1. Preamble

This policy is concerned with the processes for the development and review of courses and subjects (subjects). The objectives of this policy are to ensure that courses and subjects developed at AGSL are of a high academic standard and that existing courses and subjects continue to meet the high academic standards demanded by AGSL.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all staff involved in the creation, development or review of courses at AGSL.

3. Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Coherent, structured study in an academic discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Structured study in a range of disciplines leading to the award of a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4. Principles

AGSL acknowledges and is committed to the value of a cycle of review and improvement. This includes, among other things, reflection by academic staff on the effects on student learning of curriculum design, teaching styles and approaches to assessment.

AGSL will maintain procedures that govern the systematic monitoring and review of courses and subjects. This policy applies to all award AGSL courses. The Academic Board will undertake regular reviews and evaluation of courses and will publish a schedule for reviews in the Course Review Register.

New courses and subjects that are proposed at AGSL and existing courses and subjects offered by AGSL must undergo a rigorous planning, investigation and review to ensure initial and ongoing:

- compliance with AQF and TEQSA requirements;
- relevance and appropriateness of the course or subjects to be offered by AGSL;
- satisfaction of course and subject objectives and the highest academic standards;
- incorporation of the latest learning, discussion, examples and case studies, etc., on the topic;
- satisfaction of a market or industry demand; and
- effective management of students (e.g. if as a result of a review a course is to be closed, students currently enrolled in the course must be effectively managed through to completion).

Where appropriate and practicable, review processes will normally:

- recognise exemplary teaching and learning practices and seek ways to disseminate and encourage good practice;
- be transparent;
- involve critical feedback to those involved in course delivery;
- use external benchmarks as reference points;
- draw on multiple stakeholders;
- use multiple sources of information and data;
• include data collected from student surveys;
• cover all delivery, assessment, prescribed readings and content aspects of the curriculum.

5. Procedures

Reviewers

The Academic Board, on the recommendation of the Executive Dean, is responsible for the appointment of personnel to review courses and subjects.

Frequency

Courses and subjects are to be reviewed at least every three years on a schedule determined and approved by the Academic Board. The Academic Board may call for the review of a subject or course at any time for any reason and may specify a reduced or increased scope or terms of reference for the course or subject review.

Scope

The review of a course or subject is to consider:

• how well the course is satisfying a market need;
• how well the course or subject is achieving its objectives;
• how appropriately the course is resourced;
• the quality of lecturer or supervisor support;
• the appropriateness of course post nominal;
• the schedule on which the subjects within a course are offered;
• the financial feasibility of the course; and
• how well is the course or subject performing against similar benchmarked alternatives.

Course Review Register

In order to track course review activity and justifications for changes, a Course Review Register must be maintained. The Course Review Register identifies:

• the date on which the course was last reviewed;
• the date of the next scheduled review;
• suggested changes to content, structure, subjects, point value, admission requirements and nomenclature, together with the justifications for such changes;
• the outcome of the suggested changes (i.e. whether they are approved or not), together with justification for suggested changes that are not approved;
• details of internal and external advisors, including any professional bodies, that provide input into the review.

**TEQSA Approval**

To maintain registration as a higher education provider, a provider and its accredited courses must continue to meet the Threshold Standards. Under Section 29(1) of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011, it is the responsibility of a registered higher education provider to notify TEQSA of changes that happen or are likely to happen that will either significantly affect the provider’s ability to meet the Threshold Standards or that will require updating the provider's entry on the National Register of Higher Education Providers. The notification must be provided to TEQSA no later than 14 days after the day that the provider would reasonably be expected to have become aware of the event. Refer to [http://www.teqsa.gov.au/material-changes](http://www.teqsa.gov.au/material-changes) for information about the types of changes that need to be reported and the appropriate reporting mechanisms.

**6. Responsibilities**

The following are responsible for the application of the policy -

- Academic Board
- Executive Dean