



Course Development and Review Policy

1. Purpose

The policy sets out

- the framework for course development and approval within KOI and
- the monitoring activities adopted for course review within KOI
- the procedures for making major changes or discontinuing a course which has been offered by KOI

to assure the quality of the student experience.

In addition, KOI courses are subject to periodic re-accreditation by TEQSA and periodic professional accreditation by the relevant professional bodies.

2. Principles of course development

The vision of King's Own Institute (KOI) is to enable our graduates with a global outlook to make a valuable contribution to society. The mission is to be a prominent higher education provider with a strong commitment to excellence and learning support for students.

KOI's core values are innovation, collaboration, integrity, empathy and respect.

KOI's graduates will have current, comprehensive and coherent knowledge and the skills for critical thinking, communication, research and information literacy, creative problem-solving, ethical and cultural sensitivity, leadership, teamwork and lifelong learning.

To ensure that the courses are aligned with KOI's values, meet the needs of the labour market for quality higher education and prepare graduates for professional careers in the Australian and global communities, proposals for course development are tested against the following principles:

- The course is in a relevant professional discipline where there is demand for quality graduates
- The course has an international curriculum addressing global issues in the discipline
- The course is based on current knowledge and research as well as effective teaching approaches
- The course delivers KOI's graduate attributes at the level required by the Australian Qualifications Framework
- The course meets the accreditation standards, is benchmarked against comparable courses in the higher education sector and is sustainable within available resources.

Course proposals are approved by the Academic Board. The recommendation for a new course or a major course development is referred, along with the business case, to the Council to approve the allocation of resources.

The following details and evidence are typically required to support a course proposal:

- Rationale, context and general aims of the course in relation to the mission of KOI
- Course content positioned in the relevant disciplines to address currency and engagement with advanced knowledge and enquiry
- Expected learning outcomes and graduate destinations
- Course rules and structure of the course, showing core and elective subjects and prerequisites
- Detailed description of the subjects making up the course, including the content, learning outcomes and assessment approaches
- Justification of the teaching and assessment strategies, including the learning support that will be available for students, to show how the learning outcomes will be achieved
- Assessment of the market, competition and competitive edge
- Critique of professional relevance and demand and endorsement from relevant industry groups and professional bodies



- Assessment by experienced academic experts in the relevant areas to assure international standards are met, research base is current, teaching approaches and assessment are appropriate to the goals and desired outcomes, and standards are comparable to selected benchmarks in the higher education sector.

Core subjects are required for completion of the course. Elective subjects allow student choice. General electives in all undergraduate (respectively, postgraduate) courses can be freely chosen from all undergraduate (respectively, postgraduate) subjects offered by KOI for which the student meets the prerequisites. Discipline-based electives may be specified for which students can choose from a specified pool of subjects.

3. Quality of the student experience

This section describes the survey tools and data collected on teaching and learning and the steps taken to monitor and enhance course quality as part of the course review process.

The quality of the whole student experience determines the success of a course. In addition, many of the desired graduate outcomes accumulate from the overall course experience. For these reasons, the review process targets the whole course experience as well as the teaching and learning in each subject.

3.1 Review of subjects at the end of trimester

The Academic Board reviews the learning outcomes in all subjects taught after each trimester. The review examines the following areas.

- **Grading.** The Board of Examiners sets benchmarks for the distribution of grades and the student progress rate (subjects passed/subjects attempted). Grades in each subject are reviewed against the pattern of grades in the last 3 years of the subject (where available) and the pattern of grades across all subjects taught in the trimester.
- **Student feedback on teaching.** Student feedback on the teaching of subjects is collected and provided to academic staff for ongoing improvement. A summary of overall ratings, good aspects and areas in need of improvement is presented to the Academic Board.
- **Feedback from academic staff.** Academic staff identify areas for improvement in the teaching of their subjects in response to the student feedback and their own experience.
- **Internal moderation.** In addition, subject outlines, assessment tasks, exams and samples of student work are moderated by peers in the discipline to confirm that assessment tasks align with the learning outcomes and to check that marks and feedback to students are appropriate. Each subject is moderated once a year.

Action from the review. The Subject Coordinators use the feedback on their subjects in preparing variations for the next trimester (see the Subject Outline Policy). The Heads of Program report on the moderation to the Board of Examiners (see the Assessment and Assessment Appeals Policy) (i.e., such information is typically presented in the Examiners' Reports for Board of Examiners).

Changes to a subject as a result of student feedback and feedback from academic staff as well as information from other sources are recorded in the Head of Program (HOP) reports submitted to respective Course Advisory Committees (CACs) and/or in the subject outlines (where appropriate).

Consolidated reports for each program and revised subject outlines are presented to the relevant Course Advisory Committees for review and validation.

The Academic Board also considers the Trimester Report on student outcomes and the report from the Board of Examiners and may take further action to address perceived problems.



3.2 Review of courses after each year

KOI participates in the national Quality Indicators of Learning and Teaching (QILT) Student Experience Survey and Graduate Outcomes Survey (see <https://www.qilt.edu.au>). KOI may supplement these surveys with its own internal student and graduate experience surveys

The Academic Board undertakes an annual review of data on student progression and the course experience. The review examines the following areas.

- **Enrolments.** Enrolment numbers and trends, qualifications (academic and English proficiency)
- **Retention, progression and completion.** The Academic Board sets benchmarks for the retention, progression and completion for each course and considers the performance of significant cohorts of students in the large courses.
- **Student feedback on course experience** Student learning depends on the whole student experience and not just on the quality of the teachers. Student feedback on their overall course experience is collected each year to assess students' satisfaction in such perspectives as:
 - organisation and flexibility of their programs
 - enthusiasm and expertise of their teachers
 - relevance of assessment tasks
 - connections and balance between theory and practice
 - level of challenge
 - appropriateness of workload
 - opportunities for exploring topics in depth
 - development of graduate attributes and professional skills
 - availability and consistency of academic advice
 - timing and usefulness of feedback
 - time spent on study activities of various types outside the classroom
 - value of group work
 - quality of the physical environment for teaching and learning
 - awareness, use and satisfaction with teaching resources, learning support, services and facilities

Student information is analysed for relevant cohorts such as home country, basis of admission, level of advanced standing and conditional status.

The Trimester Report on student outcomes should include comparative results for the last three trimesters (when possible). The outcomes are benchmarked where possible against national data such as the Student Statistics published by the Department of Education and the QILT national student and graduate surveys. A summary of overall ratings, good aspects and areas in need of improvement is presented to the Academic Board and its committees.

Action from the review: The Heads of Program prepare an analysis of the results for their course to identify good performance and areas for improvement, and such analysis will be typically part of Head of Program report. The Head of Program report will cover course resourcing and action taken and planned as a result of student data and feedback, course and subject reviews and input from the relevant Course Advisory Committee.

The Vice-President (Academic) presents the reports to Learning and Teaching Committee and then the Academic Board. The Learning and Teaching Committee and the Academic Board may recommend further action to address perceived deficiencies.

3.3. Periodic course review

As part of the regular review of institutional performance, all courses are reviewed by the Academic Board every five years. The timing of these reviews will be adjusted to fit the external accreditation cycles by TEQSA and professional bodies (where relevant) to fulfil the requirements for course review and interim monitoring in the Higher Education Standards.

The information collected on subjects and courses each year is supplemented by the following reports (when



possible).

- **Longitudinal surveys of graduate destinations:** The QILT Graduate Outcomes Survey – Longitudinal measures graduate employment three years after graduation. The national survey supplements the information obtained by KOI through its graduates. As part of alumni tracking, a short survey will be completed by graduates within 6 months after completion of their courses to provide information on graduates in full time employment (including industry, occupation and salary level) and full time study (including level and field). The results can be compared to national data from the Graduate Outcomes Survey.
- **Employer surveys:** As part of industry engagement, a survey of selected employers aiming to assess employer perceptions of the key capabilities of graduates and to track developments in the professions will be conducted every five years. The survey supplements the information the QILT Employer Survey and from employers participating in industry projects with KOI.
 - The Key Graduate Attributes relate to eight fundamental employability skills
 - communication
 - teamwork,
 - problem solving,
 - self-management
 - planning and organising
 - technology
 - life-long learning
 - initiative and enterprise.
- **Rolling external moderation of subjects:** A sample of papers in selected subjects, chosen on a rolling cycle to cover all areas of study every five years, is re-examined by an external academic expert. The review is designed to check that standards of assessment and marking are referenced to those in the Australian higher education sector and to solicit comments on innovative features of the course design.
- **KOI's course reaccreditation process:** The review is designed to confirm that the program is delivering quality outcomes and meeting the needs identified at the time of its approval. The Vice-President (Academic) in consultation with the Head of Program prepares a report for the external reviewer addressing:
 - The contribution of the course to the strategic directions of the KOI
 - The rationale for the course, its success in the market, competition from other courses and providers, and relationships with other KOI courses
 - Any major changes and developments which are envisaged relating to curriculum, teaching and assessment and modes of offering
 - The achievement of the aims and objectives as set out in the original proposal or the previous review
 - Achievement of learning outcomes, student performance and progression
 - Indicative intakes for the next three years
 - Adequacy and sustainability of resources and indicative budget for the next three years
 - Comments from internal and external stakeholders, including student and graduate satisfaction, input from the Course Advisory Committee and relevant stakeholders.
 - External reviews and action taken to address any recommendations (where relevant)

Action from the review: The Vice-President (Academic) in collaboration with the relevant Head of Program prepares a course report based on the information outlined above. The Academic Board approves one or more external experts on the recommendation of the Vice-President (Academic) to examine the course and prepare a report on its compliance with the accreditation standards in the Higher Education Standards Framework and, in particular, to assure international goals are met, research base is current, teaching approaches are appropriate to the goals, and standards are comparable to those in the university sector.

¹ Department of Education, Science and Technology (2002), "Employability Skills for the Future".



The Vice-President (Academic) in collaboration with relevant Head of Program presents the course report, the external expert report(s) and a response to the external expert report(s) to the relevant Course Advisory Committee and then to Academic Board. The Academic Board may approve the continuation of the course, set conditions, or seek further advice. Where the recommendation involves significant resources, or termination of the course, the recommendation is referred, along with the relevant business case, to the Council to consider the allocation of resources. The records from the course review will form part of the evidence submitted to TEQSA for the next re-accreditation of the course.

4. Major change to a course and discontinuation of a course

This section describes the procedures for making major changes to a course and for discontinuing a course. If a major change is approved under these procedures, a submission is made to TEQSA either notifying a material change or seeking accreditation of a new course.

Major changes to a course are treated as a new course for the approval of the components being changed. A major change is one which makes a significant change to one or more of the course learning outcomes, AQF level, duration, field of study, professional accreditation, mode of delivery, or affects more than half of the core subjects.

Major change proposals must explain the rationale for the change, assess the risks of changing and not changing and assess the resource implications of the proposed change, including the continued financial viability of the changed course. The relevant Course Advisory Committee considers the academic quality of the proposal and forwards its recommendations to the Academic Board.

The proposal must also detail the transition arrangements for continuing students for consideration by the Academic Board and provide assurance of adequate resources to facilitate an orderly teach-out for students enrolled in a course which is the subject of a major change.

Proposals for discontinuation of a course or specialisation (and the stages leading to discontinuation) must take into account the students currently enrolled in the program and must specify arrangements for them to transfer to a new course or complete the existing course or specialisation including the time-frame for completion. The proposal must provide details of proposed transitional arrangements and resources for consideration by the Academic Board.

The intake for a course may be suspended for up to two years. The proposal for suspension should provide the rationale for suspension, the arrangements to accommodate students currently enrolled in the course or an approved pathway to that completion as well as the effect on other courses, for the consideration of the Academic Board. A course will usually be retired at the end of the period of suspension. If the suspension is to be lifted, advice should be provided to the Academic Board at least six months before the planned intake.

Document control

Policy title	Course Development and Review Policy
Policy owner	Vice-President (Academic)
Policy approver	Council on the recommendation of the Academic Board
Version / Date	13 February 2025
Approved	Academic Board 24 February 2023, Council 17 March 2023; Academic Board 7 February 2025
Date of next review	13 February 2027
Changes in this version	Updated various parts of Section 3 with better explanation and new information Including adding Learning and Teaching Committee in suitable places.

***** END OF POLICY *****