Course and Subject Policy

1. Purpose

The Course and Subject Policy outlines the requirements for course development, approval and review of higher education (HE) courses at the Institution. The policy aims to ensure that all courses cater to the needs of a diverse student body, industry needs and expectations and compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF). By adhering to this policy, the Institution ensures the quality, relevance and continuous improvement of courses and subjects, and alignment with its strategic objectives.

This policy should be read in conjunction with:

- Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures
- Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures
- Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures
- External Referencing Procedures
- Assessment Policy
- Assessment Procedures

2. Scope

This policy applies to all HE courses including both award and non-award, and all staff involved in the course development, design and review activities.

3. Definitions

See *Glossary of Terms.*

4. Policy statements

Pre-development stage

4.1   All new course development is informed by strategic priorities and the analysis of a range of data as outlined in the *Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures*.

4.2   The Institution thoroughly analyses the required skills and knowledge in the academic field and industry.

4.3   A comprehensive business case must be developed and approved by the Board of Directors prior to the commencement of any new course development using the approved template.

Course structures

4.4   Courses must adhere to the AQF volume of learning for each AQF qualification in Table 1. Variations to this are made in exceptional circumstances upon approval by the Academic Board.

4.5   Course duration varies according to the AQF qualification specifications associated with each course. See Table 1.

4.6   Bachelor degrees normally comprise three types of subjects (core / elective / specialisations) arranged to create different substructures, and a compulsory WIL component. Other undergraduate qualifications offered by the Institution are normally nested within the structure of the Bachelor degree.

4.7   Masters degrees normally comprise three types of subjects (core / elective / specialisations) arranged to create different substructures, and a compulsory WIL component. Other postgraduate qualifications offered by the Institution are normally nested within the structure of the Masters' degrees.

4.8   In addition to the clauses 4.6 and 4.7, WIL is a compulsory component of Associate Degrees and the Diploma of Sports Management (High Performance).

4.9   Subjects within courses are typically balanced across AQF levels to scaffold learning, as set out below:

a. Diploma: at least six AQF level 5 subjects.

b. Associate Degree: at least six AQF level 5 and six AQF level 6 subjects, structured in a manner to scaffold student learning from lower to higher AQF level subjects.

c. A Bachelor degree has a balance of at least six subjects at each AQF levels 5, 6, and 7 across three years, structured in a manner to scaffold student learning from lower to higher AQF level subjects.

d. Graduate Certificate: a majority of subjects should be introductory (AQF level

8).

e. Graduate Diploma: at least half of the subjects should be at AQF level 8.

f. Masters degree: half or more of the subjects should be at AQF level 9.

4.10   All undergraduate subjects are equivalent to three credit points, with the exception of the Work Integrated Learning (WIL) subjects which are equivalent to six credit points.

4.11   All postgraduate subjects are equivalent to four credit points, with the exception of the WIL subjects which are equivalent to eight credit points.

4.12   Subject levels at the Institution align to an AQF levels as follows:

- 100 level subjects – AQF 5 (Diploma)
- 200 level subjects – AQF 6 (Associate Degree)
- 300 level subjects – AQF 7 (Bachelor Degree)
- 600 and 700 level subjects – AQF 8 (Graduate Certificate and Graduate Diploma)
- 800 level subjects – AQF 9 (Masters Degree)

4.13   Any variation to the schema outlined above and in Table 1-2 must be based on a robust academic rationale that is approved by the Academic Board.

4.14   Table 1 outlines the volume of learning, course duration and credit points per AQF qualification as follows:

AQF qualification*	AQF volume of learning	AQF level	Typical full-time course duration**	Number of credit points (CP) Total**	Typical number of subjects (x CP)**
Undergraduate					
Undergraduate Certificate	0.5 – 2 years	5	0.5 year	12	4 subjects x 3 CP
Diploma	1 – 2 years	5	1 year	24	8 subjects x 3 CP
Associate Degree	2 years	6	2 years	54	16 subjects x 3 CP 1 subject x 6 CP (WIL)

Bachelor Degree	3 – 4 years	7	3 years	84	24 subjects x 3 CP 2 subjects x 6 CP (WIL)
Postgraduate					
Graduate Certificate	0.5 – 1 year	8	0.5 year	16	4 subjects x 4 CP
Graduate Diploma	1 – 2 years	8	1 year	32	8 subjects x 4 CP
Masters Degree	1 – 2 years	9	2 years	64	12 subjects x 4 CP 2 subjects x 8 CP (WIL)

*The volume of learning identifies the notional duration of all activities required for the achievement of the learning

outcomes specified for a particular AQF qualification type. It is expressed in equivalent full-time years.

** Any variations must be based on a robust academic rationale that is approved by the Academic Board.

4.15   Table 2 outlines the total workload per subject as follows:

Type of hours	Undergraduate per subject	Postgraduate per subject
Total timetabled course delivery hours (including WIL)	33 hours	33 hours
Total personal study hours	77 hours	107 hours
Total subject workload hours	110 hours	140 hours

Course design

4.16   Courses are designed to provide a coherent and comprehensive learning experience. Content is up-to-date, relevant, and aligned with academic and industry standards, the Institution's strategic objectives and its Learning and Teaching Principles outlined in the Learning and Teaching Policy. The Institution's graduate capabilities are embedded into all courses.

4.17   Courses and subjects are developed with clear and measurable learning outcomes that align with academic and industry requirements. Learning outcomes

convey the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students are expected to achieve upon completion of the course.

4.18   Learning outcomes are informed by national and international comparators and industry expectations. They are consistent across delivery modes and locations.

4.19   Course content, learning activities and assessments are mapped to the learning outcomes to ensure clear and logical progression of learning throughout the course.

4.20   Courses are appropriately sequenced and scaffolded to facilitate progressive learning across the course and individual subjects.

4.21   Courses and subjects align with the relevant qualification level in the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), including volume of learning requirements to ensure the necessary amount of learning for each qualification.

4.22   Courses and subjects are designed to uphold the Institution's commitment to academic integrity as per the Academic Integrity Policy and Academic Integrity Procedures.

4.23   Assessment methods are designed to be valid, reliable and fair and enabling students to demonstrate their achievement of the learning outcomes as per the Assessment Policy and Assessment Procedures.

4.24   Courses and subjects are designed with diverse delivery modes in mind, such as face-to-face, online, or hybrid delivery, to cater to the needs of all students.

4.25   Appropriate technology is integrated into curriculums to enhance student engagement, promote active learning, and facilitate collaboration in accordance with the Technologies in Learning and Teaching Policy.

4.26   Adequate resources, including staffing requirements, learning materials, technology, and support services, are considered to ensure effective course delivery across all delivery modes and locations. All facilities and equipment support the number of student enrolments for each courses.

4.27   Courses and subjects are designed to ensure an inclusive and supportive

learning environment that accommodates the diverse needs of students. Accessibility, cultural sensitivity, and the provision of academic and wellness support are considered in the design process.

4.28   All subject development includes a process of review once the subject has been developed by the subject matter expert. Subject, review and approval processes are outlined in the Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures. Key subject information is outlined in the Subject Outline Policy.

4.29   Artificial intelligence (AI) technology may be utilised for the design of courses and subjects in accordance with the requirements outlined in the Artificial Intelligence in Education (AIED) Framework, Use of Artificial Intelligence in Assessment Guidelines, Technologies in Learning and Teaching and the Artificial Intelligence Policy.

Interim monitoring and evaluation

4.30   The Institution systematically monitors and evaluates its courses and subjects to ensure they continue to meet academic quality standards, meet the needs of stakeholders including industry and professional bodies, to mitigate any risks to quality and remain current and relevant.

4.31   Interim monitoring and evaluation processes are evidence-based and include the analysis and evaluation of data (e.g. quality indicators, validation and moderation outcomes, student and staff feedback, graduate outcomes, etc.) to drive improvements.

4.32   Interim monitoring and evaluation processes include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study including:

- analyses of progression rates, attrition rates, completion times and rates and, where applicable, comparing different locations of delivery, and
- the assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study.

4.33   Benchmarking, peer review and moderation are methods used for external referencing in accordance with the External Referencing Procedures.

4.34   Robust mechanisms are in place to gather and incorporate feedback from

students, staff, industry partners, and other relevant stakeholders. This activity includes a feedback loop, including the communication of outcomes and actions and for improvement.

4.35   The outcomes of interim monitoring and evaluation inform decisions on necessary changes to courses and subjects, and feed into periodic comprehensive course reviews.

4.36   Procedures for interim monitoring and evaluation are outlined in the Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures and External Referencing Procedures.

Comprehensive course reviews

4.37   All courses undergo periodic comprehensive reviews to assess their effectiveness and relevance at least once in their accreditation cycle. The review must commence no later than the end of the fifth year of delivery.

4.38   Comprehensive course reviews include the design and content of each course of study, the expected learning outcomes, the methods for assessment of those outcomes, the extent of students' achievement of learning outcomes, and also takes account of 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.

4.39   Comprehensive course reviews are informed and supported by regular interim monitoring and evaluation activity, of the quality of teaching, student progress and the overall delivery of subjects within each course of study.

4.40   In addition to the criteria outlined in paragraphs 4.29 to 4.35, comprehensive course reviews include additional independent, expert advice through the establishment of Course Development Advisory Sub-Committees and input from external reviewers.

4.41   Procedures for comprehensive course reviews are outlined in the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures.

Continuous improvement

4.42   The Institution uses the outcomes of interim monitoring, evaluation,

comprehensive reviews, external referencing and student feedback to guide and evaluate future improvements and mitigate future risks to quality. It uses student progress and success data to inform improvements (e.g. admission criteria and approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support).

4.43   Changes to courses as a result of interim monitoring, evaluation or comprehensive course reviews may be regular, minor or major in accordance with Appendix A of the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures.

Course approval and accreditation/reaccreditation

4.44   Courses are approved internally by peak governance bodies prior to submission to TEQSA for accreditation or reaccreditation. Procedures for the approval of courses are outlined in the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures.

4.45   Course approval processes are applied consistently to all courses of study, prior to being first offered and during re-approval or re-accreditation.

4.46   A course is approved or re-approved by Academic Board and the Board of Directors, prior to the submission to TEQSA for accreditation or reaccreditation, only when:

1. the course meets, and continues to meet, the applicable Standards of the Higher Education Standards Framework;
2. the decision to (re-)approve a course of study is informed by overarching academic scrutiny of the course of study that is competent to assess the design, delivery and assessment of the course of study independently of the staff directly involved in those aspects of the course, and
3. the resources required to deliver the course as approved or accredited will be available when needed.

Course discontinuation

4.47   Discontinuation of a course requires Board of Directors, Academic Board and TEQSA approval. A teach out and/or transition plan is required to ensure students are not detrimentally impacted in accordance with the Course Teach-Out

and Transition Procedures.

5. Roles and responsibilities

5.1   The DVC (Learning and Teaching) has oversight of the implementation of this policy and is responsible for overseeing all aspects of course and subject development, evaluation and approval processes.

5.2   Board of Directors is responsible for:

1. approving business cases and releasing funds for course development;
2. ensuring course development aligns with strategic objectives;
3. ensuring course financial viability and mitigating financial risks associated with the delivery; and
4. based on recommendations from the Academic Board, approving course proposals for submission to TEQSA for accreditation, reaccreditation or registration purposes.

5.3   The Academic Board is responsible for:

1. monitoring academic quality and standards across all courses;
2. approving a schedule of periodic comprehensive course reviews;
3. approving major changes to existing subjects; and
4. scrutinising and recommending course proposals and other related accreditation/ reaccreditation documentation for approval by the Board of Directors for accreditation and registration purposes prior to submission to TEQSA.

5.4   The Course and Subject Committee (CSC) is responsible for:

1. monitoring all course and subject activity across the Institution;
2. approving minor changes to subjects and the subject review schedules;
3. ensuring that comprehensive course and subject reviews are conducted as per the schedule and that the recommendations from the reviews are implemented;
4. recommending course proposal documentation to the Academic Board for accreditation and reaccreditation purposes.

5.5   The Course Development and Advisory Sub-Committee (CDASC) is responsible for:

1. scrutinising and recommending course proposals and comprehensive course review documentation ensuring that they meet the course design and course review requirements, consider recommendations from external reviewers and make recommendations to the CSC; and
2. ensuring course documentation meets standards of rigour and depth appropriate to the level of the award and that the rationale, aims and subject content are consistent with, and reflect best practice;

5.6   The Dean/Associate Dean and Program Managers are responsible for:

1. maintaining academic quality at the course (Dean/Associate Dean) and subject (Program Manager) level by monitoring and reporting course and student performance outcomes and implementing quality assurance processes and continuous improvements to courses;
2. ensuring the timely and systematic evaluation of courses and subjects as per the Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures in collaboration with their course and subject teams;
3. working with the Registrar to develop Teach out and/or Transition Plans; and
4. communicating planned improvements to key stakeholders, including students, teaching teams.

5.7   The lecturers and Subject Leads are responsible for:

1. maintaining academic quality at the subject level by monitoring and reporting subject performance issues to the Program Manager (or course coordinator if applicable) and implementing systematic and timely evaluation of the subjects they teach; and
2. reflect on evaluation data with subject teaching teams involved in the delivery and development of improvement plans.

5.8   The Chief Quality Officer is responsible for the accreditation and reaccreditation submissions to TEQSA.

6. Related documents

Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures

Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures

Course Teach-Out and Transition Procedures

External Referencing Procedures

Learning and Teaching Policy

Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures

Subject Outline Policy

Approved by Academic Board on 17 November 2023 (updated by AB on 23 May 2025)