

C7 - COURSE REVIEW POLICY

1 PURPOSE

This policy articulates the BBI – The Australian Institute of Theological Education (BBI) commitment to ongoing review of its course offerings in order to to guarantee quality learning and teaching standards, and to define a process for changes to existing courses of study.

2 BACKGROUND

BBI is committed to quality learning and teaching, as reflected in its primarily educational mission. This policy has been created in order to ensure that the Institute's course offerings are reviewed on a regular basis, including both internally and externally.

3 SCOPE

This policy applies to the creation of policy, the development of courses, and the delivery of courses across BBI.

4 DEFINITIONS

N/A

5 POLICY

All accredited courses are to be reviewed on a regular cycle. This ensures that all accredited courses are delivered with consistent academic standards in accordance with regulatory requirements and sector benchmarking, and that accredited courses reflect the values of the Institute as outlined in the Strategic Plan. Any changes to an existing course of study must be implemented by following the procedures outlined below.

Regular Course Review Mechanisms:

Each accredited course of study will be reviewed in the following ways:

1. Annual Report.

An annual report of each course of study will be submitted by the relevant Course Coordinator to the Academic Board. The annual report is a review of the performance of the previous year and will generally include information such as:

- enrolment data for the previous year;
- performance data (such as attrition, progress and completion rates);
- student feedback;
- staff feedback;
- key stakeholder feedback;
- any approved changes, such as amendments to unit outlines approved by the Academic Board;
- improvement plan for the upcoming year;

The annual report will be reviewed by the Academic Board. This allows for the ongoing monitoring of performance and improvement of the course of study. The implementation of any recommendations for improvement to the course arising from this annual report will be overseen by the Academic Board or its subcommittees.

2. Mid-Accreditation Review.

Each accredited course of study will undergo a mid-accreditation review on a regular cycle. This will be overseen by the Academic Board (or its delegate) in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

3. Additional Review.

In certain circumstances, for example in response to market demand, an additional course review may be undertaken. In this case, a proposal for a course review outside the regular cycle must first be submitted to the Academic Board. This proposal should include a clear rationale for the additional review of the course of study. This additional review will then be overseen by the Academic Board (or its delegate) in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

4. Reaccreditation Review.

Prior to reaccreditation, a course of study review will be conducted as part of the reaccreditation application. This will be overseen by the Academic Board in accordance with the procedures outlined below.

5. Other Review Mechanisms.

Other mechanisms for review of a course of study may be implemented from time to time. These may include:

- External Benchmarking Review. The task of external benchmarking, as articulated in the Institute's *Benchmarking Policy*, is to provide professional feedback on the Institute's operations and training and educational products and services.

6 COURSE OF STUDY REVIEW PRODUCE

Reviews of existing courses of study will follow the procedures outlined below:

1. The Academic Board will appoint a Course Review Sub-Committee (CRSC). Members of the CRSC will usually include the Academic Dean, the Course Coordinator, a Course Coordinator from another BBI courses, other relevant academic staff and at least one external member from a relevant field (or two external members, one academic and one practitioner, for a reaccreditation review). The purpose of this committee is to review the course of study according to the guidelines of the policy. A chair will also be nominated by the Academic Board.
2. The CRSC will conduct a review of the course of study, including consideration of the following information as relevant:
 - a) Annual reports;
 - b) Other performance data (such as any outcomes of external monitoring of grades);
 - c) Student feedback (including feedback from completed subject evaluations, course experience surveys and other student surveys);

- d) Staff feedback (including feedback from targeted staff surveys conducted in preparation for the review);
 - e) Benchmarking data, gathered in accordance with the Institute's *Benchmarking Policy*.
 - f) Stakeholder surveys (including feedback from targeted stakeholder surveys conducted in preparation for the review);
 - g) Feedback from the professional accreditation body (if applicable);
 - h) How the future delivery of the course aligns to the strategic direction of the Institute.
3. From this review, recommendations are made as to improvements to the structure, delivery, student learning, graduate outcomes and course management of the program. These reviews and recommendations are tabled at the Academic Board for approval. If these recommendations require a substantial change to the course of study, the CRSC will be tasked with overseeing the development of the Material Change Notification. Alternatively, in the case of a reaccreditation review, the CRSC will be tasked with developing recommendations. The following additional steps are required:
- a) Review by External Review Committee.
Only in the case of reaccreditation of higher education awards, an External Review Sub-Committee (ERSC) is appointed by the CRSC. It comprises external peers who are academic leaders and industry representatives for the field of study of the program being accredited. This Committee is an ad hoc committee appointed by the CRSC to review the reaccreditation application developed by the CRSC, to ensure that the course design and components are robust and withstand external scrutiny.
 - b) Approval by Academic Board.
The completed Material Change Notification or reaccreditation application will be reviewed by the Academic Board. Once the Board is satisfied of the quality of the notification it can be submitted to the relevant Agency.
 - c) Submission of Application to relevant Agency.
No advertising or promotion of a revised course of study is permitted until official approval, or official sanction to do so, has been granted by the relevant agency.

7 RELEVANT LEGISLATION

N/A

8 KEY RELATED DOCUMENTS

Contact Officer	Academic Dean
Implementation Officer/s	Director of Student Engagement and Services, Academic Dean, Chief Executive Officer
Approval Authority / Authorities	Academic Standards Sub-committee / Academic Board / Audit and Risk Committee / Board
Date Approved	15/12/15
Date of Commencement	1/1/17

Date for Review	24 MONTHS AFTER COMMENCEMENT
Amendment History	N/A
Key Stakeholders	Faculty & Sessional Academics / Students