

## COURSE REVIEW AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURE

<b>Policy/Document Approval Body:</b>	Academic Board
<b>Date Created:</b>	26 October 2012
<b>Policy Custodian:</b>	Chair, Academic Board
<b>Policy Contact:</b>	Dean of Engineering
<b>File Location:</b>	W:\Data - ALL.Standard\Policies and Procedures\EIT Policies and Procedures
<b>Location on EIT website:</b>	<a href="http://www.eit.edu.au/organisation-policies">http://www.eit.edu.au/organisation-policies</a>
<b>Review Period:</b>	Three years
<b>Revision No:</b>	7
<b>Date of Revision:</b>	23 August 2021
<b>Date Approved:</b>	7 October 2021
<b>Date Commenced:</b>	14 October 2021

### 1.0 Purpose

This procedure outlines the steps taken as part of the academic review of the Engineering Institute of Technology's (EIT's) higher education courses and the units that make up each course. It gives guidance to the conduct of reviews and should be read together with the overarching policy. The purpose of academic reviews is to provide quality assurance through regular internal and external review, and to facilitate quality improvement with respect to higher education courses offered by the Institute.

### 2.0 Scope

This procedure applies to all members of EIT's higher education community. Key activities of the academic review process are the collection of data on student learning, interpretation of that data, and monitoring emerging trends according to key indicators of student performance.

This procedure includes information on ongoing internal reviews of units or courses as well as circumstances where a full review is conducted for units or courses. However, it does not include the development of new courses.

It is recognised that academic staff may update units on an ongoing basis, as good practice, where there are no changes to the learning outcomes or overall aims of the unit. Issues arising that have been identified via lecturer evaluations will be acted upon via the lecturer evaluation process. Reviews of individual units will take into account whether improvement is required as a result of a systemic issue, or whether it is a result of a specific lecturer or class/cohort situation.

### 3.0 Process

EIT is committed to ensuring that input is sought from a diverse group of people in the conduct of academic reviews. The academic committees responsible for conducting reviews and assessing data collected are prescribed in the Academic Governance terms of reference for each committee.

The Academic Board may, from time to time, seek additional expertise to assist with the provision of feedback on courses, or to assist with assessing feedback. The terms of reference for the Board of Studies and Course Advisory Committee provide details of roles and responsibilities.

Academic reviews are conducted for entire courses and individual units. These reviews are conducted internally on an ongoing basis as part of the continuous improvement process, together with regular external reviews of partial or entire courses. The Course Review Criteria for all types of review is provided in Appendix 1.

#### 3.1 Frequency

The frequency of an external course review process will occur as per the timeframes listed in Appendix 4. The next external review will occur at least 18 months to 2 years prior to the due date for submission of the renewal of the course to TEQSA. Once a course has been granted renewal of accreditation by TEQSA, the frequency of external course review will occur at a maximum timeframe of seven yearly, which will be determined by the Academic Board based on any changes in the discipline area or sector.

Internal reviews of a course will occur annually.

The stages for internal and external review processes are located at Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 respectively.

The overarching Course Review Implementation Plan, located at Appendix 4, sets out the frequency and timeframes over a seven-year period for all types of review.

#### 3.2 Recommendations/Reports

A Course Review Report will be developed at the end of each course review cycle, which will include all data that has been collected, and will measure course performance against stated KPIs. It is expected that an evidence-based approach will be undertaken that will reference external standards and benchmarking, where possible.

##### Report details

Reports will include the following:

- a. Review processes considering all offerings of the same award across all locations, focusing on course performance and development possibilities and taking account of strategic priorities of EIT and impact on students.
- b. A brief review report that includes an action plan identifying issues that need to be addressed at the course level, and across EIT.

- c. A course review report informing the relevant stakeholders across EIT including the academic staff, the technical writers and the academic committees.
- d. Development and re-development priorities based on the issues identified that need to be resolved.
- e. Issues identified for action which are referred to the appropriate personnel for action; are appropriately resourced; and the outcomes communicated back to the Dean and relevant members of staff and academic committees.
- f. Processes for external re-accreditation of the course to be undertaken as required by the relevant external accreditation body, and where feasible, aligned with internal course review processes.

If the report recommends discontinuance of a course, then detailed information regarding the impact on students, and teach out plans must be included. This should only progress under extenuating circumstances and after careful consideration.

If the report recommends discontinuance of a unit, then details of a replacement unit and the impact on students must be included.

Unit Review Reports focus on specific units of study, but recognises that a unit is embedded in a course. It seeks to examine all aspects of the student's experience including those that are often outside of the lecturer's control. Aspects out of the lecturer's control that are to be examined can include: the learning outcomes for the unit, mode of delivery, and course resources.

Unit Review Reports will be developed as required, and at the end of each cohort cycle as part of the Course Review Report and similarly for the reviews for external renewal of accreditation.

### **3.3 External course review – accrediting authority approval**

The external review process for renewal of accreditation will be conducted based on the same process for the external course review after initial accreditation. However, for renewal of accreditation, EIT will conduct a more in-depth review of the courses, including benchmarking against higher education institutions. EIT will ensure that the process takes account of all requirements of the accrediting authority in the revision of the higher education courses.

The Dean will initiate a review of EIT's higher education courses in sufficient time for submission to TEQSA. The Academic Board may appoint a Course Advisory Committee to undertake an internal and external review of the courses due for renewal of accreditation. The revised curriculum, once approved by the Academic Board, will be forwarded to TEQSA for assessment.

To develop an application to TEQSA, the Academic Board may form a Course Advisory Committee to oversee the revision of the higher education courses that are due for renewal. The Committee's terms of reference outline the roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships.

Benchmarking will be conducted against similar courses at other higher education institutions.

Benchmarking may be conducted with partnering institutions to inform curriculum review or other

mechanisms to facilitate continuous improvement. The Benchmarking Policy and Benchmarking Procedure provide further details.

In order to avoid unnecessary duplication of work, the Engineers Australia (EA) and TEQSA review requirements will aim to be combined in this process (as the timeframes for reaccreditation are similar (5 years for EA vs up to 7 years for TEQSA)).

### **3.4 Impact from Discontinuance**

#### **Students**

Proposals to amend higher education courses or units must ensure that students are not unduly disadvantaged. Students should be consulted on proposed changes that may have an impact on students, and then notified in writing within 14 days, if the proposal is approved. Minor unit improvements do not require written notification to students. The written notification should include:

- Effective date of the change
- Details of the change
- Transition arrangements and options for completing the course within a clearly defined period of time
- Name of contact persons to provide academic advice to students

No new enrolments will be accepted into a discontinued course. For any pending applications or enrolments, students must be notified and where possible transferred to an alternative EIT course, or other course.

All students enrolled in a course at the time of discontinuation should be allowed the opportunity to complete the course under the advertised structure and timeframe at the time of their enrolment, wherever possible. Students will not be permitted to defer their studies.

#### **Staff**

All higher education staff must be notified of approved changes to courses and/or units as soon as practical, including discontinuation of courses or units.

### **3.5 Material Changes**

TEQSA states in its Material Change Notification Policy that:

*4. Notifications do not constitute an application for approval to implement changes, as approval is not required. However, TEQSA will follow up if it considers there is a risk that Standards in the HES Framework have been or will be breached.*

*7. Notwithstanding, TEQSA would expect providers to notify TEQSA of the following changes:*

- *major course changes (for providers without self-accrediting authority) such as changes to the titles of courses, a notable reduction in course duration or the introduction of new majors or specialisations.*

TEQSA provides further advice in its Guidance Note: Changes in a Course of Study that may lead to Accreditation as a New Course v1.0:

Because of the variety of factors that may affect a determination by TEQSA, providers are advised to discuss proposed significant changes to a course of study with TEQSA. These discussions will help to resolve whether or not the proposed changes fundamentally change the nature of the course of study and/or likely expectations of it from students and the community, to the extent that TEQSA will require accreditation as a new course.

Recommended changes arising from Unit Review Reports or Course Review Reports that constitute a material change that 'may lead to accreditation as a new course', will need to be submitted to TEQSA for approval, after approval from the Academic Board in the first instance followed by final approval by the Governance Board.

If any course of study and/or unit is offered to international students studying in Australia on a Student Visa, there may be additional requirements under the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 and the National Code 2018.

## 4.0 Implementation and Monitoring

The Board of Studies is responsible for the ongoing monitoring of higher education courses under delegation from the Academic Board. The collection of data will be in accordance with the data itemized under each type of academic review process. Course data will be examined based on trends over time and interpreted in the context of each individual course, where relevant. Feedback via various mechanisms will be aggregated and used as evidence to inform changes to effect continuous improvement in all aspects of the curriculum.

Academic teaching staff will contribute to the monitoring process via their input at staff meetings, reporting to the Board of Studies on trends and issues and providing specific input when requested.

The Academic Board may request specific monitoring of any issues that arise from time to time.

The Curriculum Change Register will document key details of changes made to the course and individual units as a result of the academic review process. The Curriculum Change Register is a key document that provides the history of all changes made as part of the continuous improvement process that will feed into the renewal of accreditation process.

### 4.1 Internal Review Monitoring

Data analysis personnel will analyse the following data collected from surveys and other data collection mechanisms:

- Student feedback on the course and units including assessment, labs, IT and internet support infrastructure and tools
- Student feedback on teaching and supervision/support
- Staff feedback on all aspects of the course, units and delivery
- Enrolment, entry requirements and student attrition data

- Student progression data including grade distributions and moderation outcomes
- Student/staff ratios
- Articulation pathway data

Care will be taken to distinguish between online and classroom-based modes, as they represent different cohorts.

EIT will ensure that feedback mechanisms obtain information that will provide responses to the following key questions. Each board and committee will undertake their respective roles and responsibilities in accordance with their terms of reference. The Board of Studies, Course Advisory Committee and Academic Board will also have regard for ensuring that the following key questions are answered when reviewing and approving minor changes to units.

1. Will the proposed change alter the learning outcomes? If so, will the proposed changes keep unit outcomes consistent with the course outcomes?
2. Do the learning and teaching activities of the unit/course ensure that learning outcomes are met in accordance with the objectives of the Teaching and Learning Plan?
3. Are the methods of assessment consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed, and are they capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment?
4. Does the content and learning activities of the course/unit engage with advanced knowledge and inquiry consistent with the level of study and the expected learning outcomes, including:
  - current knowledge and scholarship in relevant academic disciplines
  - study of the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the academic disciplines or fields of education or research represented in the course/unit, and
  - emerging concepts that are informed by recent scholarship, current research findings and, where applicable, advances in professional practice?
5. Are the teaching and learning activities arranged to foster progressive and coherent achievement of expected learning outcomes throughout the course/unit?
6. Is the course/unit designed to enable achievement of expected learning outcomes regardless of a student's place of study or the mode of delivery?
7. Will the changes impact on the workload of the course?
8. Will the proposed changes constitute a 'material change' as defined by TEQSA? If so, see the section on Material Changes.
9. Does the course meet the requirements of the applicable Standards of the Higher Education Standards Framework, the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and other external accreditation requirements, where relevant;

#### **4.2 External Course Review Monitoring**

Data analysis personnel will analyse the following student data collected by EIT from surveys and other data collection mechanisms:

- Student feedback on the course and units including assessment, labs, IT and internet support infrastructure and tools
- Student feedback on teaching and supervision/support
- Staff feedback on all aspects of the course, units and delivery
- Enrolment, entry requirements and student attrition data
- Student progression data including grade distributions, moderation outcomes, completion times and rates
- Student/ staff ratios
- Articulation pathway data
- Feedback from the Institute’s community
- Feedback from external stakeholders
- Benchmarking
- Where applicable, comparing different locations and/or modes of delivery

EIT will ensure that feedback mechanisms obtain information that provide responses to the following key questions. Each board and committee will undertake their respective roles and responsibilities in accordance with their terms of reference. The Academic Board, Board of Studies and Course Advisory Committee will also have regard for ensuring that the following key questions are answered when conducting a full external higher education course review.

1. Are the stated learning objectives consistent with the EIT’s strategic direction, values, plans and policies?
2. Are the teaching and learning activities designed for the course designed to achieve the learning outcomes, especially the core graduate attributes, in accordance with the objectives of the Teaching and Learning Plan?
3. Are the methods of assessment consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed, and are they capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment.
4. What are the key trends relating to student entry, progression and success in the course, and what improvements have already been made, or are planned to be made?
5. What are the key issues that need to be addressed in the next accreditation cycle for the course?
6. Has the course been benchmarked against a comparable course nationally and/or internationally?
7. Does the content and learning activities of the course engage with advanced knowledge and inquiry consistent with the level of study and the expected learning outcomes, including:
  - current knowledge and scholarship in relevant academic disciplines
  - study of the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the academic disciplines or fields of education or research represented in the course/unit, and
  - emerging concepts that are informed by recent scholarship, current research findings and, where applicable, advances in professional practice?

8. Are the teaching and learning activities arranged to foster progressive and coherent achievement of expected learning outcomes throughout the course?
9. Is the course designed to enable achievement of expected learning outcomes regardless of a student's place of study or the mode of delivery?
10. Does the course meet the requirements of the applicable Standards of the Higher Education Standards Framework, the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and other external accreditation requirements, where relevant;
11. Will the proposed changes constitute a 'material change' as defined by TEQSA? If so, see the section on Material Changes.

## 5.0 Definitions

A glossary is provided at Appendix 5.

## 6.0 Related Policies and Procedures

The following policies and procedures are related to this policy:

- Course Review and Quality Assurance Policy
- Curriculum Change Register
- Teaching and Learning Policy
- Benchmarking Policy
- Benchmarking Procedure
- Academic Board Terms of Reference
- Board of Studies Terms of Reference
- Course Advisory Committee Terms of Reference

## 7.0 Accountabilities

The Terms of Reference for each of the academic governance committees shall determine the composition of panel members and their roles and responsibilities in relation to course reviews. In particular, the:

- a. The Board of Studies and Course Advisory Committee are responsible for making recommendations arising from feedback collected from stakeholders and making recommendations to the Academic Board for approval.
- b. The Deputy Dean has overarching responsibility for implementing approved changes to units and the course and reporting outcomes to the Academic Board.
- c. The Deputy Dean, Course Coordinators and Unit Coordinators are responsible for implementing and monitoring relevant changes made to units and courses under their responsibility and reporting outcomes to the Dean, the Board of Studies and the Academic Board.

## APPENDIX 1 - COURSE REVIEW CRITERIA

<b>Purpose and function</b>	The purpose of Course Reviews is to provide quality assurance through regular internal and external reviews and to facilitate quality improvement with respect to courses offered by the EIT.
<b>Criteria</b>	<p>For higher education coursework courses, the committee will examine the data and evidence collected, and make recommendations regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The relevance and currency of the curricula in meeting the needs of students, the profession and employers.</li> <li>2. The current and likely future demand for the course areas and their viability with respect to students, employers, professions and partner organisations, and plans for future course developments (including prospective partnerships and the creation or closure of courses).</li> <li>3. The content and learning activities of the course engage with advanced knowledge and inquiry consistent with the level of study and the expected learning outcomes, including:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. current knowledge and scholarship in relevant academic disciplines</li> <li>ii. study of the underlying theoretical and conceptual frameworks of the academic disciplines or fields of education or research represented in the course, and</li> <li>iii. emerging concepts that are informed by recent scholarship, current research findings and, where applicable, advances in practice</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Whether the teaching and learning activities are arranged to foster progressive and coherent achievement of expected learning outcomes throughout the course.</li> <li>5. Whether the methods of assessment are consistent with the learning outcomes being assessed, and are they capable of confirming that all specified learning outcomes are achieved and that grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment.</li> <li>6. Whether the course design enables achievement of expected learning outcomes regardless of a student's place of study or the mode of delivery.</li> <li>7. Whether the course design meets the applicable Standards of the <i>Higher Education Standards Framework</i>, the <i>Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)</i> and other external accreditation requirements, where relevant.</li> <li>8. The relationship between the course and other EIT higher education courses across and training programs.</li> <li>9. The adequacy of learning resources (including library, IT and infrastructure support) and the level of student learning support.</li> <li>10. The effectiveness of quality assurance processes for courses and units including processes for benchmarking and obtaining student and employer feedback and the use of appropriate performance indicators.</li> <li>11. The adequacy of the level (for example, numbers, classification, qualifications, experience) of teaching staff (including sessional staff) and the quality of staff development and support provided for teaching staff.</li> <li>12. Any additional matter of relevance.</li> </ol>
<b>Committee Membership</b>	<p>The Board of Studies for ongoing reviews.</p> <p>The Course Advisory Committee for external reviews.</p>
<b>Method of appointment</b>	All members are appointed in accordance with the relevant committee's terms of reference.
<b>Secretariat</b>	As per the relevant committee's terms of reference.

<b>Schedule of meetings</b>	<p>The duration of the Course Review meeting will be determined by the relevant committee, and will be determined depending on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the quantity of information to be considered; and</li> <li>• whether the review forms part of the renewal of accreditation submission to the external accrediting authority</li> </ul>
<b>Final Approval</b>	<p>Final approval of a course will only be given by the Academic Board when:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the course meets the applicable Standards of the Higher Education Standards Framework, the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) and other external accreditation requirements, where relevant.</li> <li>• the decision to approve a course of study is informed by overarching academic scrutiny of the course of study that is competent to assess the design, delivery and assessment of the course of study independently of the staff directly involved in those aspects of the course, and</li> <li>• the resources required to deliver the course as approved will be available when needed.</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 2 - INTERNAL COURSE REVIEW PROCESS

The internal review process for a course and for individual units will consist of the following stages:

Stages of individual unit reviews	Timeframe	Responsibility
Distribution of surveys to staff and students	2 weeks before the end of each teaching period of the course.	Unit Coordinator under direction from the Course Coordinator and administered by the Learning Support Officer
Analysis of internal data collected from enrolments, assessments and survey data	Commence within 1 week of the end of each 6 month period of the course.	Data analysis personnel
Production of Report containing suggested changes to units, consideration of whether it constitutes a material change, and overall impact on the course prepared by the Deputy Dean together with a proposed Unit Change Plan submitted to the Dean for endorsement and forwarding to Board of Studies for consideration and approval.	Within 4 weeks of the end of each 6 month period of the course.	Deputy Dean
The Board of Studies submits approved Report and Unit Change Plans to Academic Board for consideration and approval.	Within 4 weeks of receipt of report.	Board of Studies
Academic Board considers recommendations and denies or approves changes for implementation, together with direction to prepare a material change application to TEQSA, if applicable.	Within 4 weeks of receipt of report.	Academic Board
If approved, changes are to be implemented, recorded and monitored.	As per approved timeframes.	Deputy Dean, relevant academic staff and committees
<b>Note:</b> The Course Review process is the same as for individual units, except administered annually with a focus on the overall course.		

## APPENDIX 3 - EXTERNAL COURSE REVIEW PROCESS

The external review process of an entire course will consist of the following stages:

Stages	Timeframe	Responsibility
Production of a self-review report for each course (utilizing internal data and feedback, and details of improvements already made).	1 month before the review meeting, at end of each cohort.	Deputy Dean and Course Coordinator
Request for interested parties from the EIT's community, including external stakeholders, to provide comment.	2 months before the review meeting.	Deputy Dean and Course Coordinator
Consideration of additional expertise to form a Course Advisory Committee (CAC)	At least 1 month before the review meeting.	Deputy Dean and Course Coordinator
Board of Studies or Course Advisory Committee (CAC) special meeting to discuss submissions and data, talk to stakeholders and develop recommendations.	Panel members will need adequate time to review the material.	Board of Studies or CAC
Preparation of a Course Review Report by the Board of Studies or Course Advisory Committee, including a Course Amendment Implementation Plan developed by the Deputy Dean, and consideration of material change requirements.	Completed within 1 month of the panel meeting, where possible.	Secretary BoS or Secretary, CAC and Deputy Dean
Submission of the Course Review Report and Course Amendment Implementation Plan to Academic Board for consideration and approval.	Submitted to the Academic Board	Deputy Dean
Academic Board considers recommendations and denies or approves changes for implementation, together with direction to prepare a material change application to TEQSA, if applicable.	Within 1 month of receipt of report.	Academic Board
If approved, changes are to be implemented, recorded and monitored.	As per approved timeframes.	Deputy Dean, relevant academic staff and committees
<p><b>Note:</b> An external accreditation process is the same as above, except that the Self Review Report will include benchmarking against other higher education institutions and taking account of TEQSA's requirements. It will be a more in-depth process usually requiring the formation of a Course Advisory Committee and preparation of a Course Accreditation Renewal submission once approved by the Academic Board.</p>		

## APPENDIX 4 – COURSE REVIEW IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Issue	Frequency	Timeframe	7 year timeline	Action Steps	Responsibility
<b>Doctorate, Masters, Graduate Diploma and Graduate Certificate</b>					
<b>Course Review</b>					
<i>Internal</i>	Annual	2 months	End of Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Review current year	Course Coordinator/ Deputy Dean
<i>External after initial accreditation by TEQSA</i>	2 years	3 months	End of Year 2	Review full cohort	Course Coordinator/ Dean
<i>External accreditation thereafter</i>	1.5 – 2 years prior to TEQSA's due date	6 months	Year 5 to 6	Full review	Course Coordinator/ Academic Board
<b>Unit Review</b>					
<i>Internal</i>	Every 6 months	1 month	Every 6 months Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Review current teaching period. All units for first cohort and sample thereafter.	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean/ Board of Studies
<i>External after initial accreditation by TEQSA</i>	2 years	2 months	End of Year 2	Review units as part of course review	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean
<i>Part of external accreditation thereafter</i>	1.5 to 2 years prior to TEQSA's due date	6 months	Year 5 to 6	Review units as part of renewal of course accreditation	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean

Issue	Frequency	Timeframe	7 year timeline	Action Steps	Responsibility
<b>Bachelor and Undergraduate Certificate courses</b>					
<b>Course Review</b>					
<i>Internal</i>	Annual	2 months	End of Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Review current year	Course Coordinator/ Deputy Dean
<i>External after initial accreditation by TEQSA</i>	3 years	3 months	End of Year 3	Review full cohort	Course Coordinator/Dean
<i>External Accreditation thereafter</i>	1.5 to 2 years prior to TEQSA's due date	6 months	End of Year 6	Review all changes over 2 full cohorts	Course Coordinator/Academic Board and CAC
<b>Unit Review</b>					
<i>Internal</i>	Every teaching period	1 month	Every teaching period, Year 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Review current teaching period. All units for first cohort and sample thereafter.	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean/ Board of Studies
<i>Part of External after initial accreditation by TEQSA</i>	3 years	2 months	End of Year 3	Review full cohort	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean
<i>Part of External Accreditation thereafter</i>	1.5 to 2 years prior to TEQSA's due date	6 months	End of Year 6	Review all changes over 2 full cohorts	Unit Coordinator/ Deputy Dean

## APPENDIX 5 – GLOSSARY

**Articulation** – a defined pathway that enables a student to progress from a completed course of study to another course of study with admission and/or credit.

**Attrition** – TEQSA defines attrition as the ratio of first-year higher education commencing students in a year who neither completed nor returned to study in the following year, to the total commencing students in that year.

**Benchmarking** – Benchmarking is recognized as a means by which an entity can: demonstrate accountability to stakeholders; improve networking and collaborative relationships; generate management information; develop an increased understanding of practice, process or performance; and garner insights into how improvements might be made. In the context of course accreditation, benchmarking involves comparing performance outcomes and/or processes of similar courses of study delivered by other providers. Internal benchmarking against other relevant courses offered by EIT may also be undertaken.

**Course (aka program)** – a single course leading to an Australian higher education award.

**Course Coordinator** – An academic position responsible for leading, managing and coordinating the course study for which they are assigned to, as well as the Unit Coordinators and the guest and sessional staff involved in the course.

**Grade distributions** – are set by each higher education provider and involve analysing the aggregation of final grades using data by unit, course of study, student cohort or other grouping.

**Graduate attributes** – generic learning outcomes that refer to transferable, non-discipline specific skills that a graduate may achieve through learning that have application in study, work and life contexts.

**KPI** - A set of quantifiable measures used to gauge or compare performance in terms of meeting strategic and operational goals.

**Learning outcomes** – learning outcomes are 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.

**Learning Support Officer** - Full time, administrative coordinator assigned to a course(s). Also referred to in the National Code as ‘Student Contact Officer’.

**Nested courses** – courses of study leading to higher education awards that include articulated arrangements from a lower level higher education award into a higher-level higher education award to enable multiple entry and exit points.

**Student progression rates** – is the equivalent full- time student load (EFTSL) passed as a percentage of the EFTSL attempted (comprising units passed, failed and withdrawn and excluding work experience in industry load)

**Student/staff ratio** – is calculated by dividing the student load by the associated teaching staff effort where:

- student load is expressed as equivalent full-time student load (EFTSL); and
- teaching staff effort is the number of teachers expressed as full-time equivalents (FTE).

**Unit** - A unit is a discrete unit of study and a combination of units make up a course of study.

**Unit Coordinator** - An academic position responsible for coordinating the delivery of the particular unit they are involved with for all sites and modalities for which the unit is being delivered.