

Monash University Procedure

Procedure Title	Coursework Course Review Procedures
Parent Policy	Coursework Course and Unit Accreditation Policy
Date Effective	27 February 2017
Review Date	27 February 2020
Procedure Owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
Category	Academic Quality and Standards
Version Number	3.1
Content Enquiries	policy-education@monash.edu
Scope	<p>All coursework courses leading to an award of the University</p> <p>All Monash University non-award enabling programs approved as preparation for entry to a coursework award course.</p> <p>All units of study</p> <p>All campuses and locations</p>
Purpose	To enable the University to fulfil its responsibility for accreditation of units and courses of study required for a degree or other award, as set out in Monash University (Council) Regulations , Part 5, Section 10, Clause 1(e).
PROCEDURE STATEMENT	

CONTENTS

1. [The role of course reviews](#)
2. [Forward planning for course reviews](#)
3. [Self-review team composition and role](#)
4. [Independent Review Panel composition and role](#)
5. [Course review portfolio](#)
6. [Review event](#)
7. [Review Panel report](#)
8. [Faculty response report](#)
9. [Reporting of review outcomes and applying for re-accreditation](#)
10. [Alternative arrangements](#)
11. [Review of courses offered at overseas teaching locations](#)
12. [Annual monitoring](#)

Monash University Procedure

1. The role of course reviews

- 1.1. Course review is a process for evaluating a course with respect to the academic and business aspects of the course, including planning, resourcing, course design, learning and teaching, student outcomes, course demand, management and external engagement.
- 1.2. The [Coursework Course and Unit Accreditation Policy](#) describes course review as an element in the accreditation life-cycle of a course. Re-accreditation is a process through which an existing course is assessed against the criteria set out in the [Coursework Course and Unit Accreditation Policy](#). The outcome of a course review informs Academic Board's decision whether to re-accredit the course and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)'s (or delegate's) decision whether to continue to support the offering of the course. An overview of the relationship of course reviews to accreditation in the course lifecycle is provided in the document, [Monash course accreditation and review lifecycle](#).
- 1.3. In making its decision to reaccredit a course, Academic Board will consider the application for re-accreditation together with advice from Coursework Admissions and Programs Committee (CAPC), informed by the application for re-accreditation, the report of the Review Panel and the faculty's response to the report.
- 1.4. The following terms of reference establish the minimum requirements for a course review investigation.
 1. To consider and advise the University on:
 - a) The strategic alignment of the course(s) with the overall academic profile and priorities of the University and the portfolio of courses offered by the University.
 - b) The business case for the course(s) particularly in relation to market positioning and demand, and the economics of sustaining the course at an appropriate level of quality. Are there any external factors which may challenge the course or its future viability of which the University should be aware?
 - c) The academic standards of the course(s), in particular the appropriateness of entry criteria and levels and learning outcomes in relation to AQF levels (and MQF levels for Malaysia), and to the appropriateness and validity of external benchmarking.
 - d) The academic design of the course(s) across teaching locations including curriculum relevance and currency, course structure, pedagogy, assessment strategies, and related academic support initiatives for students.
 - e) Student outcomes from the course, such as academic success, student satisfaction, graduate employment and employer satisfaction, and with particular reference to equity and diversity in the student profile.
 - f) The academic resources for the course(s) across teaching locations, including information technology; library programs, resources and services; learning spaces; and staffing. Is there sufficient evidence that they are adequate to continue to offer the course(s) at the University's high quality standards?
 - g) The academic governance and management arrangements for the course(s), including Board of Examiners. Is there sufficient evidence that they are appropriate for ensuring successful delivery and oversight of the course?
 2. To advise the University if each course being reviewed is of appropriate quality, standard and viability and if there are any matters that should be addressed or considered by the course, faculty and/or University. This should include explicit commentary on how any relevant double degree courses are working.

Monash University Procedure

2. Forward planning for course reviews

- 2.1. The responsibility for managing the course review resides with the managing faculty. All coursework courses must be reviewed at least every 7 years and within the two years of when an application for reaccreditation will reach Academic Board. Accreditation expiry dates for all coursework courses are recorded in *Courseloop* and can be accessed via the system.
- 2.2. A shorter review/re-accreditation cycle may be employed for strategic or operational reasons, at the request of the Dean. Academic Board or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may also direct the Dean to undertake a course review if either is concerned that academic quality standards are not being met or maintained systematically, or for any other reason. While the cycle may be shortened the scope and content of the review remains the same.
- 2.3. A shorter review/re-accreditation cycle may also be appropriate to accommodate the requirements of:
 - Any offshore campus or overseas teaching locations. Faculties should liaise with any campus, teaching location and partner when planning their review cycle to ensure that their needs are addressed.
 - external accreditation/registration requirements. See section 10, Alternative arrangements.
- 2.4. By 1 August each year, faculties advise the Course Review and Accreditation Program Manager of which courses they expect to review in the following year and when. The Education Programs Office will collate the following year's course review schedule information provided by all faculties and submit the schedule to Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) for information.
- 2.5. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegates) and Chair (or Deputy Chair) of Academic Board will meet with the Dean (or Deputy Dean) of each managing faculty planning one or more course reviews for the following year. This meeting is to discuss the objectives for each review and any issues that may impact on how the reviews are carried out, including the composition of the Review Panel. It is at this meeting that a proposal for an alternative arrangement as described in section 10 should be considered.
- 2.6. Should there be a need to address specific issues not covered by the Terms of Reference in 1.4. above, they may be expanded. Any additions should be discussed at the meeting of the Dean with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Chair of Academic Board, or their delegates. Any additions to the terms of reference should be approved jointly by the Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) prior to the appointment of the Review Panel.
- 2.7. If a faculty is planning to disestablish a course so that the final intake takes place prior to the re-accreditation expiry, the course need not be reviewed.
- 2.8. A course review should include all majors, minors and specialisations within the course, any campus, teaching location, delivery mode or partner, and any double degree courses it is associated with. While the review will pay particular attention to the component of the double degree course directly related to the degree course under review, the double degree course should also be considered holistically. However, when it comes time to apply for re-accreditation, the faculty only applies for re-accreditation of the courses that it manages.
- 2.9. Faculties should consider reviewing cognate groups of courses together wherever practical.
- 2.10. Managing faculties are responsible for managing the course review process throughout, but other faculties teaching into the course must be given an opportunity to be involved in the planning, preparation and delivery of the review event.
- 2.11. See [CR Guidance 1 – Overview and indicative timeline](#) for a typical course review timeline.

Monash University Procedure

3. Self-review team composition and role

- 3.1. The Dean, in consultation with the Associate/Deputy Dean (Education) and the Course Coordinator, will appoint a Self-review team to lead the self-reflection process. The Self-review team must include the current Course Coordinator and at least one senior academic staff member who teaches in the course.
- 3.2. Administrative support for the Self-review team must not be provided by the Executive Officer to the Review Panel.
- 3.3. The Self-review team is responsible for engaging with staff associated with the delivery and management of the course, across all campuses, teaching locations, delivery modes and partners in a process of critical reflection. The Self-review team prepares two elements of the course review portfolio: the Self-review team report and the academic case documents for the current accreditation with updates to reflect current course information. The Self-review report draws upon evidence-based outcomes of the peer review discussions, interpretation of the data-analysis report, benchmarking activities and evaluation of key stakeholder perceptions.
- 3.4. Advice for the Self-review team is provided in the document [CR Guidance 3 - For Self-review team](#).

4. Independent Review Panel composition and role

- 4.1. The managing faculty is responsible for nominating members of the Independent Review Panel, in consultation with relevant Heads and partner faculties, consistent with the principles below.
- 4.2. Panel membership must, at a minimum, consist of:
 - One Chair who has the following attributes:
 - A senior academic; and
 - Relevant experience and expertise including in university management; and
 - Previously served as a member on at least one quality assurance Review Panel within the higher education sector.
 - Two other members who are senior academics with relevant experience.
- 4.3. The selection and appointment of Review Panel members must take into consideration the following attributes:
 - Impartiality/objectivity;
 - Expertise in relevant field(s); and
 - Experience in academic and/or quality assurance leadership.
- 4.4. Normally the Chair would be external to Monash University but if that is not possible or appropriate then the Chair must be external to the faculty and at least one of the other panel members must be external to Monash University.
- 4.5. For courses taught only at Monash Malaysia, the Review Panel must satisfy both Monash University requirements and Malaysian government requirements, see the advice in [CR Guidance 6 - Courses offered in Malaysia](#) with the associated Annexes A to D.
- 4.6. None of the panel members can have been involved in the management or teaching of the course(s) under review, within the current accreditation period.
- 4.7. Faculties can nominate additional panel members if it is deemed that specific knowledge critical to achieving the terms of reference of the review would otherwise be lacking (e.g. industry expertise, complementary discipline expertise where a suite of courses is being reviewed, local/regional expertise where a multi-campus course is being reviewed). Any additional nominations must meet the conditions listed above and follow the approval process detailed in these Procedures. In some cases, an international perspective on the Panel may be desirable.

Monash University Procedure

- 4.8. The Review Panel must be supported by an Executive Officer. The Executive Officer is an appropriately skilled person with knowledge of relevant Monash policy and procedures, nominated by the Faculty Manager (who may take advice from a School Manager on the nominee). The Officer is not a member of the Review Panel, and must not have been involved in the preparation of the Self-review report. See [CR Guidance 2 - For Executive Officer](#) for advice.
- 4.9. The Review Panel membership must be submitted to the Education Programs Office for approval by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) who will make a determination based on the attributes and requirements outlined above and the discussions held with the faculty. If the Review Panel Chair is not external to the University, a justification should accompany the request for approval.
- 4.10. The Review Panel is empowered to consult widely but not to co-opt others to its membership or to modify the terms of reference.
- 4.11. The Review Panel is responsible for reviewing the course(s)' past and present effectiveness, and future directions, in the context of the initial accreditation/last review, current university and faculty strategic plans, and in particular the educational principles of the University and faculty.
- 4.12. The Panel's review report advises Coursework Admissions and Programs Committee, Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) in relation to the standards and quality of the course(s) under review, the availability of resources to support it and its current and future sustainability and opportunities.
- 4.13. See [CR Guidance 4 - For Review Panel](#) for advice for the Review Panel and [CR Guidance 5 - Review Panel formation/approval](#) for invitation and approval templates to assist with forming the Review Panel.

5. Course review portfolio

- 5.1. The course review portfolio is the complete set of documentation about the course provided to the Review Panel prior to the review event. At a minimum, the course review portfolio consists of the following parts:
 - A. the Monash context;
 - B. a data analysis report;
 - C. academic case documents for current accreditation with updates;
 - D. submissions to the review; and
 - E. a self-review team report.
- 5.2. The following additions to the portfolio may be included:
 - The Self-review team may provide additional pre-existing documentation as appropriate.
 - The Review Panel should be invited to request additional information.
 - If the course under review is offered and recognised in a country other than Australia, that has legislative requirements for course reviews that are to be met by the Monash Course Review, the managing faculty must consult with the appropriate unit or person at the teaching location to determine what information needs to be included in the course review portfolio in order to meet those legislative requirements. At Monash Malaysia, the relevant unit to contact for advice is the Quality Assurance and Compliance Unit. For courses offered only at Monash Malaysia or also at Monash Malaysia see the complementary advice in [CR Guidance 6 - Courses offered in Malaysia](#).

Benchmarking

- 5.3. Benchmarking relative to one or more appropriate universities is required for all course reviews and, at a minimum, must address progression, retention, success, completions, assessment methods and

Monash University Procedure

grading of student achievement. Some of these will be addressed in the data analysis report (5.5) but the Self-review team (3.3) is responsible for ensuring completeness and its report should show evidence of critical reflection on the implications of the comparative data for informing course development.

A. Monash context

- 5.4. The Monash context provides a brief high order overview of the University and, where relevant, the campus context, and includes the appropriate University strategic directions document and education plan, and (for undergraduate courses) an overview of the undergraduate course portfolio. It also includes the Terms of Reference for the Course Review. Reference to appropriate source documents is at CR Guidance 14 - [Monash context for course reviews](#).

B. Data analysis report

- 5.5. The data analysis report is produced by the managing faculty independently of the Self-review team. It would be expected to be no more than ten pages for a single course (but up to twenty pages for courses with multiple specialisations or majors that require disaggregation). It objectively analyses and interprets the course's business intelligence data over at least the current accreditation period, includes a comparison with the faculty and university as a whole, and is appropriately benchmarked standards where possible. It provides course viability data, in particular, profitability/financial performance. See [CR Guidance 7 - Data analysis report](#).

C. Academic Case documents for current accreditation with updates

- 5.6. A complete copy of the Academic Case for accreditation, submitted to Academic Board the last time the course(s) was accredited, drawn from *Courseloop*, must be included in the Course Review Portfolio. This includes:

- Academic course information;
- Design compliance;
- Course governance; and
- Implementation plan.

Where the current period of accreditation commenced prior to *Courseloop* in 2016, the accredited version first entered in *Courseloop* should be used.

- 5.7. Where the current period of accreditation commenced prior to *Courseloop* in 2016, all four components of the original Academic Case may not be available. If the Design compliance and Course governance is not complete in *Courseloop*, each should be completed for the current version of the course and provided as part of the updated version of the Academic Case.
- 5.8. If the course has changed since the last accreditation, an updated copy of any of the four components of the current Academic Case that have changed as a result of the course change must also be included in the Course Review Portfolio clearly marked to identify where there are changes.

D. Submissions to the review

- 5.9. The Dean (or delegate) will invite submissions to the Review Panel from members of the university community and any other stakeholders identified by the Dean. The call for submissions is made prior to preparation of the Self-review report. See [CR Guidance 8 - Call for submissions](#).
- 5.10. The call for submissions informs stakeholders that the submission will be available to the Self-review team. A person making a submission to the Review Panel may request that his/her name be removed from the submission when it is shared with the Self-review team.
- 5.11. A separate call for submissions to the Review Panel is sent to current students and recent graduates who should also be informed that the submission will be available to the Self-review team and who

Monash University Procedure

may also request that their names be removed from the submission when it is shared with the Self-review team.

- 5.12. Current students and recent graduates are also invited to apply to be selected to meet with the Review Panel during the review event. It must be made clear that the Panel will determine the interviewees.
- 5.13. While any party within the university community may make written submissions to the course review, the Review Panel will determine with whom they will speak.

E. Self-review team report

- 5.14. The Self-review team produces a Self-review report for inclusion in the course review portfolio, ensuring all terms of reference are considered. The report:
 - provides a focused reflection on the performance of the course(s) since the last accreditation, considered particularly in relation to the Monash graduate attributes and course learning outcomes;
 - does not reproduce the data analysis report provided by the faculty, but rather focusses on the narrative referencing the data analysis report as required to, for example, support arguments or provide needed clarifications;
 - reflects the critical peer review discussions facilitated by the Self-review team and any other feedback available to it;
 - makes reference to any benchmarking activities as appropriate (see 5.3);
 - reflects on the outcome of the opportunities and challenges identified at initial accreditation or during the last review (whichever applies) and, in the latter case, comments on the response to the recommendations of the last review; and
 - reflects on the opportunities and challenges anticipated in the next accreditation period.

See [CR Guidance 9 - Self Review Report](#) for advice on the structure of the Self-review team report.

Distribution

- 5.15. All documentation prepared for the course review portfolio should be shared with the Self-review team, in particular the data analysis report and the received submissions to the Review Panel, so that it may inform their deliberations. However, the Self-review team must not edit any elements of the course review portfolio other than those they are responsible for preparing.
- 5.16. The Executive Officer is responsible for compiling the course review portfolio and sending it to the Review Panel, any key stakeholders identified during the meeting with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) and Chair of Academic Board, and to any other individuals meeting with the Review Panel.
- 5.17. The Review Panel must be given the opportunity to request further relevant information from the University before the review event.

6. Review event

- 6.1. The review event brings the full Review Panel together for an intensive program of interviews with relevant parties, discussions and deliberations in order to fulfil its terms of reference.
- 6.2. The Executive Officer is responsible for drafting an agenda for the review event and sending it to the Chair who will finalise the agenda. See [CR Guidance 10 - Course review event agenda](#) for a typical example.
- 6.3. Where reviews involve teaching activities in more than one campus, or teaching location or with one or more partner organisations, the Chair of the Review Panel will determine, in consultation with the

Monash University Procedure

Dean (or delegate), the need to travel to locations other than the administrative centre of the academic area.

- 6.4. The review event would normally be conducted face-to-face at one or more of the teaching locations, but technology may be utilised to facilitate the presence of one or more panel members or interviewees.
- 6.5. Specific requirements of any campus or teaching locations need to be considered when planning how the review event will be conducted, particularly in relation to any relevant local regulatory requirements. For example, reviews of courses offered at Monash University Malaysia must include a site visit in order to meet Malaysian government requirements. If it is not possible to include a visit to Malaysia for the full membership of the Review Panel, the relevant school in Malaysia may establish a Malaysian Review Panel and hold a local review event. The Malaysian Review Panel may make recommendations to the Review Panel to inform their deliberations of the course overall, but does not substitute for the Review Panel and must not make recommendations directly to the School, Faculty or Campus.
- 6.6. At a minimum the Review Panel must meet with the following groups:
 - the managing faculty's senior officers and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate);
 - student and alumni representatives;
 - industry representatives;
 - the teaching team; and
 - representatives of relevant service areas.
- 6.7. The Review Panel should also have the opportunity to tour relevant facilities if they wish.
- 6.8. At the end of the event the Review Panel must give an oral presentation of their preliminary findings and recommendations to representatives of the faculty and university. At a minimum the Dean (or delegate), the Associate/Deputy Dean (Education) and the Course Coordinator are expected to be present. An invitation must also be extended to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate).

7. Review Panel report

- 7.1. The Review Panel report must address each of the terms of reference in relation to the evidence presented in the course review portfolio and at the review event. See [CR Guidance 11 - Review Panel Report](#) for advice on the structure of the report.
- 7.2. The Executive Officer is responsible for writing a preliminary Review Panel report, for the Chair to review. The preliminary report must be sent to the Chair within two weeks of the review event.
- 7.3. The Chair is responsible for reviewing and refining the report and ensuring that all Panel members agree with the contents of the report or have the opportunity to register a minority view, prior to the report being finalised.
- 7.4. A copy of the draft report must be sent to the Dean (or delegate) when the Chair feels it is a full and accurate reflection of the conclusions of the review. The Dean (or delegate) is responsible for reviewing the report for factual inaccuracies. If any are found they must be reported to the Executive Officer and the Chair within two weeks of receipt.
- 7.5. The Chair must finalise the report with the Executive Officer and send the final report to the Dean (or delegate) no later than eight weeks from the review event.

Monash University Procedure

8. Faculty response report

- 8.1. The Dean, in consultation with the Associate/Deputy Dean (Education) and the Course Coordinator, will review the findings and initiate the preparation of a faculty response report which addresses each of the Panel's recommendations as appropriate. See [CR Guidance 12 - Faculty Response Report](#) for a template which may be used.
- 8.2. Where recommendations are specific to a campus or teaching location, the Dean (or delegate) must consult with the campus or location in the development of the response.
- 8.3. A copy of the faculty response report should be sent to the Review Panel to demonstrate how their recommendations are informing Monash's continual development.
- 8.4. Responsibility for implementing the outcomes of course reviews rests with the Dean (or delegate).

9. Reporting of review outcomes and applying for re-accreditation

- 9.1. The Dean (or delegate) must submit the Review Panel report and the Faculty Response report to the Education Programs Office in sufficient time for the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) to consider whether s/he is able to endorse the case for reaccreditation and to discuss with the Faculty any concerns prior to the reaccreditation application. (Note that there is no requirement to submit further business case documentation, since the Review Panel report and Faculty Response Report would be expected to provide the evidence needed. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) has the option to request additional information.)
- 9.2. Applications for re-accreditation must be submitted in a timely manner so that the re-accreditation process, as outlined in the Coursework Course Accreditation Procedures (section 9), can be completed before the current accreditation period expires. See [CA Guidance 5 – Applying for reaccreditation](#) for further information.
- 9.3. The re-accreditation application would normally be submitted so that it can be considered by Coursework Admissions and Programs Committee within six months of the review event. In the case that the faculty is not ready to submit the re-accreditation application within this time frame, and there is still time remaining in the current accreditation period, the faculty must submit the Review Panel report and the faculty response report to Coursework Admissions and Programs Committee for noting. The re-accreditation application, including the full set of documentation, must follow at a time that allows Academic Board to consider it before the current accreditation period expires. According to the Coursework Course and Unit Accreditation Policy, applications for re-accreditation must be made within two years of the course review.
- 9.4. If the managing faculty determines that it will not be applying for re-accreditation of a course, the faculty must apply before the end of its current accreditation period to have the course disestablished.
- 9.5. To ensure transparency, course review reports and faculty responses will be made available on the University's intranet website.

10. Alternative arrangements

- 10.1. The primary purpose of enabling alternative approaches is to minimise duplication of effort and time, while ensuring that there is a robust process for assuring Academic Board and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) of the quality standards and viability of the course.
- 10.2. If a course is professionally accredited/registered and will have recently had a re-accreditation event that addressed many or all of the terms of reference, as specified in these Procedures, then much of the standard review process may not require repetition.

Monash University Procedure

- 10.3. Any alternative approach to course review must still meet the minimum requirements set out in these Procedures, including its terms of reference, composition of Review Panel and input from stakeholder groups identified in section 6.6.
- 10.4. A faculty wishing to take an alternative approach to a course review must discuss first with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and Chair of Academic Board (or their delegates) in the meeting detailed in 2.5-2.6 above, and then submit a written request to the Education Programs Office. The request must specify what changes to the standard course review process are being proposed, and include a strong pedagogical, strategic and/or operational rationale. (See [CR Guidance 13 - Application for alternative arrangement](#) for a suggested format.)
- 10.5. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) and the Chair of Academic Board, and in discussion with the relevant Deans, will make the decision on any applications for an alternative approach.

11. Review of courses offered at offshore campuses and overseas teaching locations

- 11.1. Where a course is offered in a country other than Australia and is subject to local requirements, the managing faculty must take into account any legislative requirements of that country relating to course reviews, which may include length of review cycle, Review Panel composition and terms of reference, or how the review event is conducted.
- 11.2. In particular, where a course is offered across several campuses one of which is Malaysia, and where the Independent Review Panel is unable to visit Malaysia, a Malaysian Review Panel may be formed consistent with Malaysian regulatory requirements to inform the Independent Review Panel as described in 6.5. Where the course is only offered in Malaysia, the Independent Review Panel should be formed to be compliant with 4.1-4.5 with any additional membership as required.

12. Annual monitoring

Annual Course Health Check

- 12.1. The Education Programs Office will ensure faculties are provided annually with key management information metrics over recent years for each course in the undergraduate portfolio in the form of a bespoke BI Health Check report including at least enrolment and load data, student retention, success and progress, completion rates and equity indicators for each course or double degree course (including vertical doubles) and, where available, its associated majors, minors and specialisations. Faculties will be informed when the reports have been updated each year, typically in April. See [AHC Guidance 1 - Using the BI Annual Health Check report](#).
- 12.2. The Graduate Education Office will provide faculties annually with a brief summary of graduate courses' performance data over recent years.
- 12.3. Associate /Deputy Deans (Education) are expected to review the information annually when the data becomes available to ensure that all courses in the Faculty's course portfolio, across all campuses and teaching locations, are performing according to expectations and to identify areas for further investigation and improvement. See [AHC Guidance 2 - Annual Health Check process](#).
- 12.4. Where a course is not performing as anticipated, the Dean or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may decide to investigate further.

Reflection Event

- 12.5. Each year the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) will host an event to reflect on the process and outcomes of course reviews held in the previous year and what lessons could be learnt by the University and the courses to be reviewed in the coming year.

Monash University Procedure

- 12.6. Following the annual reflection event the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) will prepare a report for Coursework Admissions and Programs Committee and Academic Board summarising the key outcomes from the past year's reviews and highlighting any common themes for consideration and discussion.

Responsibility for implementation	Deans (or delegates) Academic Board CAPC Vice-Provost (Learning and Teaching) Vice-Provost (Graduate Education) Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) Pro-Vice Chancellor Monash Malaysia
Status	Revised
Approval Body	Name: Academic Board Meeting: 1/17 Date: 27 Feb 2017 Agenda item: 12.4
Definitions	<p>Academic Course Information: The academic information about a course including the Handbook description (including course overview, learning outcomes, course structure, specialisations, major and minors, course requirements, awards, professional accreditation), the eligibility requirements for admission, designed pathways, and AHEGS statement.</p> <p>Accreditation: The University's process for course approval using criteria established by Academic Board to ensure courses meet academic standards. External Accreditation or Professional Accreditation is the evaluation of a course or qualification undertaken by a body external to the University and aimed at gaining recognition in an industry or profession or by a government agency.</p> <p>AQF Levels: Indicate the relative complexity and/or depth of achievement and the autonomy required to demonstrate that achievement. AQF Level 1 has the lowest complexity and AQF Level 10 has the highest complexity. (AQF definition)</p> <p>Double Degree Course: An approved course of study which leads to two awards.</p> <p>Executive Officer: For the purposes of these Procedures, Executive Officer means the person who supports the Review Panel.</p> <p>Graduate Attributes: Transferable, non-discipline specific skills a graduate may achieve through learning that have application in study, work and life contexts. See also Monash Graduate Attributes.</p> <p>Learning Outcomes: The expression of the set of knowledge, skills and the application of the knowledge and skills a person has acquired and is able to demonstrate as a result of learning. (AQF definition)</p> <p>Managing Faculty: The faculty that is assigned responsibility to coordinate</p>

Monash University Procedure

	<p>administrative matters for each single or double degree course (including but not restricted to admission, enrolment, course advice, academic progress and academic referral). Only one faculty can manage a course/enrolment; for example the Bachelor of Laws (Honours)/Bachelor of Arts has the managing faculty of Law.</p> <p>Re-accreditation: The University's process for reviewing the accreditation of existing courses.</p> <p>Teaching Location: For the purposes of these Procedures, Teaching Location means a locale where a course is delivered. A course can have several teaching locations and include both Australian and offshore locations.</p>
Legislation Mandating Compliance	
Related Policies	
Related Documents	<p><u>Guidance documents</u></p> <p>The following sources of advice available at the Coursework Accreditation and Review Management (CARM) website provide a course review process map with an indicative timeline, specific guidance to key participants in course reviews, and guidance and exemplars for key course review documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monash course accreditation and review lifecycle • CR Guidance 1 - Overview and indicative timeline • CR Guidance 2 - For Executive Officer • CR Guidance 3 - For Self-review team (with advice on possible questions and data sources) • CR Guidance 4 - For Review Panel • CR Guidance 5 - Review Panel formation/approval • CR Guidance 6 - Courses offered in Malaysia • CR Guidance 7 - Data analysis report • CR Guidance 8 - Call for submissions • CR Guidance 9 - Self Review Report • CR Guidance 10 - Course review event agenda • CR Guidance 11 - Review Panel report • CR Guidance 12 - Faculty Response Report • CR Guidance 13 - Application for alternative arrangement • CR Guidance 14 - Monash context for course review • CA Guidance 5 – Applying for reaccreditation • Annex A: Malaysian Government's Criteria and Standards for Programme Accreditation and Review • Annex B: Monash Malaysia's template for the Malaysian Self-Review Report • Annex C: Monash Malaysia's requirements for the Review Panel • Annex D: Monash Malaysia's requirements for the Review Report • AHC Guidance 1 - Using the BI Annual Health Check report • AHC Guidance 2 - Annual Health Check process