
COURSE EVALUATION AND REVIEW PROCEDURE

1.0 Purpose

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

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

2.0 Scope

This policy applies to the evaluation and review of all CGSI courses.

3.0 Definitions

The **Dean Learning and Teaching** means the senior academic staff member who is responsible to the Academic Board for delivering excellence in learning and teaching and for fostering a culture of scholarship.

The **Course Director** means the academic staff member, designated by the **Academic Director**, responsible for the management, conduct, teaching and assessment of courses.

4.0 Responsibilities

The **Academic Board** is delegated responsibility by the Board of Directors for the academic governance and leadership of CGSI.

The **Learning and Teaching Committee** under the auspices of the Academic Board oversees the evaluation and review of CGSI 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; and
- ongoing student feedback.

The **Course Advisory Committee** is responsible for providing advice in relation to CGSI's accredited courses and subjects. The committee is made up of core members and discipline-specific members who are called upon for their specific expertise as required. The Course Advisory Committee ensures that:

- courses and subjects are suited to the intended student cohort and achieve the intended learning outcomes; and
- course structures and sequencing continue to provide coherent and contemporary learning experiences for students.

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/Dean Learning and Teaching** in conjunction with the **Course Director**.

5.0 Procedure

This Course Evaluation and Review Procedure is implemented as outlined in the *Course Evaluation and Review Policy*.

5.1 End of Trimester Subject Performance Review

5.1.1 End of Trimester Review of Student Performance

The performance of the student cohort in each trimester is collated by the Course Director. This information is summarised into a report and forwarded to the Assessment Committee for review and development, then tabled at the Learning and Teaching Committee for recommendations, before it is forwarded to the Academic Board for approval.

5.1.2 Student Experience Questionnaires

CGSI collects student feedback on subjects and teaching using standardised survey questionnaires at the end of each trimester. The data is collated into a report by the Dean Learning and Teaching for consideration and analysis by the Assessment Committee, before being forwarded to the Learning and Teaching Committee. A summary of the outcomes of these questionnaires is included in the annual Learning and Teaching Report which is compiled by the Dean Learning and Teaching.

5.1.3 Informal/ Additional Student Feedback

Students are able to provide feedback at any time via a range of channels, including email, SLACK, telephone etc. This feedback is collated by the Course Director and presented to the Learning and Teaching Committee at the end of each trimester. Student feedback is discussed and improvement actions are planned and documented. A summary of this feedback is included in the annual Learning and Teaching Report prepared by the Dean Learning and Teaching.

5.2 Annual Reviews and Evaluation of the Courses by the Subjects

5.2.1 Learning and Teaching Review

The Academic Board delegates to the Learning and Teaching 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 Director reflects on and analyses subject feedback, with a view to improving the quality

of curriculum and student satisfaction.

Subjects are evaluated according to the following procedures:

- collation of student and teacher feedback on each subject by the Course Director;
- generation of subject-specific reports based on analysis of feedback data, compiled by the Course Director.
- Course monitoring data, which assesses each course's performance against a standard set of higher education indicators, is also presented by the Course Director to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

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

5.2.2 Academic Teaching Staff Feedback

Academic teaching staff are provided with various informal opportunities for evaluation of the teaching and learning environment over a trimester and through a formal annual meeting chaired by the Academic Director.

5.2.3 Graduate Surveys

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

5.3 Benchmarking Review (every three years)

Every three (3) years, the Learning and Teaching Committee conducts a Benchmarking Review in accordance with the Benchmarking Policy and Procedures. These reviews will only be conducted where a course has been taught continuously over the previous three year period and will continue to be offered by CGSI.

5.4 Full Review of Courses (at least twelve months prior to re-accreditation)

The Academic Board initiates and oversees a full review and evaluation of CGSI courses and subjects at least twelve months prior to re-accreditation (unless required earlier in response to previous reviews, particularly the benchmarking review). This task is delegated to the Course Advisory Committee, working in conjunction with the Academic Director, Dean Learning and Teaching, and Course Director.

5.4.1 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; including strategies being used to mitigate issues of academic integrity.
- 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;
- the impact of similar courses offered by competitor institutions on viability and sustainability of the CGSI course;
- longitudinal data, analysis and commentary about the course from previous reviews and Learning and Teaching Reports (refer to Governance, Accountability and Delegation Policy).
- the systematic collection and analysis of data relating to graduate employability, feedback from professional bodies (if applicable) and peer review processes.

5.5 Course Review Guidelines

1. The Course Advisory Committee is of key importance in relation to Course Reviews, nominating a Project Team led by the Academic Director (Chair of the CAC) and comprising members drawn from the Committee, CGSI academic staff and external academics or consultants with expertise in the discipline.
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 and Higher Education Standards Framework, and professional and industry body requirements?
 - How do the subjects contribute to the overall aim of the course?
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?
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 to mitigate academic integrity issues as they arise?
 - 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. 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?

- Does the course continue to meet the Course Accreditation Standards of the HES (2021)?
6. The final report will include recommendations arising from the review process for the Academic Board’s consideration and endorsement.
 7. The Academic Board’s recommendations will be implemented by the Academic Director, who will report progress back to the Academic Board at subsequent meetings.

6.0 Related

Course Evaluation and Review Policy
 Quality Assurance Framework
 Course Design Development and Approval Policy
 Course Design Development and Approval Procedure
 Benchmarking Policy
 Benchmarking Procedure
 Learning and Teaching Plan
 Work-Integrated Learning Policy

Version Control

Document:	Course Evaluation and Review Procedure		
Approved by:	Academic Board	Date:	30 November, 2023
Version:	3.1	Replaces:	3.0
Next Review Date:	2025		
Version History			
Version	Change Notes		
3.1	Reviewed, with new academic titles and organisational responsibilities amended and a shift to online delivery.		
3.0	Approved		
2.1	Amendments and logo added		