

ELICOS and Foundation Program Development, Review and Approval Procedures

1. Governing policy

The ELICOS and Foundation Program Development, Review and Approval Procedures give effect to the Non-award Courses Policy by establishing clear and proportionate processes for the development, review, approval and continuous improvement of ELICOS and Foundation programs. Program development and review must be evidence-based, proportionate, aligned to regulatory requirements and designed to support student progression, achievement and transition to further study. These procedures provide a simpler and more fit-for-purpose approach than the higher education course accreditation and reaccreditation procedures, while maintaining appropriate academic governance, regulatory alignment and external scrutiny.

Programs are developed, reviewed and approved with reference to the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000, National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code), ELICOS Standards 2018, Foundation Program Standards, where applicable, TEQSA requirements for CRICOS registration and Foundation Program approval, NEAS Quality Assurance Framework and relevant pathway partner requirements.

2. Scope

These procedures apply to the development review and approval of curriculum, assessment, delivery and pathway arrangements for ELICOS and Foundation programs. They do not apply to higher education award courses (refer to the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures) or other non-award courses (e.g. Study Abroad and the Postgraduate Qualifying Program).

3. Monitoring and review cycle

Review activity	Frequency	Purpose
-----------------	-----------	---------

Ongoing monitoring	Each teaching period combined in End-of-trimester reports	Identify immediate issues in delivery, subject-level performance, student progress, assessment, staffing resources and student experience
Subject review	In accordance with the Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures and the Course and Subject Review Plan	Review subject-level curriculum, assessment, delivery, learning outcomes and identify improvements for end-of-trimester monitoring, program review and continuous improvement
Periodic external program review	At least once within each CRICOS seven-year re-registration cycle, or earlier if required by monitoring, risk, regulatory change, NEAS findings or proposed major change	Confirm continued compliance with the applicable ELICOS Standards or Foundation Program Standards and relevant TEQSA/CRICOS requirements, using current, relevant and mapped evidence
Regulatory review	CRICOS seven-year re-registration cycle	Provide current, relevant evidence for the TEQSA self-assurance report, CRICOS re-registration, compliance monitoring and continuous improvement

4. New program development and approval

The following process applies to the development and approval of a new ELICOS or Foundation Program. Documentation must show how the proposed curriculum, assessment and delivery arrangements support student achievement, progression and transition to further study.

Step 1: Business case

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs prepares a brief evidence-based business case addressing strategic alignment, student demand, pathway need, competitor benchmarking, staffing, facilities, resources, financial viability, risks and regulatory requirements.

Step 2: Approval to proceed

The business case is considered by the Executive Management Group (EMG). Board of Directors (BOD) approval is required where there are material financial, strategic, infrastructure or regulatory implications.

Step 3: Program development

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs prepares documentation using the non-award course proposal template, including rationale, learning outcomes, curriculum structure, entry requirements, progression requirements, assessment approach, delivery arrangements, staffing, resources and quality assurance arrangements.

Step 4: External advice

At least one appropriately qualified external reviewer or pathway partner is engaged to review the proposal.

For Foundation Programs, reviewer input should consider curriculum comparability, preparation for higher education study and alignment with the Foundation Program Standards. For ELICOS, reviewer input should consider language outcomes, assessment, pathway entry arrangements and alignment with the ELICOS Standards 2018. External reviewer input may be obtained through direct review and/or through evidence from relevant NEAS approval processes, where this evidence can be mapped to the applicable ELICOS or Foundation Program Standards.

Step 5: Internal review

The DVC (Learning and Teaching), Dean (Academic) and Chief Quality Officer review the proposal and external feedback. The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs updates the documentation and prepares an implementation plan.

Step 6: Governance approval

The Course and Subject Committee (CSC) recommends the proposal to Academic Board (AB). AB approves the academic components and recommends BOD approval where required.

Step 7: Regulatory approval/CRICOS

The Quality Assurance and Accreditation team coordinates TEQSA/CRICOS applications, notifications or approvals before the program is marketed or delivered, where required.

Step 8: Implementation and post-implementation monitoring

Delivery is monitored through end-of-trimester reporting, with a summary of early implementation issues, actions and outcomes reported through the governance framework after the first year of delivery.

5. Existing program monitoring and review

The following process applies to the monitoring and review of existing ELICOS and Foundation Programs. It combines routine end-of-trimester monitoring, subject-level review, Periodic Program Review (PPR), self-assurance reporting and proportionate external review.

Step 1: End-of-trimester monitoring, action tracking and escalation

At the end of each teaching period, the Head of English Language and Foundation Programs prepares a data-informed end-of-trimester monitoring report. The report considers, as relevant, enrolments, retention, progression, completion, attendance, subject-level curriculum and delivery issues, student achievement, assessment outcomes, moderation findings, student feedback, complaints and appeals, support trends, pathway entry and transition issues, staffing, professional development, teaching observations, resource adequacy, assessment security, stakeholder feedback, compliance matters and progress against prior actions. Where issues or improvement opportunities are identified, the report must include actions, owners, due dates and priority. Reports are considered by the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) and AB.

Step 2: Subject-level review

Subjects are reviewed in accordance with the Subject Development, Review and Approval Procedures and the timelines outlined in the Course and Subject Review Plan.

Step 3: Periodic external program review and benchmarking

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs schedules a periodic external program review at least once within each CRICOS re-registration cycle, and normally within three years of the relevant CRICOS expiry date so the evidence remains current. Earlier review may be required due to monitoring outcomes, risk, regulatory change, NEAS findings or a proposed major change. The review confirms continued compliance with the applicable

program standards and relevant TEQSA/CRICOS requirements. NEAS quality assurance activity may satisfy the external review requirement for ELICOS and Foundation Programs where the evidence is independent, current, relevant and mapped to applicable standards. Evidence may include:

- current NEAS reports, finding and action plans mapped to the applicable standards;
- input from an independent reviewer, pathway partner, sector benchmark or discipline expert, where required; and
- appropriately qualified reviewers where external reviewer input is used.

Additional external review or benchmarking is arranged where NEAS or other available evidence is not current, does not cover the full review scope, or identifies unresolved risks.

Step 4: Implementation plan

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs prepares an implementation plan documenting external reviewer recommendations, the Institution's response and agreed actions.

Step 5: TEQSA Self-assurance reports

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs prepares separate TEQSA-aligned self-assurance reports for the ELICOS program and the Foundation Program. Each report:

- demonstrates how the governing body assures itself that the program meets, and will continue to meet, the ESOS Act, National Code, applicable ELICOS Standards or Foundation Program Standards, and relevant TEQSA/CRICOS requirements;
- confirms the program remains current, appropriately resourced and effective in supporting student progression and pathway outcomes;
- is evidence-based and cross-referenced to an index of supporting evidence; and
- identifies key risks, controls, strengths, evidence or compliance gaps,

completed and planned actions and measures for monitoring effectiveness.

Where the periodic review is undertaken in preparation for, or alongside, CRICOS re-registration, the Head of English Language and Foundation Programs works with the Quality Assurance and Accreditation (QAA) team to ensure the self-assurance report and supporting evidence address TEQSA/CRICOS requirements and are submitted to TEQSA as part of the CRICOS re-registration process.

Step 6: Governance approval

The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs submits the updated self-assurance report and implementation plan to the CSC and AB for approval. BOD approval is required where the recommendation has material strategic or financial implications. The Head of English Language and Foundation Programs ensures approved actions are assigned to responsible owners, monitored by the CSC and escalated where unresolved risks, delays or regulatory matters require further oversight.

6. Changes to programs

Changes to ELICOS and Foundation Programs are classified as Minor, Major or Regular in accordance with Appendix A of the Course Development, Review and Approval Procedures. The classification determines the approval pathway and whether regulatory notification or approval may be required. Major changes must be approved before implementation and must not be marketed or delivered until TEQSA/CRICOS requirements have been confirmed and completed where required.

7. Related documents

Course and Subject Policy

Course Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures

Non-award Course Policy

Subject development, Review and Approval Procedures

Subject Outline Policy

Course Teach-out and Transition Procedures

8. Version history

Summary of changes	Approved by	Date approved
New	CSC	21 July 2026