

Version	1.0
Short description	This procedure outlines the processes for the re-accreditation of higher education award courses.
Relevant to	All academic and professional staff involved in the re-accreditation of higher education courses.
Authority	Academic Board
Policy Owner	Manager, Academic Quality and Standards
Responsible office	Office of the Vice Chancellor
Date approved	30 August 2023
Date effective	1 February 2024
Review due	August 2028
Related Avondale documents	<p>Course Accreditation Procedure</p> <p>Course Amendment Procedure</p> <p>Course Quality Assurance Policy</p> <p>Course Suspension and Discontinuation Procedure</p> <p>Unit Development, Amendment & Discontinuation Procedure</p>
Related legislation	<p>Australian Qualifications Framework Second Edition 2013</p> <p>Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021</p>
Key words	Course, quality, evaluation, re-accreditation, standards

1. PURPOSE

- 1.1 This procedure supports the Course Quality Assurance Policy by outlining Avondale University's (Avondale) course re-accreditation processes, which seek to ensure the quality of course design and delivery, and student outcomes in line with the Higher Education Standards Framework, Australian Qualifications Framework, and industry standards.
- 1.2 Avondale is authorised by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) to self-accredit its courses.
- 1.3 Current accreditation status is a requirement for offering a course at Avondale University.

2. SCOPE

- 2.1 This procedure applies to:
 - Higher Education Coursework courses
 - Higher Degree by Research (HDR) courses
- 2.2 This procedure does not apply to:
 - Vocational Education & Training courses
 - Professional Accreditation of courses

3. DEFINITIONS

- 3.1 **Accreditation:** the process (or the outcome of the process) by which a proposed course is initially assessed and assured for quality of design, delivery and student outcomes in the context of the Higher Education Standards Framework, Australian Qualifications Framework, and industry standards. Current accreditation status is a requirement for offering a course at Avondale University.
- 3.2 **Accreditation cycle:** the period of time between when course accreditation begins and expires, as determined by the Academic Board at the time of accreditation or re-accreditation.
- 3.3 **Course Review Panel:** a group of external discipline and/or industry experts appointed by the Vice Chancellor to assess the course and provide advice to the Learning and Teaching Committee and Academic Board.
- 3.4 **Re-accreditation:** the process for renewing course accreditation, as outlined in this procedure; sometimes referred to as accreditation renewal.
- 3.5 **Re-accreditation Working Party:** a group of staff appointed by the Deputy Vice Chancellor, whose main responsibilities are to write the Course Re-accreditation Report and the Action Plan Response to the Course Review Panel Report.

4. PROCESS OVERVIEW

- 4.1 The following table sets out the steps required for course re-accreditation, together with the person responsible for each step and an approximate timeline for completion. This timeline may vary following consultation with the Deputy Vice Chancellor.

	Step	Person Responsible	Indicative Timeline months prior to accreditation renewal date
1	Set up Working Party	Deputy Vice Chancellor	18 months
2	External Advisory Check	Deputy Vice Chancellor	18 months
3	Complete Course Re-accreditation Report	Course Convenor	10 months
4	Submission to School Committee/HDR Review Panel	Course Convenor	10 months
5	Submission to Manager, Academic Quality and Standards for review	Course Convenor	9 months
6	Set up Course Review Panel	Vice Chancellor with Deputy Vice Chancellor	6 months
7	Submission to Course Review Panel	Vice Chancellor with Deputy Vice Chancellor	4 months
8	Prepare Action Plan Response to Course Review Panel Report, submit to Academic Quality Committee for endorsement	Course Convenor	2 months
9	Submission to L&T/Research Committee for endorsement	Vice Chancellor or nominee	2 months
10	Submission to Academic Board for approval	Vice Chancellor or nominee	1 month

4.2 Workflow diagrams for the endorsement of the Course Re-accreditation Report and the approval of the Course Re-accreditation can be found with this procedure in the Policy Repository.

5. WORKING PARTY

- 5.1 The purpose of the Working Party is to support the course re-accreditation review process, largely through completion of the Course Re-accreditation Report and the Action Plan Response to the Course Review Panel Report.
- 5.2 Approximately 18 months before re-accreditation is due, the Deputy Vice Chancellor will establish a Working Party.
- 5.3 Membership of the Working Party will include the Course Convenor (Chair) and other relevant team members, for example academics, L&T staff, library and/or school professional staff.
- 5.4 If a Working Party member becomes unavailable during the life of the Working Party, the Deputy Vice Chancellor will nominate a replacement.
- 5.5 The Deputy Vice Chancellor and Vice Chancellor may be ex officio members of the Working Party.

- 5.6 The Academic Quality Office in the Vice Chancellor portfolio will support staff throughout this process and will provide feedback and recommendations as needed.

6. EXTERNAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- 6.1 The Deputy Vice Chancellor will confirm that the External Advisory Committee is in place and has met within 12 months of the due date for the submission of the Course Re-accreditation Report to the School Committee.
- 6.2 The External Advisory Committee Terms of Reference (which can be found in the Policy Repository) includes the purpose, terms of reference and membership of the Committee.

7. COURSE RE-ACCREDITATION REPORT

- 7.1 The Course Re-accreditation Report (the Report) will be used to present a case for re-accreditation based on analysis of course performance data over the accreditation period and other relevant information. The Report also represents an opportunity for the Course Convenor and Working Party to provide evidence-based responses to the course quality themes outlined in this template.
- 7.2 The Working Party will prepare the Report using the template (which can be found with this procedure in the Policy Repository). The Course Convenor will be responsible for ensuring that the report is complete, accurate and delivered on schedule.
- 7.3 This work should normally be commenced 18 months prior to the re-accreditation due date.
- 7.4 The Report for coursework courses will provide sufficient information regarding each of the following sections to enable the Course Review Panel to make a determination regarding re-accreditation:
 - 7.4.1 Course Details
 - 7.4.2 Purpose and Outcomes of the Course
 - 7.4.3 Course Learning Outcomes
 - 7.4.4 Course Design
 - 7.4.5 Scholarship of Learning and Teaching
 - 7.4.6 Learning and Teaching and Assessment Arrangements
 - 7.4.7 Student Achievement of Learning Outcomes
 - 7.4.8 Resources and Infrastructure
 - 7.4.9 Student and Stakeholder Feedback
 - 7.4.10 Overall Performance of the Course against National and International Benchmarks
 - 7.4.11 Areas of improvement and how those improvements will be implemented.
- 7.5 The Report for Higher Degrees by Research courses will provide sufficient information regarding each of the following sections to enable the Course Review Panel to make a determination regarding re-accreditation:
 - 7.5.1 Course Details

- 7.5.2 Purpose and Outcomes of the Course
- 7.5.3 Course Learning Outcomes
- 7.5.4 Course Design
- 7.5.5 Scholarship of Learning and Teaching and Research Culture
- 7.5.6 Research Training and Supervisor Training
- 7.5.7 Supervision, Progress and Examination
- 7.5.8 Candidate Achievement of Course Learning Outcomes
- 7.5.9 Resources and Infrastructure
- 7.5.10 Candidate, Supervisor and Stakeholder Feedback
- 7.5.11 Overall Performance of the Course against National and International Benchmarks
- 7.5.12 Areas of improvement and how those improvements will be implemented.
- 7.6 Where a course is required to be accredited by an external professional body, the Report may also refer to or replicate relevant information submitted as part of the professional accreditation process.
- 7.7 The period covered by the Report should be the previous 5 years for each section of the Report relevant to course delivery and outcomes, and the next 5 years for course plans and targets.
- 7.8 The Report should reference as appropriate the Higher Education Standards Framework (see the 2021 Threshold Standards Checklist with this Procedure in the Policy Repository); the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF); Avondale policies; academic governance structures (committees) within the University; and any course advice by external industry and sector experts.
- 7.9 The report must:
 - 7.9.1 reflect on risks identified and actions taken as a result of monitoring and quality enhancement activities; and how these have informed good practice;
 - 7.9.2 consider how it is planned to engage in internal monitoring, external benchmarking and continuous improvement practices in the future; and
 - 7.9.3 demonstrate that there are sufficient processes in place for closing the loop on key quality enhancement activities.
- 7.10 The final Re-accreditation Report should not exceed 12 pages (excluding appendices).
 - 7.10.1 Word limit guides have been provided for each section to assist with meeting the page limit requirement.
 - 7.10.2 Appendices may be used but should be kept to a minimum, focused on substantive supporting data/evidence.
 - 7.10.3 Supplementary material may be hyperlinked and available online.
 - 7.10.4 The font should be Calibri font, size 10, single spaced.

8. SCHOOL COMMITTEE/HDR COMMITTEE ENDORSEMENT

- 8.1 The draft Report is to be presented by the Course Convenor to the relevant School Committee/HDR Committee for discussion and comment.
- 8.2 The Committee will either endorse the Report for review by the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards or provide feedback requiring actions and/or revisions to the Report. If revisions are required:
 - 8.2.1 the Committee will determine whether the revisions are to be considered as major or minor.
 - 8.2.2 if major revisions are required, the Report should be re-drafted by the Working Party, and then re-submitted to the School Committee/HDR Committee.
 - 8.2.3 if the revisions required are minor, these are to be applied to the Report by the Working Party and then the Report is to be submitted to the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards for review and comment.

9. ACADEMIC QUALITY OFFICE ENDORSEMENT

- 9.1 The endorsed Report is to be submitted by the Course Convenor to the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards for review and endorsement.
- 9.2 The Manager, Academic Quality and Standards will review the Report and either endorse it for submission to the Course Review Panel or work with the Course Convenor and Working Party on any revisions and evidence gathering required. If revisions are required:
 - 9.2.1 the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards will decide whether the revisions should be considered as major or minor.
 - 9.2.2 if major revisions are required, the Report should be re-drafted by the Working Party, and then re-submitted to the School Committee/HDR Committee.
 - 9.2.3 if the revisions made to the Report are minor, then the revised Report is to be returned to the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards for final endorsement and then the Report is to be submitted to the Course Review Panel by the Vice Chancellor.

10. COURSE REVIEW PANEL

- 10.1 The Course Review Panel Terms of Reference (which can be found in the Policy Repository) includes the purpose, terms of reference and membership of the Panel.
- 10.2 The Course Review Panel is comprised of at least three external discipline/industry experts, appointed by the Vice Chancellor.
- 10.3 Relevant stakeholders, such as academic staff, academic leaders, professional support staff, and students, will be invited to make written submissions and/or to present to the Panel.
- 10.4 The Executive Assistant to the Vice Chancellor will coordinate the arrangements of the Panel meeting and act as Panel Secretary, providing administrative support.
- 10.5 Following the Course Review Panel meeting, the Chair of the Panel, in coordination with the Panel, will produce a Report using the Course Review Panel Report template (which

can be found with this procedure in the Policy Repository) indicating the commendations and recommendations of the Panel.

- 10.6 The report will be submitted by the Chair of the Panel to the Vice Chancellor and the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards normally within 4 weeks. After evaluating it, the Manager, Academic Quality and Standards will submit the report to the Working Party.

11. WORKING PARTY ACTION PLAN RESPONSE

- 11.1 The Working Party will prepare a response to the Course Review Panel Report, with a timeline of actions to be completed using the Action Plan Response template (which can be found with this procedure in the Policy Repository).
- 11.2 The Academic Quality Office is available to support the Working Party throughout this process and identify any issues that may need to be addressed in order to satisfy the Learning and Teaching/Research Committee and Academic Board.

12. COURSE RE-ACCREDITATION APPROVAL

- 12.1 The Course Re-accreditation Report, Course Review Panel Report and Action Plan Response are to be submitted by the Course Convenor to the Academic Quality Committee (AQC) for evaluation.
- 12.2 Using the Avondale Guidelines regarding the HESF Standards, the Academic Quality Committee will affirm that the guiding principles of the policy have been met. Specifically, that the course continues to:
- reflect Avondale's Purpose and Values;
 - develop and facilitate student achievement of Avondale's Graduate Attributes;
 - comply with the relevant provisions of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 and the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF); and
 - be designed to educate, support and encourage academic integrity.
- 12.3 The AQC will either endorse the documents for review by the Learning & Teaching/Research Committee or request further documentation and/or revisions to the Action Plan Response. If revisions are required:
- 12.3.1 the Committee will determine whether the resulting revisions are to be considered as major or minor.
- 12.3.2 if major revisions are required, the Action Plan Response should be re-drafted by the Working Party, and then re-submitted to the AQC.
- 12.3.3 if the revisions required are minor, these are to be applied to the Action Plan Response by the Working Party.
- 12.4 The Course Re-accreditation Report, Course Review Panel Report and endorsed Action Plan Response are to be presented by the Vice Chancellor to the L&T/Research Committee for comment and endorsement.
- 12.5 The L&T/Research Committee will review the documents and either endorse for review by Academic Board or request further documentation and/or revisions to the Action Plan Response. If revisions are required:

- 12.5.1 the Committee will determine whether the resulting revisions are to be considered as major or minor.
- 12.5.2 if major revisions are required, the Action Plan Response should be re-drafted by the Working Party, and then re-submitted to the Committee.
- 12.5.3 if the revisions required are minor, these are to be applied to the Action Plan Response by the Working Party.
- 12.6 The Course Re-accreditation Report, Course Review Panel Report and endorsed Action Plan Response are to be presented by the Vice Chancellor to the Academic Board to consider approval for course re-accreditation.
- 12.7 Upon receipt of the documents, Academic Board will either approve the renewal of course accreditation or request further documentation and/or revisions to the Action Plan Response. If revisions are required:
 - 12.7.1 the Academic Board will determine whether the resulting revisions are to be considered as major or minor.
 - 12.7.2 if major revisions are required, the Action Plan Response should be re-drafted by the Working Party, and then re-submitted to Academic Board.
 - 12.7.3 if the revisions required are minor, these are to be applied to the Action Plan Response by the Working Party and then submitted to the Chair of Academic Board for re-evaluation and approval.

13. PERIOD OF RE-ACCREDITATION

- 13.1 On approval, the Academic Board will confirm the renewed course accreditation cycle and expiry date. The period of re-accreditation is typically five years, however, may be shorter, or longer, up to a maximum of six years at the discretion of the Academic Board.

14. ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

- 14.1 Upon approval, the Academic Quality Office will action updates to the Master Course Information.
- 14.2 The Academic Quality Office will share a summary of the course re-accreditation decision with the Academic Office, Admissions, Advancement, Business Office, Library, and IT Services.

15. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (located with this procedure in the Policy Repository)

- Course Re-accreditation Report Template (Coursework Courses)
- Course Re-accreditation Report Template (HDR Courses)
- Guidelines regarding the HESF Standards
- Course Re-accreditation Report Endorsement Process Workflow
- Course Re-accreditation Approval Process Workflow
- Course Review Panel Report Template
- Course Review Panel Report Action Plan Response Template

Table of Amendments

Version Number	1.0	Replaces Version	NA
Implementation Date	1 February 2024	Scheduled Review Date	August 2028
Approving Body	Academic Board	Approval Date	30 August 2023
Policy Owner	Manager, Academic Quality and Standards	Date first introduced	February 2024
Short description of amendment	New procedure		