

Course Development and Review Policy and Procedure

1. Introduction

The Australian Performing Arts Conservatory (APAC) Course Development and Review Policy and Procedure sets out the purpose, scope, principles, policy statements, procedures, and responsibilities relating to the development and review of courses. The document is designed to underpin and structure APAC's approach to the development and review of its courses, as required by mandated higher education standards, to embed academic quality assurance, to foster good practice, and to appropriately assign responsibility and accountability.

1.1. Purpose

The intent of this document is to provide a framework, reflecting underpinning principles, which ensures that APAC develops high-quality courses for offer and regularly reviews and improves existing courses.

This Policy and Procedure should be read in conjunction with the following APAC documents: Course Review Criteria, Interim Course Review Process and Comprehensive Course Review Process.

1.2. Scope

This Policy and Procedure applies to all staff and to members of decision-making and advisory groups.

1.3. Principles

1. Courses offered align with, and advance, APAC's mission and strategic goals;
2. Course development is underpinned by an evidence-based business case demonstrating the sustainability and viability of the course;
3. Course development and accreditation aligns with the requirements of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (2018) and with the Australian Qualifications Framework 2013;
4. Course content and methods of course delivery reflect contemporary knowledge and professional practice;
5. Courses provide students with the initial skills and knowledge for entry to professions and careers, and also provide a basis for career progression, life-long learning and professional innovation;
6. Course development and course review are guided by external reference points, including benchmarking and expert advice from academic and professional leaders;

7. Course development and course review utilise a range of data, including feedback from students, industry and employers, and data on student satisfaction and graduate outcomes, to improve courses and student outcomes;
8. Course development and course review take account of contemporary and emerging professional and industry needs, and embed work-integrated learning, to facilitate graduate success;
9. Course development and course review ensure the constructive alignment of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment with course learning outcomes;
10. Course development and course review reflect a commitment to academic quality assurance, continuous academic quality improvement, embedding academic standards, and to meeting the requirements of the course accreditation authority.

2. Policy Statements

2.1. Strategy and Sustainability

1. Decisions to develop courses, with a view to securing their accreditation and then delivering them, are guided by APAC's mission and strategic goals, with careful consideration of the probable impact of developing and offering the course on APAC's long-term sustainability, and consequently consideration of the viability of the course itself. Before a decision is made to develop a course a comprehensive, evidence-based business case is developed for consideration by the Board of Directors.
2. The business case will quantify the likely initial and on-going costs, including opportunity costs, of developing and delivering the course, including, but not limited to, those related to staffing, required facilities and infrastructure, necessary supporting services such as student support services, relevant professional accreditation requirements, and marketing and promotion. In projecting revenue account is taken of, but not limited to, evidence regarding trends in domestic and international student demand, benchmarking with competitor offerings, course differentiation, market position and price points, and employment trends in relevant industry areas and professions.
3. The business case is developed with significant input from external academic, professional and industry experts, and, if required, external financial advice.
4. The regular review of courses is also conducted with reference to alignment with APAC's mission and strategic goals. Review findings may reveal that a course is drifting from an earlier alignment, or that without improvement it will cease to be viable. Decisions to address these issues are informed by a business case for making required investments that will prevent the discontinuation of the course. The business case here mirrors the characteristics described in clauses 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 above. See also the Course Discontinuation Policy and Procedure.

2.2. Academic Quality Assurance and Academic Quality Improvement

1. Once the decision is made to develop a course for accreditation and subsequent delivery, the assurance of academic quality will be considered during its development. The academic quality assurance process focuses on the following key matters:
 - embedding appropriate academic standards in all aspects of the course;
 - ensuring compliance with legislative and regulatory requirements, accreditation requirements, including for professional accreditations;
 - specifying relevant graduate attributes and course learning outcomes;
 - ensuring that course content reflects contemporary knowledge and contemporary and emerging professional practice, and industry trends;
 - ensuring that course delivery is by means of contemporary and effective methods;
 - embedding work-integrated learning and connections with industry and professions;
 - ensuring the constructive alignment of course curriculum, pedagogy and assessment with course learning outcomes; and
 - identifying the ancillary support, including facilities, infrastructure and student support services, required for the effective delivery of, and equitable access to, the proposed course.
2. Academic quality assurance of courses being developed requires the significant input of external academic, professional and industry experts, and the utilisation of other external reference points, including benchmarking with similar courses offered elsewhere, including internationally. Internal decision-making and advisory groups, which have some external membership, are key contributors to academic quality assurance and have layered endorsement and approval roles as a course evolves to the point where accreditation is sought, moving from endorsement by the Course Advisory Committee, to endorsement by the Teaching and Learning Committee, to approval by the Academic Board.
3. Regular review of courses is a driver of academic quality improvement. Reviews include comprehensive evidence-based reviews conducted by a panel of internal and external academics, and professional and industry experts, and various interim monitoring reviews which may focus on the course overall or on certain of its components or aspects.
4. All course reviews are characterised by varying degrees of external expert input and the use of external reference points, including benchmarking, the use of data and feedback relating to student satisfaction with courses and graduate outcomes, academic success, progression, retention and completion, and the use of data and feedback from industry and the professions.

5. Course review findings, and consequent responses and action plans, are considered by internal decision-making and advisory groups, which provide advice, and which play an endorsement and approval role.
6. Action plans for academic quality improvement are developed in the context of budget considerations and in the context of the changes to courses parameters specified by the accrediting authority. Plans are endorsed by the Course Advisory Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee and approved by the Academic Board.

3. Procedure

3.1. Course Development

1. All staff are encouraged to provide ideas for new courses. Ideas are considered in the first instance by the Director of Higher Education in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, who together make an initial assessment of the feasibility and viability of what is proposed. Where the initial assessment is positive the Director of Higher Education and the Head of Discipline develop a course development brief providing an overview of the strategic, market and financial case for the course. Commentary on the brief is provided by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), the Course Advisory Committee, the Teaching and Learning Committee and the Academic Board.
2. The course development brief and commentary are considered by the Board of Directors, which may request additional external expert advice on what is proposed, as well as additional information from internal sources. If the Board of Directors makes a positive assessment, then it may authorise the development of a business case, as described in Section 2.1 of this Policy and Procedure.
3. Where the development of a business case is authorised, it is coordinated by the CEO and the Director of Higher Education, with support from the relevant Head of Discipline.
4. A completed business case is considered by the Board of Directors, which may request additional external expert advice on what is proposed as well as additional information from internal sources. If the Board of Directors makes a positive assessment of the business case, it may authorise the commencement of the course development process.
5. The course development process is managed by a Course Development Group (CDG) consisting of the Director of Higher Education, as Chair, the CEO, and the relevant Head of Discipline. The CDG may co-opt additional internal support, and seek external input, as required.
6. The CDG develops a detailed course proposal, including demonstrating its consistency with the Higher Education Standards (Threshold Standards) 2021 and the Australian Qualifications Framework 2013, and specifying ancillary support required.
7. The CDG liaises regularly with the Course Advisory Committee, who provides feedback and advice.
8. Once the Course Advisory Committee endorses the completed detailed course proposal, the proposal is considered by the Teaching and Learning Committee, which may request additional external expert advice on what is proposed as well as additional information from internal sources.

9. Once the Teaching and Learning Committee endorses the detailed course proposal, the proposal is considered by the Academic Board, which may request additional external expert advice on what is proposed as well as additional information from internal sources.
10. Once the Academic Board has approved the detailed course proposal, the Board of Directors will decide whether to initiate the process of securing accreditation/CRICOS approval.

3.2. Course Review

1. APAC follows a schedule of comprehensive and interim course reviews to drive academic quality improvement and to comply with regulatory requirements. Standard 5.3.1 of the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021 requires that courses undergo comprehensive review that is overseen by peak academic governance processes and include external referencing or other benchmarking activities every seven years. Standard 5.3.3 of the HESF requires that comprehensive course reviews are supported by regular interim monitoring activities.
2. APAC requires that annual interim review is undertaken to support comprehensive course reviews, and that courses undergo comprehensive review at least once every five years, and preferably two years before the course requires reaccreditation. Table 1 details the review scheduling requirements for APAC Courses.

Table 1 Review scheduling requirements for APAC courses

| Offering Type | Interim Review Schedule | Comprehensive Review Schedule |
|--------------------|--|--|
| New Course | Annually, except in the year of comprehensive review | As required by the Board of Directors based on factors identified in the business case, but within five years of commencement. |
| Established Course | | Every five years, unless a comprehensive review is recommended by an annual interim review. |

3. The schedule for APAC interim and comprehensive course reviews is maintained in the APAC Corporate Review Register/Review and Benchmarking Schedule.

3.2.1 Interim Course Reviews

1. Interim Course Reviews are evidence-based and conducted by the Director of Higher Education and the relevant Head of Discipline, in liaison with the Course Advisory Committee. The review considers information including but not limited to:
 - student achievement, progression, and retention;
 - analysis of the relationship between the above performance indicators and admission requirements, including English language proficiency, and the source or channels through which students were recruited, such as through particular student recruitment agents or particular pathways;
 - student satisfaction and student feedback at the course and unit level, including on assessment, facilities, infrastructure and student support services;
 - grade distributions and moderation outcomes;

- breaches of academic integrity;
 - benchmarking at the course and unit level, including benchmarking focused on academic outcomes, in line with the Benchmarking Policy and Procedure.
2. An Interim Course Review Report is developed by the Director of Higher Education and the relevant Head of Discipline. The report will identify problems revealed and recommend actions to be taken to ensure compliance and achieve academic quality improvement, including an action plan with targets, key performance indicators, and timelines. One recommendation may be to bring forward a comprehensive review.
 3. The Interim Course Review Report and action plan is considered by the Course Advisory Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee for feedback and endorsement. The Academic Board will then consider the Interim Course Review Report and action plan for approval in whole or in part and may request modifications to the action plan.
 4. Action plans must identify whether any proposed improvements require a notification of material change to TEQSA (see s3.4 Changes to Courses and Units). Such instances may trigger a comprehensive review.
 5. Where actions require resourcing outside allocated budget, the CEO, in consultation with the Board of Directors, will make the required decisions, noting the recommendations relating to ensuring compliance must be acted upon.
 6. Progress on action plans is regularly reported to the Academic Board and made available to the APAC community.

3.2.2 Comprehensive Course Reviews

1. Comprehensive course reviews are overseen by the Course Advisory Committee. In exercising this function, the Course Advisory Committee will appoint an ad hoc Course Review Panel, with its Terms of Reference and Composition to be approved by the Academic Board.
2. A comprehensive review will include consideration of:
 - the design and content of the course of study;
 - expected learning outcomes;
 - methods of assessment of those outcomes;
 - the extent of students' achievement of learning outcomes; and
 - emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study.

Further review information may be found in the Course Review Criteria.

3. The Course Review Panel will comprise the Director of Higher Education (Chair), relevant internal academics, Admissions and Compliance Manager, Administration, external senior academics of good standing, students and/or alumni and industry and/or professional representatives. The Course Review Panel will report to the Course Advisory Committee. The Academic Board maintains oversight of all academic matters.

4. Comprehensive reviews are evidence-based and commence with the consideration of a review portfolio. The review portfolio is compiled by the Director of Higher Education, in partnership with the relevant Heads of Discipline, who may draw on the support of staff as required. The portfolio includes information regarding but not limited to:
- student achievement, progression, retention, completion and graduate outcomes;
 - analysis of the relationship between the above performance indicators and admission requirements, including English language proficiency, and the source or channel through which students were recruited, such as through particular student recruitment agents or particular pathways;
 - student satisfaction and student feedback at the course and unit level, including on assessment, facilities, infrastructure and student support services;
 - staff feedback at the course and unit level, including on student capability, facilities, infrastructure, student support services, and demands on, and expectations of, staff;
 - enrolment data and articulation pathway data, benchmarked with data from similar courses at other higher education providers;
 - student/staff ratios benchmarked with data from similar courses at other higher education providers;
 - grade distributions and moderation outcomes;
 - breaches of academic integrity;
 - feedback from students, graduates, external academic experts and external stakeholders in industry and the professions;
 - benchmarking at the course and unit level, including benchmarking focused on academic standards, in line with s2.1 of the Benchmarking Policy and Procedure; and
 - profiles of staff teaching in the course.

Additional information may be requested to assist the review as required.

5. The Course Advisory Committee or Course Review Panel, as the case may be, may conduct a site visit to the campus and interview selected decision-making and advisory groups, staff, students, graduates, and stakeholders, including from industry and the professions.
6. A Comprehensive Course Review Report will be compiled by the reviewing body, including recommendations for actions to be taken to ensure compliance and to achieve academic quality improvement.
7. The Comprehensive Course Review Report is considered by the Director of Higher Education, and the relevant Heads of Discipline, who develop a response and action plan with targets, key performance indicators, and timelines.
8. The Comprehensive Course Review Report and action plan is considered by the Course Advisory Committee and Teaching and Learning Committee for feedback and endorsement. The Academic Board will then consider the Comprehensive Course

Review Report and action plan for approval in whole or in part (for continuing courses) or endorsed by the Academic Board for the Board of Directors' Approval (for new courses). The Academic Board or Board of Directors may request modifications to the action plan.

9. Action plans must identify whether any proposed improvements to courses or units require a notification of material change to TEQSA (see s3.4 Changes to Courses and Units).
10. Where actions require resourcing outside allocated budget, the CEO, in consultation with the Board of Directors, will make the required decisions, noting that recommendations relating to ensuring compliance must be acted upon.
11. Progress on action plans is regularly reported to the Academic Board and Board of Directors, and made available to the APAC community.

3.3. Review of Units

1. APAC undertakes regular interim monitoring and review of units to support academic quality improvement and interim and comprehensive course review activities.
2. APAC requires that units are subject to interim monitoring at least once in the year of offer, or on a trimester basis as required by the Director of Higher Education; and reviewed by an external expert at least once between scheduled Comprehensive Course Reviews, and within two years of reaccreditation of the associated course. Table 1 details the review scheduling requirements for APAC Units.
3. The schedule for APAC unit interim monitoring and external reviews is maintained in the APAC Corporate Review Register/Review and Benchmarking Schedule.

Table 2 Review scheduling requirements for APAC units

| Offering Type | Interim Monitoring | External Review |
|---------------|---|---|
| Unit | At least once in the year of offer, or on a trimester basis as required by the Director of Higher Education, unless in a year of External Review. | At least once between scheduled Comprehensive Course Reviews, and within two years of reaccreditation of the associated course. |

3.3.1 Interim Monitoring of Units

1. Interim monitoring of units is overseen by the Head of Discipline and must take place at least once in the year the unit is offered, or on a trimester basis as required by the Director of Higher Education. The review considers information including, but not limited to:
 - enrolments;
 - student performance and learning outcomes;
 - unit completions;
 - grade distribution;
 - teaching evaluations;

- student to staff ratios;
 - student feedback; and
 - results and trends of any external benchmarking of the unit.
2. Where reviewed separately to annual or comprehensive course review processes:
 - The unit must be reviewed holistically with the relevant course; and
 - An Interim Unit Monitoring Report will be compiled by the Head of Discipline for consideration and endorsement by the Director of Higher Education. The report will identify areas for improvement of the unit, including suggested changes and their overall impact on the course, and consideration of whether such change(s) may constitute a material change. Should the report find that changes to the unit are required, a Unit Change Plan will be submitted with the report.
 3. Interim unit review documentation will be maintained by APAC and reported to the Teaching and Learning Committee for consideration and Course Advisory Committee for noting. The Teaching and Learning Committee and/or Academic Board will endorse and/or approve suggested changes and Unit Change Plans in accordance with s3.4.2 of this Policy and Procedure.

3.3.2 External Unit Reviews

1. External Unit Reviews are overseen by the Course Advisory Committee. In exercising this function, the Course Advisory Committee will recommend an appropriate external expert, being a senior academic of high repute in the same or cognate discipline, and the Terms of Reference of the External Unit Review to the Academic Board for approval.
2. Units must be reviewed by an external expert at least once between Comprehensive Course Reviews, and within two years of the reaccreditation of the associated course. The review considers information including, but not limited to interim unit monitoring indicators (s3.3.1.1 of this policy and procedure) and the:
 - alignment of unit learning outcomes to the relevant field of education or discipline, and employment skills;
 - alignment of unit learning outcomes to course learning outcomes;
 - alignment of unit learning outcomes to graduate attributes;
 - alignment of unit learning outcomes and assessment tasks and rubrics with the relevant AQF level;
 - alignment of unit learning outcomes to relevant levels of Bloom’s taxonomy;
 - effectiveness of the unit description in the unit outline and its rationale for the unit;
 - relevance, currency and sequence of topics in the unit;
 - relevance, currency and validity of reading lists and resources for the unit;

- suitability of summative assessments in the unit, including alignment to unit and course level outcomes, graduate attributes and relevant levels of Bloom’s Taxonomy;
 - suitability and effectiveness of summative assessment briefings, marking rubrics and marking guides and whether that information provides sufficient criteria for students to be guided in assessment responses;
 - data or reports on marking moderation, and the reliability of that moderation;
 - availability of feedback to students on assessment performance and outcomes, the mode of delivery and guidance on continuous improvement;
 - suitability and effectiveness of online and on-campus classroom materials;
 - suitability and effectiveness of teaching content; and
 - suitability and effectiveness of formative assessment.
3. An External Unit Review Report will be compiled by the External Expert for consideration and endorsement by the Head of Discipline. The Report will then be submitted to the Director of Higher Education for consideration and endorsement. The report will identify areas for improvement of the unit, including suggested changes and their overall impact on the course, and consideration of whether such change(s) may constitute a material change. Should the report find that changes to the unit are required, a Unit Change Plan will be submitted with the report.
 4. External unit review documentation will be maintained by APAC and reported to the Teaching and Learning Committee and Course Advisory Committee for consideration. The Teaching and Learning Committee and/or Academic Board will endorse and/or approve suggested changes and Unit Change Plans in accordance with s3.4.2 of this Policy and Procedure.

3.4. Changes to Courses and Units

1. Comprehensive or interim review findings, developments in the sector, or other factors as they may arise may merit changes or improvements to courses or units. In all events, APAC will ensure its obligations to students and regulating bodies are maintained.

3.4.1 Changes to Courses

1. Any changes to courses must be considered by the Academic Board, which then determines whether the extent of the changes made warrants a notification of material change to TEQSA.
2. Major changes to a course that generally require a notification of material change to TEQSA include changes to:
 - Volume of learning
 - Admissions requirements
 - Course structure, including adding or removing a core unit (that markedly changes learning outcomes or volume of learning), major or stream.

3. In instances where the Academic Board has determined that the extent of the change will require a notification of material change to TEQSA, and the Academic Board has endorsed the improvement in question, the Board of Directors will decide whether the improvement should be pursued.
4. Changes to a course that are not considered a major change (as noted in 3.3.1.2 above) do not generally require a notification of material to change to TEQSA, but must be approved by the Academic Board, who may deem a notification of material change is required.
5. Where a recommendation is made to discontinue a course, the *Course Discontinuation Policy and Procedure* will apply.
6. Where a decision is made to discontinue a unit, an Action Plan must be developed by the Director of Higher Education in conjunction with the relevant Head of Discipline to ensure students are not disadvantaged by this change, including alternative units for students to undertake to achieve the learning outcomes of the course. The discontinuation of a unit may constitute a material change to an accredited course.

3.4.2 Changes to Units

1. Approval authorities for changes to units will vary according to the type and extent of the change required. The Unit Change Matrix in Table 2 has been adapted from the HEPP-QN Unit Change Guide (2022), endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee, and approved by the Academic Board.
2. The following definitions are applied to the extent of changes to units:
 - **Major change:** A change to an individual unit that could significantly impact the course and/or a student's ability to meet the requirements of the course and/or course learning outcomes.
 - **Minor change:** A change to an individual unit that will not impact the course and/or a student's ability to meet the requirements of the course and/or course learning outcomes. However, minor changes could impact the unit and/or a student's ability to meet the requirements of the unit and/or unit learning outcomes.
 - **Regular change:** A change to an individual unit that is expected to be made periodically for purposes such as maintaining currency, quality or safeguarding academic integrity.

Table 3 Unit Change Matrix

| Element | Change | Approval Authority | Notes |
|-------------------|--------|--------------------|--|
| Credit points | Major | Academic Board | |
| Duration | Major | Academic Board | Any change outside of accredited course materials. Otherwise, Regular. |
| AQF level | Major | Academic Board | |
| Unit name / title | Major | Academic Board | Academic Board approval to ensure appropriate safeguards in relation to communication with key stakeholders. |
| Student workload | Major | Academic Board | Change to total study hours per week / volume of learning |
| Unit code | Major | Academic Board | Per unit name |

| Element | Change | Approval Authority | Notes |
|---|------------------|---|--|
| Prerequisites | Major | Academic Board | |
| Unit learning outcomes | Major or Minor | Major: Academic Board Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee | Major: Change / Addition / Removal of a learning outcome which will impact the student's ability to meet/require a change to the overall course learning outcomes Minor: Change in language/expression of a learning outcome which will not impact the student's ability to meet/require a change to the overall course Learning outcomes |
| Work-integrated learning | Major or Minor | Major: Academic Board Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee | Major: Adding, removing or significantly changing a WIL component Minor: Changes which do not significantly change an existing WIL component |
| Specialised facilities or equipment | Minor | Teaching and Learning Committee | |
| Topics | Minor or Regular | Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee Regular: Director of Higher Education | Minor: Removal or addition of topics Regular: Rewording or refining of topics |
| Assessment tasks and weighting | Minor or Regular | Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee Regular: Director of Higher Education | Minor: Change in the number, type, expression and/or weighting of assessments. Regular: Alternating between equivalent alternative assessment tasks (not involving a change in the type of assessment) e.g., for the purposes of promoting academic integrity |
| A list of the prescribed and recommended texts for the unit | Minor or Regular | Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee Regular: Director of Higher Education | Minor: Changes to texts which will impact the topics of the unit Regular: Updating of texts and text editions for the purposes of currency |
| Further information to students | Minor or Regular | Minor: Teaching and Learning Committee Regular: Director of Higher Education | Minor: Other changes to further information Regular: Changes reflecting specifics of the current teaching period, e.g., Lecturer information, LMS information, dates |
| Rubrics | Regular | Director of Higher Education | |
| Teaching Plan and Sequence | Regular | Director of Higher Education | |
| Current teaching period | Regular | Director of Higher Education | |

4. Responsibilities

4.1. The Board of Directors

The Board of Directors is responsible for:

- assuring itself that there is an effective system in place for course development and comprehensive and interim course review, and that the system ensures compliance with mandated higher education standards;
- authorising the business case for the development of a course;
- authorising the commencement of the course development process; and
- deciding whether to seek accreditation of a newly developed course and deciding whether to pursue improvements requiring approval of the accreditation authority.

4.2. The Academic Board

The Academic Board is responsible for:

- overseeing and monitoring the course development process;
- overseeing and monitoring the course review process;
- approving detailed course proposals prior to securing accreditation;
- approving the Terms of Reference, Composition and Membership of comprehensive course review panels;
- approving Review Reports and Action Plans resulting from comprehensive and interim course and unit reviews;
- monitoring progress of action plans; and
- approving changes to courses and units, as required.

4.3. The Teaching and Learning Committee

The Teaching and Learning Committee is responsible for:

- ensuring the quality of teaching and learning in APAC's educational offerings;
- making recommendations to inform admissions and approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support where required;
- providing feedback on course development briefings and proposals;
- endorsing/approving Review Reports and Action Plans resulting from comprehensive and interim course and unit reviews, and providing feedback as required; and
- endorsing or approving changes to courses and units, as required.

4.4. The Course Advisory Committee

The Course Advisory Committee is responsible for:

- providing strategic academic oversight of course development and review, including maintaining oversight of APAC's systematic review of courses and units;

- providing feedback on course development briefings and proposals;
- convening a Course Review Panel to facilitate a comprehensive course review as required, recommending the Panel's composition and Terms of Reference for consideration and approval by the Academic Board;
- recommending an appropriate external expert and Terms of Reference to facilitate external unit reviews, for consideration and approval by the Academic Board; and
- endorsing interim and comprehensive review reports of courses and units and providing feedback.

4.5. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

The CEO is responsible for:

- coordinating, in partnership with the Director of Higher Education, the development of the business case for proposed courses; and
- adjusting budgets to enable academic quality compliance and academic quality improvement.

4.6. The Director of Higher Education

The Director of Higher Education, is responsible for:

- developing, in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, course development briefs for the Board of Directors;
- chairing the Course Development Group (CDG);
- compiling, in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, the review portfolio for comprehensive course reviews;
- developing, in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, a response and action plan in the light of external review findings and recommendations;
- conducting, in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, interim course reviews;
- producing, in partnership with the relevant Head of Discipline, an Interim Course Review Report and resultant action plan;
- considering and endorsing Interim Unit Monitoring Reports, External Unit Review Reports and Unit Change Plans, as required, for submission to the Teaching and Learning Committee and/or Academic Board as appropriate.

4.7. Heads of Discipline

Heads of Discipline are responsible for:

- in partnership with the Director of Higher Education, developing course development briefs for consideration by the Board of Directors;
- compiling Interim Unit Monitoring Reports and Unit Change Plans, as required, for consideration by the Director of Higher Education;
- considering External Unit Review Reports and Unit Change Plans, as required, for

consideration by the Director of Higher Education;

- in partnership with the Director of Higher Education, conducting interim course reviews and producing an Interim Course Review Report and associated action plans;
- in partnership with the Director of Higher Education, compiling review portfolios for comprehensive course reviews.

4.8. Staff

Staff are responsible for:

- providing open and honest feedback on courses and units, and on ancillary support.

4.9. Students

Students are responsible for:

- providing open and honest feedback on courses and units, and on ancillary support.

5. Relevant Documents

- Australian Qualifications Framework 2013
- Benchmarking Policy and Procedure
- Comprehensive Course Review Process
- Course Discontinuation Policy and Procedure
- Course Review Criteria
- Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000 Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000
- Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
- Interim Course Review Process
- National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018
- TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Quality Assurance 2017
- TEQSA Guidance Note: Changes in a Course of Study that may lead to Accreditation as a New Course 2017
- TEQSA Guidance Note: Course Design (including Learning outcomes and Assessment) 2017

6. Definitions

- An **External Expert** (Course and Unit Reviews) is a senior academic of high repute in a similar or cognate discipline.
- **Course** is an approved sequence of study leading to the conferral of a higher education award.
- **Unit** is a discrete unit of study with its own name, code and value that makes up part of a course.

Version Control and Document Owner

| Policy Category | Academic | Approval Date | 14 October 2022 | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| Document Owner | Director of Higher Education | Approval Authority | Academic Board | |
| Audience | Staff | Review Date | October 2025 | |
| Revision History | | | | |
| Version | Author | Change Summary | Date Approved | Date Effective |
| 1 | APAC | New document. | 25 September 2015 | |
| 1.1 | APAC | Current document. | 26 October 2017 | |
| 2.0 | APAC | Minor amendment. | 18 December 2020 | |
| 3.0 | DVE Business Solutions Pty Ltd | Review and update of policy and procedure. | 14 October 2022 | |
| 4.0 | DVE Business Solutions Pty Ltd | Review and update of policy and procedure to align committee processes and clarify review activities. | | |
| 4.1 | DoHE | Updated to reflect small amendments to language/terminology | | 16 May 2023 |

Document Code: APAC - Course Development and Review Policy and Procedure

Version: 4.1

Review Date: October 2025

Page 16 of 16

Australian Performing Arts Conservatory ABN 11 009 772 481

Registered as an Australian Institution of Higher Education PRV14046 CRICOS Provider Number 03897G