This procedure complements the University's [Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure](#), which mandates comprehensive course reviews on a five-year cycle. The annual assessment process provides regular monitoring and quality assurance between formal reviews, ensuring timely reporting of course performance to inform continuous improvement and support scheduled comprehensive review.

This procedure operates within the broader Higher Education Course [Quality Framework](#), a suite of procedures which outline the interconnection between annual assessment, course review, and benchmarking. Staff are encouraged to refer to the framework summary for context, definitions, and visual representation of the quality cycle.

Legislative context

- Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011
- Federation University Australia Statute 2021
- Federation University Australia Academic Regulations 2022
- Federation University [Academic Governance Policy](#)

Definitions

Definitions in this procedure align with the University's central glossary of academic terms (or reference the glossary for the [Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure](#)).

Term	Definition
ACPC	Academic Course Portfolio Committee
Attainment Categorisation	A quality classification system applied to a course based on aggregated course data from the monitored EPSIS model measures. The categories for attainment are:

	Gold, Silver, Bronze and Not Meeting Threshold.
Course Quality	<p>Course quality refers to the extent to which a course is designed, delivered, and reviewed in a manner that ensures students achieve the intended learning outcomes and experience a consistent engaging, and academically rigorous learning environment aligned with regulatory and institutional standards.</p> <p>A course will be considered to be a high-quality course if it exhibits each of the following five characteristics.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provides an excellent study experience which engages students, supports them through the provision of high-quality, culturally safe materials and integrates authentic experiences and assessment. 2. Allows students to make good progress through the course, receive timely academic support and achieve at a level commensurate with their knowledge and skills. 3. Demonstrates excellent completion rates which lead to positive employment outcomes reflective of the attainment of graduate attributes (FedTASKs) and the success of the co-operative model. 4. Is attentive to its performance and demonstrates constant commitment to maintaining the integrity of its curriculum integrity, and, delivery and alignment with the University's vision and strategy. 5. Exhibits strong student demand, is financially sustainable delivery, supported by the appropriate staffing profile and demonstrably embeds the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. <p>Federation University uses this definition to apply the EPSIS domains model to monitor course quality (see definition below)</p>
EPSIS Domains	<p>The abbreviated term for the five key standardised metric categories used to measure course quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Experience (E) • Student Progress (P) • Student Success (S) • Course Integrity (I) • Course Sustainability (S) <p>Within each domain, a series of subcategories are measured to create a subcategory aggregate.</p>
VCST	Vice-Chancellor's Senior Team

Actions

Course Quality Annual Monitoring

	Activity	Responsibility	Steps
--	----------	----------------	-------

A	Preparation of Course Quality Metrics Data	Manager, Strategic Course Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compile annual point-in-time data for each current course using EPSIS domains for courses. 2. Postgraduate course with a sustained research component will have additional metrics related to quality of supervision, candidate progression and training environment. <p><i>Note: Annual reports generated under this procedure must be used to populate the Course Quality Review Report and inform the Course Review Outcome Report as part of the Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure.</i></p>
B	Preparation of Annual Course Quality Reports	Manager, Strategic Course Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Produce course quality reports. 2. Categorisation is determined through objective analysis of the collated data and application of defined metrics for each EPSIS subcategory. The following attainment categories will apply: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gold - Course demonstrates excellence across all, or most, domains. • Silver – demonstrated excellence in some domains, and all domains exhibit satisfactory performance. • Bronze – satisfactory performance across all domains. • Not Meeting Threshold - Course falls below expected standards in one or more domains, requiring targeted intervention. <p><i>Note: A rubric outlining thresholds and indicators for each category will be included in the supporting documentation.</i></p>

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Distribute individual course reports to Course Coordinators, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current year categorisation • Summary of performance metrics, trajectory of course performance since the last formal course review, highlighting improvements, declines, or stability across key domains. 4. Distribute course reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associate Directors of Learning and Teaching (ADLTs) • Heads of Discipline (HOD) • Executive Deans, or equivalent in GRS (if appropriate).
C	Institute/School-Level Review	ADLTs / HODs / Executive Deans or equivalent for HDR	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review submitted reports and contextual data. 2. Where appropriate, incorporate findings into Institute/School-level continuous improvement planning.
D	Central Monitoring and Reporting	Manager, Strategic Course Quality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Compile an aggregated annual Course Quality Monitoring Report, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Categorisation summaries • Thematic analysis and emerging trends 2. Submit the aggregated report to nominated academic governance committees, and senior management for oversight, performance monitoring, and strategic planning. (See <i>Governance Oversight</i> section below) 3. Ensure distribution of relevant summary data to Institutes/ School and governance bodies to support local and strategic decision-making.
E	Ongoing Monitoring and Support	Quality and Accreditation Team	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Track course performance over time using the Course Review Register.

			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Support and monitor courses at risk of not meeting course quality thresholds as required. N.B: Triggers for ongoing support and monitoring may include categorisation as 'Not Meeting Threshold', significant year-on-year declines in key metrics, or identification of risks through governance reporting. 3. Use data from successive annual assessments to evaluate trends and inform future interventions. 4. Report to ACPC (and/or VCST) regarding any courses with persistent identified quality risks.
--	--	--	--

Governance oversight

	Activity	Responsibility	Steps
A	Governance Oversight – Learning and Teaching Quality Committee	LTQC	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review annual course quality aggregate data and reports. 2. Identify institutional trends and discuss analysis of courses within each of the attainment categories. 3. Approve the Course Quality Annual Monitoring reports or seek additional data/information if required. 4. Ensure that insights, recommendations and decisions are communicated back to Institutes to close the feedback loop and support local planning, continuous improvement, and alignment with institutional priorities.
B	Governance Oversight – Academic Board	Academic Board	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review annual course quality aggregate data and reports, with emphasis on recommendations/feedback from LTQC. 2. Note the aggregate outcomes within the reports, including trends, areas of improvement

			and any recommendations for Institutes.
C	Governance Oversight – Corporate Governance		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACPC: Utilise aggregate reports to conduct business analysis and provide strategic recommendations. 2. VCST: Utilise aggregate reports to have executive oversight and ensure alignment with university priorities. <p><i>Note: Strategic oversight and business analysis of course performance is supported by the Academic Course Portfolio Committee (ACPC) and Vice-Chancellor's Senior Team (VCST), in accordance with their respective Terms of Reference.</i></p> <p><i>These bodies receive aggregated institutional reports and thematic insights to inform strategic planning, resource allocation, and continuous improvement initiatives.</i></p>
D	Recognition and Sharing of Good Practice	Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching (PVCLT)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Courses that attain Gold Standard status will receive formal recognition from the PVCLT, as supporting evidence of effective leadership.

Supporting Documents

- [Higher Education Course Quality Assurance and Review Procedure](#)
- [Higher Education Benchmarking Procedure](#)
- [Student Feedback Survey \(SFS\) Procedure](#)
- EPSIS Domain Mapping Table
- Federation University Higher Education Course [Quality Framework](#)

Responsibility

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

Promulgation

This procedure will be communicated throughout the University community via:

1. A FedNews announcement and on the 'Recently Approved Documents' page on the University's Policy Central website.
2. Distribution of e-mails to Executive Dean of Institute / Head of Department / University staff.
3. Notification to Institutes/Schools/Federation TAFE.

Implementation

This procedure will be implemented throughout the University via:

1. A FedNews announcement and on the 'Recently Approved Documents' page on the University's Policy Central website.
2. Training sessions.

Records management

Document title	Location	Responsible officer	Minimum retention period
HDR Annual Monitoring Report	GRS Records System	Dean, Graduate Research	7 years
Annual Course Monitoring report	The University's approved data management system	Dean, Quality, Partnerships and Accreditation	7 years