

COURSE EVALUATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURE

PURPOSE

This document sets out the procedure by which CG Spectrum Institute (CGSI) values and reviews its accredited higher education courses in an ongoing quality assurance cycle in order to ensure:

- the currency of curriculum design, delivery, teaching and learning, assessment and the effectiveness of Work-Integrated Learning experiences; and
- that CGSI's qualifications continue to meet the standards for the AQF level they purport to meet.

SCOPE

This procedure applies to the evaluation and review of all CGSI's higher education courses.

DEFINITIONS

Course Proposal means the document that specifies course requirements within the format specified by the Academic Board.

The **CEO** means the senior academic staff member who is responsible to the Academic Board for delivering excellence in teaching and learning and for fostering a culture of scholarship and external engagement with academics and other higher education institutions.

The **Course Co-ordinator** means the academic staff member, designated by the CEO, responsible for the management, conduct, teaching and assessment of courses.

RESPONSIBILITIES

The Academic Board is delegated responsibility by the Board of Directors for the academic governance and leadership of CGSI. The Academic Board oversees the evaluation and review of CGSI's higher education courses. This includes consideration of CGSI courses in relation to:

- similar courses offered by other higher education providers;
- contemporary research in the discipline;
- innovation in course design and teaching and learning.

The **Teaching and Learning Committee** is responsible for the *Teaching and Learning Plan*. In addition, the Committee compiles an annual review report for the Academic Board, which evaluates CGSI's performance against key performance indicators in the *Teaching and Learning Plan*, and presents findings and recommendations of course and subject reviews.

The **Course Advisory Committee** is responsible for overseeing, reviewing and revising CGSI's accredited courses and subjects. The Committee is responsible for ensuring that:

- courses and subjects are suited to the intended student cohort and achieve the intended learning outcomes;

- the course structure and sequencing continue to provide a coherent learning experience for students.
- review the work-integrated learning activities

The **CEO** is responsible for the implementation of this procedure.

The implementation of any changes to course content and/or structure resulting from the following review and evaluation processes are the responsibility of the **Academic Director** and the **Course Co-ordinator**.

PROCEDURE

This Course Evaluation and Review Procedure is implemented according to CGSI's course review cycle, as outlined in the *Course Evaluation and Review Policy*.

1. End of Semester/Trimester Course / Subject Performance Review

1.1 End of Semester/Trimester Review of Student Performance

The performance of the student cohort in each unit of study is collated by the Course Co-ordinator. The data is analysed against the *Teaching and Learning Plan* key performance indicators. This information is summarised into a report and forwarded to the Teaching and Learning Committee for review and development of recommendations for Academic Board.

1.2 Student Experience Questionnaires

CGSI collects student feedback on courses, subjects and teaching using standardised survey questionnaires at the end of each session. Specific questions relate to subject delivery and assessment arrangements, and the effectiveness and benefits of Work-Integrated Learning activities. The data is collated into a report by the Academic Director for consideration and analysis by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

1.3 Student Feedback

Students are able to provide feedback at any time via anonymous Feedback Forms on the website. The forms are analysed by the Academic Director at the end of each session. Student feedback is discussed at the Faculty Committee and improvement actions are planned and documented.

2. Annual Reviews and Evaluation of the Courses by the Subjects

2.1 Teaching and Learning Review

The Academic Board delegates to the Teaching and Learning Committee the implementation of annual feedback mechanisms to assess the content, learning and assessment methodologies, quality and adequacy of information provided to students and teachers, and resources, for each subject.

The review takes into account the clarity of purpose of each subject within accredited courses, as well as grade distributions and student progression. In addition, the Course Co-ordinator reflects on and analyses feedback about subjects, with a view to improving the quality of curriculum and student satisfaction.

Subjects are evaluated according to the following procedure:

- collation of student and teacher feedback on each subject by the Course Co-ordinator;
- generation of subject-specific reports based on analysis of feedback data, compiled by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

Course monitoring data, which assesses each course's performance against a standard set of higher education indicators, is also provided by the Academic Director and the Course Co-ordinator annually.

The Teaching and Learning Committee's conclusions and recommendations as a result of these reviews are incorporated into an annual Teaching and Learning Report, submitted to the Academic Board for its consideration.

2.2 *Academic Teaching Staff Feedback*

Academic teaching staff members are provided with opportunities for evaluation of the teaching and learning environment through an annual meeting chaired by the CEO and convened specifically for this purpose

2.3 *Graduate Surveys*

An annual survey of CGSI graduates is conducted by the Academic Director who compiles the data into an annual report for the Teaching and Learning Committee.

3. **Benchmarking Review** (every three years)

Every three (3) years, the Teaching and Learning Committee conducts a Benchmarking Review in accordance with the *Benchmarking Policy and Procedure*, and reports its findings to the Academic Board.

4. **Full Review of Courses and by subjects** (every four (4) years)

The Academic Board initiates and oversees a full review and evaluation of CGSI courses and by subjects every four (4) years (following implementation). This task is delegated to the Course Advisory Committee.

4.1 Focus of review

The course review processes will focus on the following elements:

- review of course aims, structure, subjects, learning outcomes, assessment activities, weightings and rubrics, resources, study modes and delivery methods, with reference to the AQF level for the course;
- adequacy, currency, and appropriateness of assessment practices and criteria;
- whether the outcomes of Work-Integrated Learning activities as specified in course and subjects learning outcomes are being achieved by students in relation to host organisations placements;
- accountability for the conduct and delivery of the course;
- quality of student and academic staff support services;
- role of the course within CGSI's educational profile and its on-going contribution to the mission and objectives;
- the impact of similar courses offered by competitor institutions on viability and sustainability;
- data, analysis and commentary about the course from previous reviews and Teaching and Learning Reports (refer to *Governance, Accountability and Delegation Policy*).

- the systematic collection and analysis of data relating to graduate employability, feedback from professional bodies and peer review processes.

5. Course Review Guidelines

5.1 The Course Advisory Committee acts as the Steering Committee for the Course Review, to be conducted by a Project Team led by the Academic Director, comprising members drawn from the Committee, CGSI academic staff and external academics or consultants with expertise in the discipline.

5.2 Reviewers are to begin the evaluation process by considering the following:

- What are the intended outcomes of the course?
- How do course outcomes relate to external benchmarking standards, the AQF, the Higher Education Standards Framework, and professional and industry body requirements?
- How do the subjects contribute to the overall aim of the course?

5.3 Reviewers are to review the information available to students and academic teaching staff. They should consider how subject information is used to promote understanding about the subject learning outcomes and other strategies used to communicate information. For example:

- How are the intended learning outcomes for each subject and constituent parts (e.g.; assessment methodology) communicated to students and academic teaching staff?
- Do students understand what is expected of them?

5.4 Reviewers are to evaluate how assessment tasks enable student achievement of the subject learning outcomes to be demonstrated and objectively assessed. For example:

- Are there marking criteria that enable assessors to distinguish between different categories of achievement?
- Are procedures for the security and integrity of the assessment sufficiently robust?
- Does the assessment methodology have an adequate formative function?
- Are assessment tasks aligned with the subject and course learning outcomes and CGSI's graduate attributes?
- Do Work-Integrated Learning activities achieve the stated learning outcomes?

5.5 In the final report, reviewers are to provide a critical evaluation of the course and subjects, supported by documentation of evidence. Reviewers are to address the following questions:

- Does the design and content of the course encourage achievement of the intended learning outcomes in terms of: knowledge and understanding, cognitive skills, subject-specific skills (including practical/professional skills), transferable skills, progression to employment and/or further study, and personal development?
- Is there documentation that demonstrates how course content and design is informed by recent developments in teaching and learning pedagogy, by current research and scholarship, and by any changes in relevant occupational, disciplinary and professional requirements?

5.6 The final report will include recommendations arising from the review process for the Academic Board's consideration and endorsement.

5.7 The Academic Board's recommendations will be implemented by the CEO, who will report progress back to the Board at subsequent meetings.

RELATED

Course Evaluation and Review Policy

Quality Assurance Framework

Quality Assurance Procedure

Course Design Development and Approval Policy

Course Design Development and Approval Procedure

Benchmarking Policy

Benchmarking Procedure

Teaching and Learning Plan

Work-Integrated Learning Policy

Version Control

Document:	Course Evaluation and Review Procedure	
Approved by:	Academic Board	Date: 24 February 2020
Version: V3.0	Replaces Version: V2.1	Next Review: 2023
V2.1	Amendments and logo added	