



Course and Unit Review Policy and Procedures

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to define and outline the Central Institute of Technology and Innovation's (the Institute) course review process. This policy articulates the evaluation and review cycle that facilitates systematic monitoring and improvements to ensure the Institute maintains academic quality, academic integrity, and financially viable courses.

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 Documents

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

- Course Development Policy and Procedures
- Course and Unit Archiving 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.



Definition of Key Terms

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

Term	Definition
Academic Leadership Team	Means the Dean 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
Constructive Alignment	Constructive alignment is an outcomes-based approach to teaching in which the learning outcomes that students are intended to achieve are defined before teaching takes place. This means that the components in the teaching system, especially the teaching methods used,



Term	Definition
	learning tasks, 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
Regular Unit Review	Regular Unit Review means a review of the main unit details. This is a light-touch review.
In-Depth Unit Review	In-Depth Unit Review means a deep review of the unit. This may include a review of unit learning outcomes, unit assessment, and unit structure.
External Comparison	External comparison refers to the process of systematically evaluating the quality, performance, and outcomes of a course of study or its components against comparable programs offered by other higher education providers. This process is



Term	Definition
	<p>used to ensure that the course meets sector standards and supports continuous improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• External comparison may include, but is not limited to:• Benchmarking learning outcomes, assessment tasks, and grading standards.• Comparing student progression, attrition, and completion rates.• Referencing curriculum content, teaching methods, and graduate outcomes; and• Engaging in peer review with external academic or industry experts.
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
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 (trimester), 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,



Term	Definition
	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
Moderation	Moderation is a process whereby academic staff responsible for assessment in a course or unit reach consensus about levels of student performance in relation to a set of agreed standards. Moderation enables judgments made by different staff involved in assessing student performance to be compared and either confirmed or adjusted.

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. All courses and units are externally benchmarked to ensure they meet sector standards for academic quality, learning outcomes, assessment practices, and student performance.
3. Learning outcomes align with the Australian Qualification Framework (AQF).
4. Assessments are clearly linked to course outcomes.
5. 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 is committed to a planned, systematic review of all courses, aligning with benchmarking practices and the TEQSA Threshold Standards (2021) domains, particularly focusing on Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1), Teaching (Domain 3), and Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5). This includes:

1. Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1): ensuring that learning outcomes are appropriate and achievable (Standard 1.4.2), and that assessment tasks are designed to measure student achievement of learning outcomes (Standard 1.4.3).
2. Teaching (Domain 3): maintaining that the educational design and content of each course of study are appropriate and effective (Standard 3.1.2) and ensuring teaching staff are appropriately qualified and supported (Standards 3.2.1 and 3.2.3).
3. Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5): implementing regular review and improvement processes for courses (Standard 5.3.4) and ensuring continuous quality improvement (Standard 5.4.1).
4. External Review and Comparison (Domain 5): ensuring that all courses and units are subject to external referencing and benchmarking against comparable courses of study at other higher education providers, including learning outcomes, assessment methods, student performance, and graduate outcomes (Standard 5.3.1, Standard 5.3.4).



Levels of Course Review

1. Unit Moderation

- 1.1 At the end of each teaching period, all units must undergo an End of Unit Moderation process, aligning with TEQSA's focus on ensuring quality and standards.
- 1.2 The Director of Learning and Teaching oversees the moderation process and reports to the Dean (Dean) and the Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) on the outcomes of the trimester moderation process, as per Institutional Quality Assurance standards (Domain 5, Standard 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 1.3 Moderation practices must include:
 - 1.3.1 Reviewing assessment tasks in relation to course objectives, student workload, and, where applicable, professional accreditation requirements, to ensure assessments are appropriate and achievable (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.2).
 - 1.3.2 Reviewing learning and teaching practices to ensure consistent, valid, and reliable judgements about student performance in relation to learning outcomes within and across units and courses (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.3).
 - 1.3.3 Reviewing how assessments are moderated during the teaching period to ensure consistency and validity in marking, including practices such as double marking, blind marking, peer marking, and/or panel marking (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.3).
 - 1.3.4 Reviewing how marks and grades are reviewed to maintain accuracy and fairness in student assessment (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standard 1.4.3).



- 1.3.5 Reviewing the quality of feedback provided to students to ensure it is constructive and helps improve learning outcomes (Teaching, Domain 3, Standard 3.1.2).
- 1.3.6 Summarising the unit to identify areas that worked well and areas for potential review, promoting continuous improvement (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standard 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 1.4 The Director of Learning and Teaching will report to the LTC and the Academic Board on the outcomes of the Unit Moderation process.

2. Tier 1: Unit Review

- 2.1 The Director of Learning and Teaching has oversight of the Unit Review process. Once collated, the results are reported to the Dean and the LTC, ensuring compliance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 2.2 All units are reviewed after each study period and utilise both teacher and student feedback. Unit Coordinators complete a moderation of unit form at the end of each study period, and students are asked to complete a Student Evaluation of Teaching and Unit (SETU) survey for each unit studied in the final weeks of the study period. This aligns with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standard 1.4.3) and Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.1.2).
- 2.3 Unit Reviews focus on minor adjustments to unit content, assessments, and learning resources, including assessment timing and weighting. These adjustments are designed to ensure consistency across the entire course in the learning and assessment process for all students, and to maintain currency with discipline developments and learning resources (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).
- 2.4 All courses of study must have detailed unit outlines available online for student access at the time any new or amended units of study are open for



student enrolment, in accordance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.2.1).

2.5 The Director of Learning and Teaching will report to the LTC and the Academic Board on the outcomes of the Unit Review process.

3. Tier 2: Course Review/Benchmarking and External Review

3.1 All courses are reviewed annually under the guidance of the Director of Learning and Teaching and the Dean, in line with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).

3.2 The Course Advisory and Industry Committee (CAIC), comprising external practitioners and education subject specialists, reviews the course and Unit Review feedback for fitness, currency, focus, and appropriate industry topics. Additionally, the Dean may instigate a curriculum or course delivery benchmarking activity to compare aspects of the course design and/or delivery with comparable courses, ensuring alignment with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).

3.3 The Tier 2 review process may necessitate more significant adjustments, such as revisions to Course and Unit Learning Outcomes, adjustments at the unit level, or modifications to the assessment structure across the course. These adjustments do not constitute a full course review and restructure but are considered significant modifications to content and assessments. Constructive Alignment with the Course Learning Outcomes must be maintained (Learning Outcomes and Assessment, Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3).

3.4 All Tier 2 outcomes must be endorsed by the LTC and reported to the Academic Board, in accordance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.3.4).



- 3.5 The Director of Learning and Teaching will report to the LTC and the Academic Board on the outcomes of the Course Review process, ensuring continuous quality improvement and compliance with TEQSA standards (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 3.6 As part of the Tier 2 review, external benchmarking must be undertaken under the Direction of the Director of Learning and Teaching using publicly available national or international data sources, such as the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT), Department of Education data sets, or comparable higher education provider websites. This external referencing ensures that the course content, structure, assessment design, graduate outcomes, and delivery approach remain relevant, competitive, and aligned with current market expectations and sector standards (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standard 5.3.1, Standard 5.3.4).

4. Tier 3: Full Course Review

- 4.1 A full course review is undertaken every five years or before reaccreditation (whichever is first). This will be done under the direction of the Director of Learning and Teaching and the Dean, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1). All course components are reviewed, including:
 - 4.1.1 Content
 - 4.1.2 Results (including historical marks) and progression data
 - 4.1.3 Student and teacher feedback
 - 4.1.4 Graduate Attributes
 - 4.1.5 Course and Unit Learning Outcomes
 - 4.1.6 Mode of delivery
 - 4.1.7 Delivery method (e.g., lecture vs practical)
 - 4.1.8 Course structure



- 4.1.9 Professional and/or industry developments
- 4.1.10 Course fees and associated delivery and resource costs
- 4.2 Feedback from previous CAIC meetings must be addressed along with any other relevant information required by TEQSA to ensure a comprehensive course review. This ensures compliance with Learning Outcomes and Assessment (Domain 1, Standards 1.4.2 and 1.4.3) and Teaching (Domain 3, Standard 3.1.2).
- 4.3 Benchmarking, consultation with external industry experts, and an independent (external) expert review are requirements of the reaccreditation process, aligning with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 4.4 As part of the full course review, external comparisons must be conducted using publicly available data sources such as the Quality Indicators for Learning and Teaching (QILT), Department of Education higher education statistics, and course and unit outlines published by comparable higher education providers. This ensures that course quality, structure, outcomes, delivery methods, and assessment practices remain relevant, competitive, and responsive to developments in the sector and expectations in the broader academic and professional landscape (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standard 5.3.1, Standard 5.3.4).
- 4.5 Detailed unit outlines for each course subject to reaccreditation must be provided to external experts, including the CAIC. The results of the external review must be reported to the LTC and the Academic Board (Institutional Quality Assurance, Domain 5, Standards 5.3.4 and 5.4.1).
- 4.6 If the Tier 3 review is part of a course reaccreditation process, the reviewed course must be approved by the Academic Board and endorsed by the Board of Directors before the application for reaccreditation is submitted, in accordance with Institutional Quality Assurance (Domain 5, Standard 5.2.1 and 5.3.4).



Procedures

The following procedures apply:

1. End of Unit Moderation

- 1.1 End of Unit moderation activities typically involve the Unit Coordinator undertaking a review of a unit after the submission of the final unit assessment. This is an iterative process that should encourage reflection on the quality of the unit material, assessment items, and rubrics or marking criteria.
- 1.2 Moderation of a Unit should occur promptly following the submission of the final assessment and should not significantly delay the provision of results or feedback to students.
- 1.3 Moderation of a Unit must cover all assessment tasks. The Unit Coordinator can request feedback from the teaching staff on the relevance of the assessment, links to learning outcomes, student feedback, and student grades. This feedback cannot be used as part of staff planning and performance management.
- 1.4 The Unit Coordinator must collect a sample of each of the assessment tasks in all grade ranges (e.g., Fail, Pass, Credit, Distinction, High Distinction). Quiz style assessments, physical artefacts, and presentations do not need to be collected. All assessments must be deidentified.
- 1.5 Marks or grades must not be altered as a result of the End of Unit Moderation process.
- 1.6 The Unit Coordinator will complete the Unit Moderation Form (appendix 1) and will submit the completed form along with the sample of the graded assessments to the Director of Learning and Teaching.
- 1.7 The Director of Learning and Teaching is responsible for the archiving of the completed forms and assessments.



- 1.8 The Director of Learning and Teaching will be responsible for actioning any relevant feedback arising from the End of Unit Moderation process.

2. Tier 1: Unit Review

- 2.1 The Dean and ALT, under the guidance of the Director of Learning and Teaching, will assess the quality of each unit at the end of each study period after analysing the following information: student performance and satisfaction data, variations in delivery locations, benchmarking, moderation meeting feedback, teacher feedback, and changes in industry practices since the last delivery, if applicable.
- 2.2 Minor unit changes will be proposed by the ALT (e.g., timing of assessments, weighting of assessments, clarifying of wording in the unit outline) to improve the unit, based on the information determined above.
- 2.3 The LTC may modify the recommended changes or suggest other changes to the details of the unit to maintain unit quality and to maximise student experience.

3. Tier 2: Course Review/Benchmarking Review

- 3.1 The CAIC will be convened annually by the Dean to assess the suitability and currency of the existing course in providing graduates for the respective industry.
- 3.2 The CAIC may recommend any necessary changes, although changes may be limited by the decisions of the LTC.
- 3.3 Regular benchmarking and external review activities should be completed by the ALT and CAIC (if applicable), under the guidance of the Director of Learning and Teaching, before changes are proposed to a unit or course of study.
- 3.4 Changes proposed by a CAIC or benchmarking review which are outside the normal scope of the LTC may be addressed via a purpose-developed



CAIC and LTC process review before the final proposal is submitted to the Academic Board

3.5 All review outcomes are reported by the Responsible Director of Learning and Teaching to the AB.

4. Tier 3: Full Course Review

4.1 The Dean will table the Tier 3 Course Review at the appropriate LTC and AB meetings for monitoring and review. (See appendix 4 for full process). The Director of Learning and Teaching and the Dean will establish a working party to undertake a comprehensive review of the course. The working party will review all units on scope within a course, including:

- 4.1.1 Course structure, design, content, and mode(s) of delivery.
- 4.1.2 Expected Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and alignment with Unit Learning Outcomes.
- 4.1.3 Outcome assessments and methods and student learning outcome achievement.
- 4.1.4 Emerging developments in the field of education (discipline).
- 4.1.5 Changing needs of students.
- 4.1.6 Identified risks to the quality of the course of study.
- 4.1.7 Identification of how to successfully develop and deliver the CLOs, including how this learning is scaffolded during delivery, and how it is best divided between the relevant units of delivery.

4.2 The Dean and the Director of Learning and Teaching will identify which units require a Regular Unit Review (Appendix 2) and which units require an In-Depth Review (appendix 3).

4.3 The Director of Learning and Teaching will undertake an external comparison of the units and course as part of the In-Depth Review.



- 4.4 The working party will revise all units and will submit the revised content with the appropriate documentation (Appendix 2 and Appendix 3) to the Director of Learning and Teaching and the Dean to review for completeness.
- 4.5 The Dean will submit the revised course content to the CAIC to provide feedback on the revised course structure and content, industry practices, and the suitability of the course to provide graduates for industry. As required, the units will be further revised to ensure that they address the feedback of the CAIC.
- 4.6 The Director of Learning and Teaching is responsible for managing the register of unit changes as per course accreditation requirements.
- 4.7 The Dean will present the findings from CAIC reports to the LTC, which will form part of the Teaching and Learning reporting to the AB.
- 4.8 The Dean, under the guidance of the AB, will engage an external reviewer.
- 4.9 The Dean will submit the course for external review.
- 4.10 The Dean and the Chair of the AB will address the feedback from the external reviewer.
- 4.11 After the full course review process, the LTC will endorse the revised course which will then be presented to the AB for approval.
- 4.12 The Chair of the AB will notify the Board of the intention to submit to the regulatory bodies, and, where deemed necessary, may review components of the documentation prior to submission (Appendix 4).

5. Responsibilities

- 5.1 **Director of Learning and Teaching:** The Director of Learning and Teaching is responsible for the End of Unit Moderation and all related processes. This includes reporting to the Dean, LTC, and the AB. Ensuring that Unit Moderation processes are compliant as per the relevant Policies and Plans.



Unit Review and all related processes. This includes reporting to the Dean, LTC, and the AB. Course Review and all related processes. This includes reporting to the Dean, LTC, and the AB.

- 5.2 **Dean (Academic Head):** The Dean responsible for the courses. This includes course delivery, assessment, staffing, unit content, and learning materials which are relevant, current, and appropriate to the course AQF level. The Dean reports to the LTC on teaching and learning resources and proposed changes to currently accredited courses of study resulting from course reviews. Teaching staff can provide recommendations for course reviews to the Dean for consideration. The Dean reports to the LTC and AB on the findings of course reviews and any proposals for change at their scheduled meetings. Unit reviews and course reviews, and any subsequent proposals for change are informed by benchmarking, key stakeholder feedback and external input through expert academic, industry, and staff consultation.
- 5.3 **Academic Board and Learning and Teaching Committee:** The Academic Board and the Learning and Teaching Committee are responsible for the oversight of course quality. The Dean and staff involved in course delivery are responsible for daily academic operations and implementation of course review activities. The LTC will review course content for currency and relevancy in conjunction with the findings of unit and course reviews and proposals for change, including learning outcomes, learning materials, staffing and facilities. Where the LTC endorses a course change, it will present the same to the AB for consideration and approval.
- 5.4 **Review of Learning and Teaching Resources:** The Institute is committed to the regular and systematic review and development of learning and information resources and commits to providing: Relevant learning materials, including software, electronic books or other learning materials. Access to learning resources through the library resources. Access to prescribed texts and a selection of recommended readings for all units of study.



Related Legislation

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
1.0	23/06/2023	Chief Executive Officer	Academic Board	Academic Policy

Policy Information

Author	Chief Executive Officer
Responsible Officer	Academic Board
Approved by	Academic Board
Approval date	23/06/2023
Status	Approved (Current Version)
Next review due	23/06/2027

Name of Policy	Course and Unit Review Policy and Procedure	
Version	V1.0	
Policy: Academic	Date: 23/06/2023	Status: Final ratified by the Academic Board 23/06/2023

File: Course and Unit Review Policy and Procedures_V1.0



Appendix 1: Unit Moderation Form

Purpose

The purpose of unit moderation is to ensure that there is an ongoing review of units. This ongoing compliance and quality assurance process is part of the Institute's commitment to a quality learning and teaching experience. Unit Coordinators must submit this form and associated documents to Learning and Teaching prior to the confirmation of grades at the end of each teaching period.

Instructions

Unit coordinators are to:

- 1.1 Fully complete all sections of this form.
- 1.2 Ensure that samples of moderated assessment at a range of grades (fail, pass, credit, distinction, and high distinction) and corresponding marked rubrics are to be submitted with the form.
- 1.3 Submit completed forms and associated documents to the Director, Learning and Teaching.

Unit Moderation

Section 1 – Unit Overview

Unit Details	
Unit code and unit name	
Teaching Period	
Course level	<input type="checkbox"/> Undergraduate <input type="checkbox"/> Postgraduate
Unit coordinator	
Date submitted	

Section 2 – Unit Outline General Information

Please check for consistency across the Unit Outline documents.

Unit Outline General Information Review



Unit Outline

- General information was updated.
- Contact details were updated.
- Learning outcomes match the master document.
- Assessment schedule was complete and updated.
- Weightings were accurate and match the master document.
- All weightings added up to 100%.
- No more than 3 assessment items.
- Submission dates were updated.
- Resources were accurate and could be accessed by staff and students.
- Library resources were within an acceptable range (i.e., within 5 years for the majority of resources unless a seminal text or theory).
- Trimester schedule was updated.

Comments: Note any areas of concern with the unit outline.

Section 3 – Post Trimester (Unit Coordinator to complete)

In this section, please provide any feedback that can be used to enable this cycle of improvement.

Post-Trimester Review	
<p>General</p> <p>Guiding Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Were there any concerns about study load? (e.g. high number of extension requests, student feedback, or staff feedback)2. Were there any concerns about academic integrity?3. Were there any concerns about assessments with high failure rates? (e.g. assessment instructions confusing, assessment too difficult)4. Was the content relevant to the learning outcomes and unit assessment?	



Assessment Moderation Guiding Questions: 1. How did you moderate your assessments?	
Assessment Reflection Guiding Questions: 1. What aspects of the assessment process worked? 2. Did not work? 3. Need to be changed? 4. Any recommended changes to the assessments?	
Unit Reflection and Changes Guiding Questions: 1. What is your feedback on the unit? 2. Do you recommend that we make changes to the unit? This information will help with the course review. This can include anything (e.g., timetabling, level of difficulty, assessment, format, student engagement, highlights, and challenges).	

Section 4 – Learning and Teaching (Director Learning and Teaching, or delegate, to complete)

In this section, please outline any observations or recommendations that can be used to enable this cycle of improvement.

Learning and Teaching Comment	
Recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> No unit revisions required <input type="checkbox"/> Minor unit revisions required <input type="checkbox"/> Major unit revisions required



Note that this does not include updating resources and library materials to ensure currency.	
Director of Learning and Teaching, or delegate	
Date	



Appendix 2: Regular Unit Review Form

Section 1: Attached Documents

<input type="checkbox"/>	Unit Outline
<input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant page/s from Course Handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student Evaluation of Teaching and Unit Surveys (available from the Director of Learning and Teaching)
<input type="checkbox"/>	External Review Data Tables and Summary

Section 2: Unit Evaluation

1. How well is the unit meeting its stated learning outcomes?

2. What are the strengths and weaknesses of the unit?

3. What actions have been implemented in response to SETU feedback and how have these been received by the students?

4. Are there specific issues to be considered?

(Possible sources of identification could include the Unit Coordinator, teaching team, student feedback, moderation forms, and accreditation reports.)

Section 3: Recommendations / Actions

1. What recommendations / actions have arisen from this review?

Section 4: Approval

(Submitted by Unit Reviewer)



Name of Unit reviewer	Click here to enter reviewer position title.
sign:	date:

Approved by Director of Learning and Teaching:

Click here to enter name of Chair.
sign: date:

Approved by Dean:

Click here to enter name of Head of School.
sign: date:



Appendix 3: In-Depth Unit Review Form

Section 1: Attached Documents

<input type="checkbox"/>	Unit Outline
<input type="checkbox"/>	Relevant page/s from Unit Handbook
<input type="checkbox"/>	Student Evaluation of Teaching and Unit (SETU)
<input type="checkbox"/>	External Review Data Tables and Summary

Section 2: Unit Evaluation

2.1 The Unit in context of its program/s

Unit aims and objectives

Do the current aims and objectives of the Unit reflect the Unit content and the aims and objectives of the program/s? How is this achieved? Consideration also needs to be given to the relevance of the Unit curriculum to students and employers.

Graduate attributes (see attached Unit Outline)

Do students have the opportunity to acquire the graduate attributes identified in the Unit Outline?

2.2 Teaching methods and learning activities & resources

Learning and teaching methods (see attached Unit Outline)

Are the learning and teaching methods used relevant? Briefly describe any innovations and/or improvements in teaching methods and learning activities introduced to the Unit since the last review (example: online exercises; podcasts).



Learning resources

Are the learning resources current and relevant? To what extent is technology-enhanced learning used in the Unit and is the currency of the material maintained?

Inclusive teaching

What are the teaching strategies and delivery modes used in this Unit to ensure the needs of students with different learning styles and/or from culturally diverse backgrounds are addressed? How are allowances for students with disabilities incorporated?

Research

Describe the teaching methods used in this Unit to develop students' research skills.

Internationalisation

Outline the components of the Unit curriculum that provide a global or international perspective (example: international case study; lectures from visiting overseas academics).

Industry

Outline the components of the Unit curriculum that provide an industry perspective (example: industry links, guest speakers, or authentic case studies).

2.3 Assessment

Design and process

Are the learning outcomes of the Unit reflected in the assessment components?
Describe how this is done.

Quality Assurance

What quality assurance processes are used in the assessment of students' work?
(Example: marking schemas; external moderation; double marking of low scoring papers)



Feedback on assessed work

Briefly outline the ways feedback on assessed work is given to students participating in this Unit.

Plagiarism and cheating

What strategies are used to identify and address any plagiarism and cheating issues in this Unit?

2.4 Staff and Student Unit evaluation

Staff Feedback

Attach feedback from staff. If there are areas of concern, how will these be addressed?

Student Feedback

Give a summary of the most informative and useful feedback from students through the Unit SETUs or moderation, referring to any action taken as a result. (Student focus groups can also be used to obtain additional feedback.)

Methods of Evaluation

Briefly outline any other methods used to assess the quality of this Unit, e.g., peer review, stakeholder input and describe the outcome of the assessment.

2.5 Benchmarking

Benchmarked Institutions

List the benchmarked institutions. Benchmark against Go8 universities or most reputable or appropriate university or higher education providers in field. (Example: contact colleagues in field; exchange Unit outlines.)



Learning and Teaching Material

Compare the topics covered, learning and teaching material utilised, and assessment and teaching methods used.

Good Practice

How do the Unit standards compare to other universities? Is there any good practice that we can adapt from other Higher Education Providers (e.g. information gathered from benchmarking)?

Section 3: Overview & Recommendations

3.1 Overall Conclusion

Describe your conclusions of the overall structure and value of the Unit.

3.2 Summary of recommendations for action as a result of the review

List the specific actions that have been identified in order to enhance the quality of the Unit.

Section 4: Approval

Submitted by Unit Reviewer:

Click here to enter name of unit reviewer sign:	Click here to enter reviewer position title. date:
--	---

Additional Reviewer (if applicable):

Click here to enter name of unit reviewer sign:	Click here to enter reviewer position title. date:
--	---



Approved by Director of Learning and Teaching:

[Click here to enter name of Director of Learning and Teaching](#)
sign: _____ date: _____

Approved by Dean:

[Click here to enter name of Dean](#)
sign: _____ date: _____