



Course Design and Development Policy and Procedures

Purpose

This Policy outlines the Central Institute of Technology and Innovation (the Institute) design and development requirements to assure the quality of its courses and units of study, through the incorporation of best practice principles in course design and development work and to ensure that the development of CITI higher education courses is conducted in accordance with industry needs, the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 and the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021.

Scope

This Policy applies to all courses and Units of Study at the Institute. It applies to courses being developed as new courses, and courses being reviewed within the institutional cycle of review.

Related Policies and Forms

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following Institute policies:

- Course Development Policy and Procedures
- Assessment Policy and Procedures
- Benchmarking Policy and Procedures
- Graduate Attributes Policy and Procedures

All documents referenced in this policy can be accessed via the CITI website.



Definitions

For the purpose of this Policy, the following definitions apply:

| Term | Definitions |
|---|--|
| Academic Leadership Team | Means the Academic Head and other senior academic leaders. |
| Academic Board (AB) | The Academic Board is the principal academic body of the Central Institute of Technology and Innovation that is responsible for approving academic proposals and for providing advice on academic policy, academic strategy, and academic standards. |
| Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) | The Australian Qualifications Framework is the national policy for regulated educational qualifications in Australia |
| Award | An award means the degree certification or diploma issued by the Institute indicating that the student has successfully completed a course of study |
| Board of Directors (Board) | The Board of Directors of the Central Institute of Technology and Innovation is responsible for the overarching governance and performance of the corporate affairs of the Institute, in accordance with all relevant Australian legislation and regulations |
| Course Advisory and Industry Committee (CAIC) | Course Advisory and Industry Committee is the Academic Board endorsed committee whose function is to ensure that the CITI courses are relevant, timely, and benchmarked against sector and industry standards |
| Course Development Committee (CDC) | Course Development Committee is the Academic Board endorsed committee whose function is to develop new courses |



| Term | Definitions |
|--|--|
| | and related course content. This is an <i>ad hoc</i> committee. |
| Constructive Alignment | Constructive alignment the alignment of the learning outcomes to the contents and assessment. This means that the components in the teaching system, especially the teaching methods used and the assessment tasks, are aligned to the learning activities assumed in the intended outcomes. |
| Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) | Course Learning Outcomes are the learner-focused statements of what students are expected to evidence or demonstrate upon completion of a course |
| Course of Study | Course of study is a structured series of academic units culminating in a higher education award |
| Course Review | Course review means the systematic triennial review of a course concerning the following academic areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Graduate outcomes• Course learning outcomes• Unit learning outcomes• Alignment with the AQF• Relevance and quality of content• Relevance and appropriateness of assessment• Teaching and learning quality• Resources and market responsiveness• Initiatives for enhancement of the course |
| Graduate Outcomes | Graduate attributes are the high-level qualities, skills and understandings that a student should gain as a result of the learning and experiences |



| Term | Definitions |
|--|--|
| The Institute | The Central Institute of Technology and Innovation including staff, affiliates, and contractors |
| Learning Management System (LMS) | The Learning Management System is used to monitor, provide, and deliver learning materials and resources, and record student learning outcomes and results |
| Study period | The Study Period means each twelve-week teaching period (semester), inclusive of teaching and exam period |
| Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) | The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) is the committee that monitors and reports on quality assurance processes for teaching and learning to ensure daily academic operations meet quality educational standards |
| TEQSA | Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency |
| Unit Learning Outcomes | Unit Learning Outcomes are statements of what a learner is expected to know, understand and be able to do at the end of a period of learning |
| Unit of Study | Unit of Study is a single component or subject that a student undertakes as part of a course of study |
| Course Design | Course Design refers to a process of iterative, collaborative design and constructive alignment of course Learning and Teaching Strategies to meet the needs of student learning; professional accreditation bodies; University Standards for courses; Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (3.1, 3.2, 3.3.1, 5.1.3, 5.3) and best practice curriculum design principles for quality. |



Policy Principles

The following principles apply to the design and development of all Institute courses and units:

Academic Quality

1. Curriculum is designed to be clear, developmentally appropriate, and engaging, ensuring compliance with the TEQSA threshold standards (2021).
2. Learning outcomes align with the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF).
3. Assessments are clearly linked to course outcomes.
4. Resources are managed efficiently and continually enhanced.

Relevance

1. Course design meets planned graduate and employment outcomes.
2. Course aligns with the Institute's mission and strategic priorities.

Viability

1. The course is cost-effective and sustainable.
2. The course aligns with the Institute's mission and strategic priorities.

Policy Statement

The Institute will develop higher education courses that meet the requirements of the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF), the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011, and the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 reflecting the Institute's status as an Institute of Higher Education registered with the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA).



1. Proposing a New Award Course

- 1.1 The development of higher education courses must follow the accepted processes as endorsed by the Academic Board and be consistent with the Institute's strategic directions, education and training profile, and educational philosophy and aims.
- 1.2 In developing a new higher education course, the Institute will consult with external stakeholders such as universities and non-university higher education providers, licensing bodies, industry partners, and other relevant stakeholders.
- 1.3 The Institute will only develop higher education programs where there is documented evidence of clear demand (either established or emerging) from Australian industry or the community.
- 1.4 The Institute will only develop higher education programs in specialised areas where there is evidence that the Institute can demonstrate that it has:
 - 1.4.1 The teaching staff with the academic and professional expertise, the overall academic leadership, the facilities, the student academic support, pastoral care and appropriate, up-to-date and accessible learning resources and information systems required to deliver the course.
 - 1.4.2 Support in the form of industry experts as members on Course Development Committees (CDC) and/or Course Advisory and Industry Committees (CAIC).
 - 1.4.3 Aligned the course proposal with the Higher Education Quality Framework, Higher Education Benchmarking Framework, and CITI Higher Education Policies.

2. Proposing a New Unit

On occasion, the need may arise to develop a new unit of study. New units may be proposed based on data gathered during ongoing review cycles. A new unit may be proposed if:

- 2.1 Current unit offerings do not meet the changing needs of students, which may result in archiving existing units.
- 2.2 New developments in a field or industry necessitate the development of new units and/or specialisations to meet evolving industry demands.
- 2.3 The CAIC, Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), and/or the Dean identify a gap in the current course structure.
- 2.4 All proposed new units must be reviewed by the LTC and approved by the



Academic Board.

- 2.5 The CAIC may be involved in the unit development process if deemed appropriate by the Academic Board.
- 2.6 The Dean or delegate is responsible for ensuring the new offering is warranted, relevant to the course, and can be mapped to the existing course learning outcomes.
- 2.7 The proposed Unit Outline must first be endorsed by the LTC and then approved by the Academic Board.
- 2.8 The Dean is responsible for allocating staff with appropriate skills and knowledge in the discipline area to develop the full unit materials.

Procedures

Each new course of study proposal will be developed and presented for approval to the Academic Board. This will be a four-stage process. The following procedures apply:

1. Stage 1 – Initial Approval and Endorsement

The first stage will involve an 'in-principle' approval of the course, with a particular evaluation of the type/level and discipline of the proposed course. The following apply:

- 1.1 The New Course Proposal template (appendix 1) must be completed and submitted to the Learning and Teaching Committee and then to the Academic Board for approval.
- 1.2 Approval from the Academic Board and endorsement from the Board of Directors (the Board) must be obtained before commencing the course development process, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.2.1 and 5.3.4).
- 1.3 As required and under the Terms of Reference established in the Governance Charter, an ad hoc Course Development Committee (CDC) will be established to develop the course and related materials. The Academic Board will approve the CDC membership, ensuring compliance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.1.3 and 5.3.4). The Dean will be the Chair of the CDC.
- 1.4 Where relevant, external members of the CDC will be sought to ensure that the proposed course has industry relevance, aligning with Learning



Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.1 and 1.4.2) and Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.1.2).

2. Stage 2 – Course Proposal and Course Specifications

Prior to developing a course, a robust course proposal and specifications must be submitted for review. The second stage will involve the development of the detailed course proposal and course specifications, setting out:

- 2.1 The qualification(s) to be awarded on completion, aligning with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
- 2.2 The structure, duration, and modes of delivery, ensuring compliance with Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.1.1).
- 2.3 The units of study (or equivalent) that comprise the course of study, in line with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
- 2.4 The entry requirements, exit pathways, articulation arrangements, pathways to further learning, and availability of the course to international students, ensuring alignment with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.2.3).
- 2.5 The expected course and unit learning outcomes, their sequence of attainment, methods of assessment, and indicative student workload. The proposal will specify learning outcomes consistent with the field of education and level of qualification, informed by national and international comparators, including discipline-related, generic, employment-related, and life-long learning outcomes (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standards 1.4.1 and 1.4.2).
- 2.6 The constructive alignment (curriculum mapping) matrix, demonstrating that assessment methods effectively confirm students' attainment of learning outcomes, show the progressive and coherent achievement of learning outcomes, and that grades awarded reflect such attainment (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.3) (Appendix 2).
- 2.7 The compulsory requirements for completion, in accordance with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
- 2.8 In the case of 'nested' course designs, clear entry and exit pathways, clear



learning outcomes for each exit point, and appropriate course design for each level (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standards 1.4.1 and 1.4.2).

- 2.9 Prospective student information that includes accurate and relevant information about the proposed course, clearly identifying qualification type, level, and field of discipline, including information relating to reasonable adjustments (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standard 5.2.3).
- 2.10 A description of how the course content and learning activities demonstrate a level of advanced knowledge and enquiry consistent with the level of study and expected learning outcomes, including current and emerging knowledge and concepts, and the theoretical framework behind the relevant academic discipline (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
- 2.11 Evidence of the conceptual basis of the course design, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.2.1).
- 2.12 An explanation of how the course structure fosters progressive and coherent achievement of expected learning outcomes throughout the course, regardless of the student's place of study or mode of delivery (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
- 2.13 An explanation of student access to teaching staff, learning resources, and student support, in accordance with Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.2.3).
- 2.14 The proposed course must be submitted to the LTC for an initial review. Any revisions must be made and re-submitted to the LTC prior to proceeding to the next step, ensuring compliance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.3.4).
- 2.15 The reviewed course proposal is submitted to the Academic Board for approval. Any revisions must be made and re-submitted to the Academic Board prior to proceeding to the next step (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standard 5.3.4).
- 2.16 The reviewed course proposal is submitted to the Board for endorsement (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).

3. Stage 3 – Course Development

The Course Development Committee (CDC) is responsible for developing the course and related materials, including unit outlines and full units, as required by TEQSA (as outlined in the TEQSA confirmed evidence tables). The development process involves



participation from various stakeholders, including Learning and Teaching experts, IT and eLearning experts, Library staff, discipline area experts (academic staff), and student representatives, ensuring alignment with Teaching (Domain 3, Standards 3.1.2 and 3.2.1), Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3), and Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.1.1 and 5.1.3).

Course Development Committee (CDC)

- 3.1 The CDC, under the direction of the Dean and Academic Board, will develop the course, unit outlines, and required unit materials.
- 3.2 The CDC will design the course, unit outlines, and relevant unit materials in accordance with applicable legislation and guidelines.
- 3.3 A Unit Development Template will be developed for each proposed unit (Appendix 3). This must include benchmarking as directed by the CDC.
- 3.4 The CDC will submit the course and unit outlines to the LTC for an initial review of content.
- 3.5 The CDC will submit the full unit content, as required by the regulatory body, to the LTC for approval.
- 3.6 The CDC will submit the course materials and unit outlines for review and approval to the Academic Board and the accompanying full unit content for endorsement.

Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC)

- 3.7 Under the direction of the Director of Learning and Teaching, the LTC will review and provide feedback on all course materials, including the course rationale, course structure, unit outlines, and full unit materials.
- 3.8 The LTC will approve full unit content.

Academic Board

- 3.9 Under the direction of the Chair of the Academic Board, the Academic Board will review and provide feedback on course materials and unit outlines.
- 3.10 The Academic Board will approve course materials and unit outlines.
- 3.11 The Academic Board may provide feedback on and endorse the full unit content.



Dean's Authority

The Dean, as the Academic Head and the most senior member of the Institute, holds the discretion to make decisions regarding unit outlines and unit content, ensuring alignment with the Unit Outline Policy and Procedures.

- 3.12 This includes final decisions on assessment-related matters such as assessment types, structures, weightings, and rubrics and resources, including information technology resources.
- 3.13 Provided that the course and unit outcomes are not modified, the Dean can approve these Unit of Study elements without the need for additional approval from the CDC, LTC, or Academic Board.
- 3.14 The Dean is responsible for reporting unit level changes to the CDC, LTC, and Academic Board as relevant.

4. Stage 4 – External Review and Revisions

All proposed courses must undergo independent external review before submission to the external regulatory body.

- 4.1 After obtaining approval from the Academic Board and addressing any requested revisions, the course will be submitted for independent external review, ensuring compliance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 4.2 Following the external review, the CDC and the Academic Board will review the feedback provided by the external reviewer, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 4.3 The Dean, CDC, and the Academic Board will develop a strategy to respond to the review, which may include:
 - 4.3.1 Revising units, unit outlines, and/or parts of units, ensuring alignment with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).
 - 4.3.2 Revising course and/or unit learning outcomes to meet quality standards and industry relevance, as per Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).
 - 4.3.3 Revising the justification and/or description of the course, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
 - 4.3.4 Addressing and responding to concerns related to staffing, student support, learning resources, accessibility, and other matters, in accordance with



Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.2.3) and Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).

- 4.3.5 Addressing and responding to any other feedback arising from the review, ensuring continuous improvement and alignment with TEQSA Threshold Standards (2021).
- 4.4 If necessary, the proposed course will undergo an additional cycle of external review before final submission to the external regulatory body, ensuring comprehensive quality assurance and compliance with TEQSA standards (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).

5. Stage 5 – Academic Board Approval and Board Endorsement

Prior to submission to the external regulatory body, the course and related materials must be approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Board.

- 5.1 The final course and related accreditation materials must be submitted for endorsement by the LTC.
- 5.2 The final course and related accreditation materials must be submitted for approval by the Academic Board.
- 5.3 The Academic Board is to review the revised course and is to recommend any final revisions.
- 5.4 The Board must endorse course and related materials prior to submission to submission to the external regulatory body.

6. Stage 6 – Responding to the Regulatory Body

Where the regulatory body has requested revisions or additional documentation, the Academic Board will have oversight of the response process. The following apply:

- 6.1 Where practicable, revisions will be made by Institute staff under the direction of the Dean.
- 6.2 Where it is deemed appropriate or where major revisions are required, the CDC will be reconstituted in order to response to the regulatory body.
- 6.3 During the period of review and until approval has been granted, students cannot be enrolled in the course or units.



Related Documents

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following related documents:

- [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021](#)
- [Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000](#)
- [Australian Qualifications Framework](#)

Change and Version Control

| Version | Date Approved | Authored by | Approved by | Description |
|---------|---------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| V1.0 | 23/06/2023 | Chief Executive Officer | Academic Board | Academic Policy |

Policy Information

| | |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Author | Chief Executive Officer |
| Policy owner | Academic Board |
| Approved by | Academic Board |
| Approval date | 23/06/2023 |
| Status | Approved (Current version) |
| Next review due | 23/06/2026 |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Name of Policy | Course Design and Development Policy and Procedures | |
| Version | V1.0 | |
| Policy: Academic | Date: 23/06/2023 | Status: Final ratified by the Academic Board on 23/06/2023 |

File: Course Design and Development Policy and Procedures_V1.0



Appendix 1: New Course Proposal Template

New Course Proposal

All new course proposals must follow the approved process to ensure academic quality and alignment with the Institute's strategic objectives.

Please carefully read and follow the instructions below:

1. Complete the Course Proposal Template

- Fill in each section of the template clearly and thoroughly.
- Ensure that the rationale, benchmarking, market analysis, course learning outcomes, and proposed units are well developed.
- Use accurate and up-to-date information, citing sources where necessary (e.g., labour market data, competitor benchmarking).
- Align course learning outcomes appropriately to the specified AQF level.

2. Seek Initial Peer Review (Optional but Recommended)

- Prior to formal submission, you are encouraged to seek feedback from colleagues within your discipline area.

3. Submit to the Learning and Teaching Committee

- Once completed, submit the New Course Proposal Template and any supporting documentation (e.g., benchmarking reports, consultation evidence) to the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) for initial review.
- The Committee will assess the proposal against academic standards, strategic fit, course design principles, and compliance requirements.

4. Respond to Feedback

- You may be required to revise or further develop your proposal based on LTC feedback.
- Resubmit the updated version to the LTC if requested.

5. Submission to the Academic Board

- Upon endorsement by the LTC, the final version of the proposal will be submitted to the Academic Board for formal approval.



- The Academic Board will review the proposal for academic integrity, quality assurance, and strategic alignment.

6. Final Approval

- No course may be offered, marketed, or advertised until it has received final approval from the Academic Board.
- Once approved, the course will be included in the Institute's official course offerings.

Important Notes:

- Incomplete proposals may be returned without review.
- Please adhere to the deadlines for submission to allow timely review and approval.
- If you require assistance in completing your proposal, please contact the Learning and Teaching

1. Course Title

(Insert the proposed course title here)

2. Field of Study

- (E.g., 02 – Information Technology, 04 – Architecture and Building)

Consult <https://www.tcsisupport.gov.au/resources/field-of-education-types>

3. AQF Level

- (E.g., AQF Level 7 – Bachelor Degree, AQF Level 9 – Masters Degree, etc.)

4. Rationale for the Course

(200 – 500 words)



- Industry Demand: (Outline trends or workforce needs driving demand for graduates in this field.)
- Educational Gap: (Identify any current gaps in educational offerings that this course would address.)
- Strategic Alignment: (Show how the course aligns with the Institute's mission, strategic goals, or national higher education priorities.)
- Stakeholder Consultation: (Briefly mention consultations with industry, students, or professional bodies, if applicable.)

5. Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs)

Graduates of this course will be able to:

1. (Example) Critically analyse and apply advanced theoretical knowledge in [discipline] to solve complex problems.
2. (Example) Communicate effectively to diverse audiences using a range of oral, written, and digital forms.
3. (Example) Apply ethical principles and demonstrate social responsibility in professional contexts.
4. (Example) Conduct independent research or project work using appropriate methodologies.
5. (Example) Lead and collaborate effectively in multidisciplinary and multicultural teams.

6. Example of Proposed Units of Study

Proposed Units of Study: (List a range of proposed units and describe any key features of the course i.e. internships or capstone units.)

7. Benchmarking

(200 – 500 words)



- National and International Comparators: (List 3-5 similar programs offered by Australian and international institutions. Summarise key points of similarity/difference.)
- Professional Standards and Accreditation: (If applicable, align course outcomes with relevant professional body standards and mention potential accreditation opportunities.)

8. Market Analysis

(200 – 500 words)

- Target Audience: (Domestic and/or international students; early career or mid-career professionals.)
- Employment Opportunities: (Main sectors and roles for graduates, with supporting data if possible.)
- Competitor Analysis: (Identify strengths or gaps in competitor offerings.)
- Market Demand Data: (Include statistics or research on student demand, job growth forecasts, or skill shortages.)
- Marketing Opportunities: (Outline key domestic and international markets for student recruitment.)

9. Staffing Requirements

(200 – 500 words)

- Brief outline of staffing requirements for the proposed course.



Appendix 2: Curriculum Mapping Template

Use this matrix to map the alignment between Graduate Attributes, Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs), Unit Learning Outcomes (ULOs), AQF Level Descriptors, and Assessments at a Unit level as part of the course development process. Each section should be completed to ensure comprehensive coverage and alignment across the course structure.

| | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| Unit Code | | | | | |
| Unit Name | | | | | |
| Graduate Attributes | Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) | Unit Learning Outcomes (ULOs) | AQF Level Requirements | Assessment Tasks | Assessment Type (e.g., Essay, Project, Exam) |
| (Example) Critical Thinking and Problem Solving | (Example) Apply critical thinking to complex problems in [discipline]. | (Example) Analyse case studies to identify key issues. | (Example) Demonstrates advanced cognitive, technical and creative skills (AQF Level 9). | (Example) Case Study Analysis Report | (Example) Written Report |

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Unit Code | | | | | |
| Unit Name | | | | | |
| Graduate Attributes | Course Learning | Unit Learning | AQF Level Requirements | Assessment Tasks | Assessment Type (e.g., |



| | Outcomes (CLOs) | Outcomes (ULOs) | | | Essay, Project, Exam) |
|--|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| (Example) Critical Thinking and Problem Solving | (Example) Apply critical thinking to complex problems in [discipline]. | (Example) Analyse case studies to identify key issues. | (Example) Demonstrates advanced cognitive, technical and creative skills (AQF Level 9). | (Example) Case Study Analysis Report | (Example) Written Report |

| Unit Code | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Unit Name | | | | | |
| Graduate Attributes | Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) | Unit Learning Outcomes (ULOs) | AQF Level Requirements | Assessment Tasks | Assessment Type (e.g., Essay, Project, Exam) |
| (Example) Critical Thinking and Problem Solving | (Example) Apply critical thinking to complex problems in [discipline]. | (Example) Analyse case studies to identify key issues. | (Example) Demonstrates advanced cognitive, technical and creative skills (AQF Level 9). | (Example) Case Study Analysis Report | (Example) Written Report |

| Unit Code | | | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| Unit Name | | | | | |
| Graduate Attributes | Course Learning | Unit Learning | AQF Level Requirements | Assessment Tasks | Assessment Type (e.g., |
| | | | | | |



| | Outcomes (CLOs) | Outcomes (ULOs) | | | Essay, Project, Exam) |
|--|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------|
| (Example) Critical Thinking and Problem Solving | (Example) Apply critical thinking to complex problems in [discipline]. | (Example) Analyse case studies to identify key issues. | (Example) Demonstrates advanced cognitive, technical and creative skills (AQF Level 9). | (Example) Case Study Analysis Report | (Example) Written Report |



Appendix 3: Unit Development Template

Unit Development Template

1. Unit Development Process and Deliverables

The Chair of the Course Development Committee (Chair) is the point of contact for matters relating to the development of unit outlines and/or full units. The Chair will approve the final version the unit outline and/or full unit materials. There is an expectation that unit developers will commit to the full process.

Unit Development Deliverables

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| Unit Outlines | Indicative deliverables CDC to review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Completed TEQSA unit outline template• Completed benchmarking exercise |
| Full Units | Indicative deliverables CDC to review <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 12 x 1 hour lectures PPTS• 12 x 2 hour tutorials PPTS• 1 unit outlines• 3 x assessments descriptions• 3 x assessment rubrics• 3 x assessment marking guides• Completed benchmarking exercise |

2. Unit Details

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Unit Name | |
| Unit Code | |
| Unit Level | <input type="checkbox"/> 100 Level <input type="checkbox"/> 200 Level <input type="checkbox"/> 300 Level <input type="checkbox"/> 400 Level <input type="checkbox"/> 500 Level |
| AQF Level | |
| Unit Type | <input type="checkbox"/> Core <input type="checkbox"/> Specialisation |



| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Pre-Requisites | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes List <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Discipline Area | If known |

3. Unit Description

3.1 Benchmarking

Please ensure that you complete the benchmarking spreadsheet for your unit/s. Please aim to benchmark your unit against three other external units. It is worthwhile looking at both university and private higher education providers. We will need this information for our submission to TEQSA.

3.2 General Description

In your own words, describe what the unit is about. That is, if you had to tell a student about this unit, how would you describe it to them?

3.3 Unit value

In your own words, explain why the unit is important in the scope of the degree. That is, why should students complete this unit?

3.4 Unit Type

Some units provide a basic introduction to a topic, some units are more practical, some units are more theoretical, some units are all about consolidation of knowledge through research or a project. In your own words, describe what type of unit this is and why?



3.5 Main Skills

What are the main practical skills that a student should learn during this unit?

3.6 Main points

What are the main points or key knowledge that a student should learn about during this unit?

3.7 Main theories

What are the main theories, if relevant, or key readings that a student should learning about during this unit?



3.8 Threshold Concepts

Are there any threshold concepts in this unit that you need a student to focus on, understand, and/or master? A Threshold Concept is like passing through a door or conceptual gateway, in that once a student passes through the door they have access to previously inaccessible ways of thinking about something. Dig a little deeper into the world of Threshold Concepts [here](#).

3.9 Main academic skills

What are the main academic skills that a student will need to use during this unit? For example, does a student need to write a report, does a student need to find literature on a database, does a student need to be able to generate code, does a student need to reference material that they are using in their work, or does a student need to be able to communicate to peers or stakeholders?

4. Student Learning Outcomes

Thinking about a typical student in your class, what are three to five main skills, pieces of knowledge, theories, or attributes that a student should have by the time they finish your unit. These things should be measurable through assessment.

Unit Learning Goals

| Goals | Can this be measured? |
|-------|-----------------------|
| | |
| | |



| | |
|--|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Unit Learning Outcomes

Have a look at Workshop 1. This is on the development of Learning Outcomes. Write your goals as learning outcomes. These will need to be revised to ensure that they are relevant to the Graduate Attributes and Course Learning Outcomes.

| Learning Outcome | Description |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



5. Graduate Attributes

Have a look at the CITI Graduate Attributes in the table below. Which of the attributes are covered and can be assessed in your unit? Note that you do not need to cover all of the Graduate Attributes, and, in some units, you will only cover one or two attributes.

| Domain | Attributes | Yes or No |
|---|--|-----------|
| Deep Knowledge of Discipline and Industry | GA1. Equipped with deep and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of their discipline and industry, with the ability to engage with different traditions of thought, and the ability to apply their knowledge across multi-professional and multi-disciplinary contexts. | |
| Social and Ethical Awareness | GA2. Socially accountable, and ethically aware global citizens whose personal values and practices are consistent with their roles as responsible members of a sustainable society. | |
| Innovative, Creative and Transformative Problem Solving | GA3. Effective and transformative problems-solvers, able to apply innovative, critical, creative, and evidence-based thinking to produce innovative responses to future challenges. | |
| Communication and Teamwork | GA4. Able to convey ideas and information appropriately and effectively to a range of audiences for a range of purposes and contribute in a positive and collaborative manner to achieving common goals. | |
| Professionalism and Leadership | GA5. Engaged in professional behaviour with the capability to be intrapreneurial and entrepreneurial and to take leadership roles in their chosen careers and communities. | |
| Resilience and Self-Awareness | GA6. resilient and self-aware; flexible and reflective and have the capacity to act with integrity and take responsibility for their actions. | |



6. Course Learning Outcomes

Have a look at the BIT Course Learning Outcomes in the table below. Which of the attributes are covered and can be assessed in your unit? As with the Graduate Attributes, in some units, you may only cover one or two of the outcomes.

| Course Learning Outcome | Yes or No |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

7. Main Activities

Thinking about your unit, what would be some of the key activities that a student could “do” in your class to learn about the topic. Noting that the classes should be designed to be face-to-face; however, there is an expectation that there will be online activities developed to compliment the in-class learning activities.

All classes should be interactive!

The more students “do” the more they “learn”. That is, what activities can you design to enable a student to plan, design, redesign, build, discuss, create, or evaluate? You want at least 10 to 12 activities that students can “do” across the course of a teaching period. The more the better!

Here are some verbs to help you.



| Knowledge | Comprehension | Application | Analysis | Synthesis | Evaluation |
|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| define/state | classify | apply | analyze | arrange | appraise |
| identify | describe | compute | appraise | assemble | assess |
| indicate | discuss | construct | calculate | collect | choose |
| know | explain | demonstrate | categorize | compose | compare |
| label | express | dramatize | compare | construct | contrast |
| list/label | identify | employ | contrast | create | decide |
| memorize | locate | give examples | criticize | design | estimate |
| name | paraphrase | illustrate | debate | formulate | evaluate |
| recall | recognize | interpret | determine | manage | grade |
| record | report | investigate | diagram | organize | judge |
| relate | restate | operate | differentiate | perform | measure |
| duplicate | review | organize | distinguish | plan | rate |
| select | suggest | practice | examine | prepare | revise |
| underline | summarize | predict | experiment | produce | score |
| tell | translate | inspect | propose | select | argue |
| translate | cite | inventory | set up | value | critique |
| sketch | question | articulate | infer | model | interpret |
| read | distinguish | assess | solve | perform | criticize |
| use | solve | collect | test | integrate | defend |

Adapted from California State University, Bakersfield, PACT Outcomes Assessment Handbook (1999)

Student Learning Tasks

| | Task | Constructive Alignment | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|
| | | Learning Outcome | Course Learning Outcome | Graduate Attribute | Assessment |
| 1 | Things that students can do in my unit | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |



| | Task | Constructive Alignment | | | |
|----|------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 6 | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | |



| | Task | Constructive Alignment | | | |
|----|------|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 12 | | | | | |



8. Measuring Learning

Looking back at the type of unit that you are doing (e.g., skills, practical, or theoretical), thinking about your student learning goals, the graduate attributes, and course learning outcomes, how best can you measure student learning?

Some of your tasks during the teaching period should just be formative (to help you and the student to see their areas of strength and the gaps in their knowledge or skills), and some of your tasks should be summative (a graded task that measures engagement with the learning outcomes).

Here, we are looking at the summative tasks that may end up being your unit assessments.



Look also at the types of activities that you think will help students to learn in your unit. Often, an assessment does not match the unit, so if you have a practical unit, an exam may not work well. Similarly, if you have a theoretical unit, a group presentation will not encourage deep learning.

1. General Assessment Information

- **Number of assessments.** Where practicable, no more than 3 pieces of assessment
- **Maximum weighting.** No single piece of assessment should be weighted at more than 40% of the unit assessment weighting.
- **First Teaching Period, First year.** First teaching period, first year, first assessments should provide an opportunity for feedback or re-submission if the student fails to achieve the learning outcomes.

2. Group Work

It is acknowledged that teamwork is both a Graduate Attribute and a Course Learning Outcome.

- **Group activities versus group assessment marks.** Group activities in class and online are encouraged. However, if you set group assessment tasks, students should be able to receive individual marks rather than group marks.
- **Individual contributions to groups assessments.** Each unit must have the majority of the marks allocated for individual contributions. This should be a cumulative unit individual mark of at least 60%.



- **Peer feedback versus peer grading.** Peer grading and/or peer marking cannot be used to grade students. Peer marks can only be used for formative feedback.

3. Engagement With the Process (EPA)

- **First year EPA.** All first-year class should have an engagement assessment that is worth 20% of the class marks. This is to encourage students to engage with their own learning. Think, rather, about what type of task will encourage a student to achieve their best learning outcomes. As such, think about how this assessment will prepare a student for the workplace.
- **Upper-level EPA.** Upper-level units may also have an EPA where relevant to the learning outcomes.

4. Quizzes

Quizzes should be used for self-assessment rather than graded assessment.

- **Avoid textbook generated quizzes as assessment.** Where possible avoid textbook based quizzes as a form of assessment.

5. Exams

The use of project-based or other forms of assessment are preferred over end of teaching period exams.

- **No exams in first year.** Exams in first year (100-level) units should be avoided. If you set an exam, it cannot be worth more than 30% of the unit weighting in first year.
- **Upper-level exams.** In the upper-level units, exams cannot be weighted at more than 40% of the unit weighting. Again, avoid exams where possible in favour of project-based assessments.

Draft Assessments

| Type of Task | Week | Attributes and Course Learning Outcomes measured | Weighting |
|--------------|------|--|-----------|
| | | | |



| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

9. What is your vision for the unit?

Think about the best version of the unit. That is what we are going for... a unit that you are happy to teach and that students enjoy attending. Look back on everything that you have covered in this template. What is your vision for the unit?