Course and Unit Lifecycle Policy and Procedure

1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy and procedure is to:
- ensure the quality, viability and relevance of MIT's courses and units and their alignment with the Institute's strategic plan;
- formally define the life-cycle of the Institute's courses and units; and
- provide a single Institute-wide policy and procedure on the process for course and unit development, approval, review, evaluation and discontinuation.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all awards approved by the Institute's Academic Board, including those approved under Self-Accrediting Authority (SAA).

3. Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Board	means the Academic Board of the Institute.
Executive Dean	is the Head of the Academic Department of MIT to whom the Heads of School report.
Accreditation	means approval of a course or unit by the Academic Board, either approved under SAA, or formally accredited by TEQSA.
Award/ award course	A program of study formally approved/accredited by the Institute, approved under SAA or by TEQSA which leads to an academic award granted by the Institute.
Academic Registrar	Academic Registrar means the person holding the position of Group General Manager within the Institute, or nomine
Course	A program of study leading to the granting of an official award or qualification of the Institute.
Course Advisory Committee	The relevant Course Advisory Committee is an advisory committee of the relevant School Committee, which reports to the Learning and Teaching Committee. The Course Advisory Committee gives advice on new and revised courses and units.
Course Concept Plan	A business and strategic plan for a new course or major change developed by schools, and assessed by Learning and Teaching Committee before the development of the course proposal.
Executive Management	is the Institute's primary committee of management and is convened

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 1 of 18

Term	Definition
Committee	by the Chief Executive Officer.
Head of School	means the relevant Head of School of Business or the Head of School of Information Technology and Engineering, or nominee.
HESF	The Higher Education Standards Framework, established by government through TEQSA.
Institute or MIT	means the Melbourne Institute of Technology.
Major change	A change that involves particular changes to a course, stream, major or specialisation, or unit, which requires approval of the Academic Board. For examples, see Section 7 - Course Change table and Unit Change Table
Minor change	A change that involves particular changes to a course, stream, major or specialisation, or unit, which may be made under delegated authority from the Academic Board. For examples, see section 7 - Course Change Table and Unit Change Table.
MIT Guidelines	means Course and Unit Approval guidelines made under this policy and procedure.
Professional accreditation	accreditation of a course by a professional body which may allow graduates of the course to be admitted to practice and/or admission to membership of, or association with, the professional body.
School	means the relevant School of Business or School of Information Technology and Engineering. (The singular includes the plural.)
School Committee	is the principal advisory committee to the Learning and Teaching Committee (from each School).
Student Evaluation of Units or SEU	a student survey instrument that assesses the students' perception of quality of the content, approach, interest and assessment, and the quality of the teaching, of the unit.
Learning & Teaching Committee	the Learning and Teaching Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Board.
TEQSA	is the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency or equivalent government regulator for tertiary education
Unit	a unit of academic work having a discrete designated code and title in which students enrol and complete specific work requirements and on completion of which the student is awarded a grade, such grades appearing on a student's academic record.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 2 of 18

Term	Definition
SAA	Self-Accrediting Authority

4. Policy Statement

The Institute, through its Academic Board, ensures the quality, viability and relevance of its academic courses, their alignment with the Institute's strategic direction and ensures compliance with current legislative, regulatory and professional requirements (as applicable). Accordingly, the policies and procedures relating to the approval and review of courses and units of the Institute are guided by the principles of:

1.1. proposals for new course(s) and offerings are based on a strong case that the course will be viable and will support the Institute's strategic direction;

1.2. market research and competitor analysis demonstrating industry relevance and viability;

1.3. resources are available to develop and offer the curriculum;

1.4. courses are consistent with the policies and procedures defining the attributes of MIT's courses and units and aligned with learning outcomes and graduate attributes to prepare graduates for employment and/or preparation for further study within legislative, regulatory and professional frameworks;

1.5. all courses and units are reviewed on a regular cycle, including annual health checks (student performance and SEU and SET results) and mid-cycle reviews - in the first accreditation cycle after introduction, and for a course not subject to professional body accreditation, in each accreditation cycle - with a separate report for each offering of the program to confirm its quality, relevance and viability against performance indicators;

1.6. courses and units are developed and reviewed in consultation with relevant stakeholders including professional bodies;

1.7. courses and units are discontinued in such a way as to maintain a positive student experience and manage risk to the Institute's reputation and achievement of its strategic objectives; and

1.8. consideration of equity and diversity issues in the development of, and access to, courses.

5. Overall Course Lifecycle

The top-level view of the course lifecycle is as follows. Note that full details of operational requirements for various accreditations / reviews are provided in separate "Guidelines" documents approved by Academic Board.

i. **Concept Stage**
The School prepares a Concept plan with early input from its Course Advisory Committee (CAC). This outlines the rationale, market need, and alignment with institutional strategy.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 3 of 18

ii. **Initial Consideration**
The Executive Management Committee (EMC), Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC), and Academic Board (AB) review the Concept plan to determine whether full development should proceed.

iii. **Course Development**
If the Concept plan is approved, the School then develops a Full Course Proposal, incorporating further feedback from CAC and validation by an external discipline expert, both of curriculum relevance and compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF).

iv. **Internal Endorsement and Accreditation**
The Course Proposal is reviewed by EMC and LTC, and accredited internally by AB. This sequence of considerations may be terminated at any stage in the process, the last two stages involving g iterative consideration of necessary.

v. **External Accreditation (if required)**
If the institution is not self-accrediting, an application is submitted to TEQSA. TEQSA feedback may require revisions, and the final version must be approved again by LTC and AB.

vi. **Annual Monitoring ('Health Check')**
Each year, the course undergoes a health check focusing on student performance data, retention, and student evaluations. Outcomes are reported to LTC and AB.

vii. **Mid-Cycle Review (for first accreditation cycle of all courses or for all cycles of non-professionally accredited courses)**
Around three years after initial or previous accreditation, a Mid-Cycle Review is undertaken. This review is streamlined but follows the same basic procedure as a Full Review (see below).

viii. **Full Review and Re-accreditation**
Six years after each accreditation, the course undergoes a Full Review with input from CAC and at least one external reviewer. Details of the Full Review Process are given below, and in more detail in additional Guidelines approved by Academic Board. Recommendations from the Review Panel are considered by LTC and AB, and the course is modified accordingly. Within one year of this review, a Re-accreditation Submission is made to Academic Board (no Concept plan required), and if the course is accredited by TEQSA, a re-accreditation submission is made to TEQSA.

6. Responsibilities

1.9. Academic Board

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC): 06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB): 27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD) 5 Dec 2025
Current Version 5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page **4** of **18**

1.9.1. The Academic Board is responsible for quality assurance and approval of courses including:

- course and unit approval processes;
- approving selection and entry requirements;
- ensuring accreditation requirements of external bodies are met;
- ongoing monitoring and review of courses and units.
- in respect of courses accredited under SAA, the Academic Board provides the final approval. In respect of courses accredited by TEQSA, the Board approves the submission to be made to TEQSA.

1.9.2. The Academic Board will provide consistent principles, policies and procedures in the design, approval, delivery, review, evaluation, discontinuation and suspension of courses and units.

1.9.3. The Academic Board is responsible for the development, compliance, monitoring and review of this policy and procedure and any associated schedules and guidelines.

1.9.4. The Academic Board will consider any reports on courses or units from the Learning and Teaching Committee at each meeting.

1.9.5. Academic Board may delegate to Schools authority to make certain minor changes to courses and units.

1.9.6. Following each meeting the secretary, or nominee, will notify Learning and Teaching Committee and the Schools of the Academic Board's decisions.

1.9.7. The Academic Board will maintain a course change register

1.10. **Learning and Teaching Committee**

1.10.1. The Learning and Teaching Committee will make recommendations on:

- new Course Concept Plans;
- new course proposals;
- major change proposals;
- annual health checks
- mid-cycle reviews
- full course reviews
- course discontinuations; and
- course suspensions.

1.10.2. The Learning and Teaching Committee will consider concept plans and proposals, and in relation to a plan or proposal will either:

- endorse it conditionally, requesting changes from the proposing School;
- endorse it and forward it to the Academic Board for approval; or
- reject it.

1.10.3. Where the Learning and Teaching Committee has conditionally endorsed a Course Concept Plan the Committee will either request the concept plan be resubmitted to the

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):   06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):   27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)   5 Dec 2025
Current Version   5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page 5 of 18

committee or delegate authority to the Chair of the Learning and Teaching Committee to approve the requested changes on behalf of the committee for development into a new course or unit proposal.

1.10.4. Where the Learning and Teaching Committee has conditionally endorsed a course proposal the Committee will request the proposal be resubmitted to the committee or in exceptional circumstances only, delegate authority to the Chair of the Learning and Teaching Committee to approve the requested changes on behalf of the committee for finalisation prior to submission to Academic Board.

1.11. Schools

Schools initiate and develop new courses and units, and changes to existing courses and units, and formally approve these through the School Committee. Before submitting a new course or unit, or major changes, these must be discussed by the Course Advisory Committee.

1.12. Executive Management Committee and Academic Registrar

The Academic Registrar will refer Course Concept Plans, new course or major change documentation, course discontinuation and course suspensions received from the Schools to the Institute's Executive Management Committee for noting and/or comment prior to it being forwarded by the Academic Registrar to the Learning and Teaching Committee. The Executive Management Committee may consult, where appropriate. Where the comments of the Executive Management Committee contain a request for further consideration by the School, the matter will be returned to the School for consideration and resubmission to EMC. On occasions, EMC may determine for business reasons that a concept proposal or Full Course Proposal should not be taken further.

1.13. Head of School

The Head of School is responsible for the presentation of proposals to the Learning and Teaching Committee (which may actually be made by one or more other academic staff).
The Head of School is also responsible for oversight of the development of units offered within the relevant school and has the responsibility to ensure that each unit:

- is developed in line with the requirements of the course to which the unit relates;
- demonstrates learning outcomes consistent with the overall aims and objectives of the relevant course; and
- is at the required level that meets the AQF guidelines appropriate for the course and the unit's placement within the course.

7. Procedure

1.14. Course Concept Plan

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 6 of 18

1.14.1. A Course Concept Plan must be submitted and approved for all new courses, adhering to MIT Guidelines. On approval it will be added to the "New Course and Unit" list maintained by the Academic Registrar.

1.14.2. Major course changes require the submission and approval of a Course Concept Plan if they involve:
- Cross-School delivery or a significant move into another School's discipline area;
- Major resource implications; or
- Major change to the structure of a course.

1.15. The School Committee will seek advice from the Course Advisory Committee prior to considering Course Concept Plans. If the Course Concept Plan is approved by the School Committee it is forwarded to the Academic Registrar for Executive Management Committee approval, prior to consideration by the Learning and Teaching Committee, which will make a recommendation to the Academic Board for approval .

1.16. New Course or Unit Proposals
Once the Concept Plan for a proposed new course has been approved, a (full) Course Proposal should be developed, providing all details of the course. Details of any proposed new units should also Any new unit that is part of an existing course (and which is not being proposed as part of a new course) should also be proposed using a fully detailed unit description.

1.16.1. The names of new courses and name changes for existing courses should comply with MIT's conventions for naming and configuring courses:
- Course Names should be short and descriptive, preferably not containing more than three nouns (eg Master of Engineering Management.)
- Course names should fairly represent the content and purpose of the course.
- Course names should clearly differentiate from other MIT course names.
- Course codes should consist of 3-4 letters, providing a meaningful abbreviation of the full course title.

1.16.2. Names of new units and name changes for existing units should comply with MIT's conventions for naming and configuring unit names:
- Unit Names should be short and descriptive, preferably not containing more than three nouns (eg Platform Technologies)
- Unit names should fairly represent the content and purpose of the course
- New unit names and name changes should be clearly differentiated from other MIT unit names, a permitted exception being if there is a postgraduate unit with a great similarity to an undergraduate unit.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030
	Page 7 of 18

- Unit codes should consist of 2-3 letters representing the initials of the principal course in which the unit is embedded and three alphanumeric characters.
- The first digit should represent the year level (1 to 3 for bachelor degree units and 5 and 6 for masters degree units).
- If the unit is connected to another (principally a pre-requisite relationship) – the second digit should, where possible, be the same for both units .

1.16.3.   Course or unit proposals will adhere to MIT Guidelines, and should be prepared for:
- new courses;
- new units;
- new specialisations within existing courses; and
- major changes to courses.

1.16.4.   A course or unit proposal shall be accompanied by:
- endorsement by an external discipline expert that in his/her assessment the new course or unit meets the AQF level required by the guidelines, and is consonant with the expected content of similar courses / units within Australia;
- confirmation by the external expert that the learning outcomes prescribed in each unit have been mapped against the relevant AQF levels and have been found to be appropriate, and that proposed assessments have been mapped against learning outcomes; and
- in the case of courses, evidence that a Course Concept Plan has been approved by Academic Board.

1.16.5.   The approval processes for a course or unit verify that:

- proposals for new courses and units are based on a strong case that the course or unit will be viable and will support Institute strategic direction;
- in relation to courses, a benchmarking process has taken place, with the course development informed by a desk study of national and international comparators, and, where possible, benchmarking with a least one Benchmarking partner with which MIT holds a current MoU (see governance file "List of Benchmarking Partners");
- market research and competitor analysis demonstrate industry relevance and viability as part of the new course and unit proposal;
- resources (informational, physical, staffing) are available to develop and offer the curriculum; and
- the learning outcomes of courses are consistent with the MIT's overall graduate attributes.

1.16.6.   A Full Course Proposal is developed after the Concept Plan has been approved. The School Committee will seek advice from the Course Advisory Committee prior to considering new course or unit proposals and, with respect to marketability and viability, from the Executive Management Committee. (In the case of courses, this is advice subsequent to that already obtained for the Concept Plan, since the detailed proposal

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 8 of 18

requires further reflection.) If the new course or unit proposal is then approved by the School Committee, it is forwarded to the Academic Registrar so that it may be considered for Learning and Teaching Committee approval and recommendation to the Academic Board. Following approval by the Learning and Teaching Committee, the Academic Board has the option to have the new course or unit proposal reviewed, in order to advise Academic Board, by one or more external experts who have not previously been involved before making a decision. How this might be managed is at the discretion of Academic Board.

1.16.7.   For a course that is accredited by TEQSA, application should be made for such accreditation in the form required by TEQSA, following Academic Board approval. Note that the MIT internal processes for self-accredited and TEQSA-accredited courses are identical. In relation to TEQSA-accredited courses, any changes requested through the TEQSA accreditation process will be considered by Learning and Teaching Committee and the Academic Board prior to responding to TEQSA.

7.4   Changes to Courses or Units

7.4.1   Academic Board may approve major changes to courses and units, on recommendation by the Learning and Teaching Committee following advice from the relevant School and its Course Advisory Committee. A major change proposal shall be developed in accordance with the new course and unit process described above in Section 7.3

7.4.1   The Academic Board has delegated to Schools the authority to make particular minor changes to courses and units. All changes made under delegated authority will be reported each trimester to the Learning and Teaching Committee; and in reports to the Academic Board from the Learning and Teaching Committee.

7.4.2   The HoS will maintain a minor changes register to facilitate this reporting.Changes proposed for courses and units are classified either as major or minor. The tables below identify most instances – others not mentioned should be considered as major unless the Chair of Academic Board advises otherwise.

Major changes are defined as significant changes to courses or units that may have:

- a direct or indirect impact on the learning outcomes of a course or unit, or
- a significant impact on students; and /or require notifications to the Academic Board.
- Major changes include major restructuring of an accredited course, addition of new core units, or any changes to learning outcomes of a course (if any of this is done before the 12 month pre-accreditation period). Such a major change will be presented to the Academic Board as a material change.
- For units, a major change generally involves changes to learning outcomes or assessments, or a change (for example to a unit name) that might merely appear to cause a divergence of

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 9 of 18

the course from that publicised.

Course change table

Major change examples	Minor change examples
Course name change	Replacement of an elective unit
Change of compulsory unit in any course	Addition of an elective unit
Change to the structure of any course (including change to the ratio of compulsory/elective points)	Deletion of an elective unit
Credit points required to complete the course	
Expected time to complete a course	
Course admission criteria	
Course learning outcomes or graduate attributes change	
Change to course completion requirements	
Changes to a stream, major, minor or specialisation within a course	
Any course change that the Academic Board considers to be a material change	

Major change	Minor change
Unit name or code change	Time commitment
Unit prerequisites	Generic skills, assumed knowledge
Unit level	Core participation requirements
Significant change to the content of the unit overview (>40%)	Prescribed texts
Changes to assessments that change the assessed learning outcomes	Changes to assessments that do not change the assessed learning outcomes
Change in student contact hours	Teaching responsibility
Change in unit learning outcomes	Learning method

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 10 of 18

Major change	Minor change
Any unit change the Academic Board consider as material	Changes to unit description/content involving grammar and syntax, refining current learning outcomes, format (to improve clarity but not to change learning outcomes), additional information for students

Unit change table

7.5 Substitution of Core Units

MIT places great importance on its courses conforming to the requirements of external accrediting bodies which permit the Institute's graduates to recognised by the appropriate State and professional bodies. For such recognition, students must complete a defined number of core units, but it is understood that on occasions, for logistical reasons, some core units may need to be replaced by non-core units that are of similar level, content and depth (for example, similar units offered in other courses). As such each School needs to ensure that any substitution conforms to the principles stated below.

7.5.1   Schools should make every reasonable effort to offer core units each main trimester (T1 and T2).

7.5.2   Core units may be substituted with units of similar level, content and depth only when the particular core units are not offered in a particular main trimester (T1 and T2).

7.5.3   The Course Coordinator approves the non-core units that may be substituted for core units. The approval of such substitutions by the Course Coordinator must occur prior to any substitution occurring.

7.5.4   A list of approved non-core units as substitutes for core units is maintained by Heads of School for their courses.

7.5.5   Substituting core units with other units must not put the registration/accreditation of the course placed in jeopardy. Where there is doubt about the similarity between particular core and non-core units, the School must consult accrediting bodies, including TEQSA and relevant professional bodies.

7.6 Compliance Monitoring of Units

7.6.1   As part of its external moderation process (specified in detail in the Moderation Policy and Procedure and associated guidelines for moderators), the School arranges that an external moderation and review of units on a three year cycle is conducted to ensure that:

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page **11** of **18**

7.6.1.1   Assessments in recent offerings of the unit have been compliant with AQF level and constructive alignment with learning outcomes, and that marking of such assessments has been appropriate;

7.6.1.2   units meet the relevant AQF level as prescribed in the AQF and HESF guidelines and comply with Institute policies;

7.6.1.3   Learning and Teaching strategies are included and up-to-date, including how the unit engages with Artificial Intelligence in both curriculum and assessment;

7.6.1.4   any changes that Schools have made to courses or units under delegated authority from the Academic Board meet the relevant AQF level as prescribed in the AQF guidelines and comply with Institute policies..

7.6.2   The School must submit a report of all approved changes that have been made to units during the calendar year to the Learning and Teaching Committee. The report will include:

7.6.2.1   all major changes to units; and

7.6.2.2   all minor changes to units made under delegated authority from the Academic Board.

7.6.3   The School will generally review around 33% of units for compliance each year. Noncompliance will be reported to the School Committee which will determine the timeline for achieving future compliance.

7.7 Course Reviews

7.7.1   Course reviews provide a systematic evaluation of course quality, relevance and viability that attests to the educational design, implementation and currency of Institute courses, and assists with planning.

7.7.2   All programs are reviewed on a regular 7-year cycle, with reviews occurring 12 months prior to the required date for re- accreditation of the courses though the Academic Board or by TEQSA. Such a review will be called a "Full Course Review" in this document when there is a need to distinguish it from the other reviews mentioned. The Academic Board may request, under certain circumstances, courses to be reviewed earlier. The offering School will prepare a self-assessment report to be considered by a Review Panel. This report will include a summary for each offering of the course (by location) to confirm its quality, relevance and viability against performance indicators. Reviews will be in the form approved by the Academic Board – Course Review Framework.

7.7.3   Roughly three years after the first intake for a new course, the course will undergo a "mid-cycle review" to check that the course is operating as expected. The mid-cycle review gives particular attention to whether the expectations in the initial academic and business case has been borne out in practice. For a course that is not professionally accredited, there will be a mid-cycle review roughly three years after each re-accreditation. The requirements for a mid-cycle review are similar to those for a full Course Review, and are published separately as guidelines.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 12 of 18

7.7.4 Every year, each course will undergo an annual course "health check", focussing on student outcomes and student survey results rather than curriculum issues. Typically this brief review requires a short report to be developed by the Course Coordinator at the end of each calendar year. The requirements for a course health check are published separately as guidelines.

7.8 Scope of Full Course Review process

7.8.1. The course review process will comprise a comprehensive broad-based review to achieve an evidence- based evaluation of the viability, quality, structure, focus and outcomes of the course.

7.8.2. Student and external input into the review must be sought.

7.8.3. The Review will assess the course in terms of its distinctiveness, mechanisms for external stakeholder input, curriculum developments, graduate attributes, internationalisation, governance, and assessment requirements. When a review is aligned with an external accreditation process, those elements of the review which are not included within accreditation must be reviewed separately to complete the review process.

7.8.4. Consideration should be given to trends (if available) in:

- student load and demand;
- student retention and success (pass rates, progression, attrition, completions and grade distributions);
- current student satisfaction (SEU) and graduate course experience (good teaching, generic skills, overall satisfaction) and graduate destinations for relevant field/s of study and benchmarked against like institutions.

7.8.5. Details of the Full Course Review process are as follows.

Activity	Responsibility
1. Review Notification 1.1 The Executive Dean and Heads of School will be notified of the timing of the course review according to a schedule established by the Academic Board.	Academic Board
2. Course performance data 2.1 Assemble data sets for courses on the Institute indicators used to measure performance of courses and units, including noncompaliant units, approved units and the School's annual report on unit evaluation, to be received by the Learning and Teaching Committee at its second meeting in each year and presented to the next Academic Board meeting. This should include noncompliant unit and approved unit changes data	Executive Dean has oversight.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):   06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):   27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)   5 Dec 2025
Current Version   5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page 13 of 18

3. Review within Schools 3.1. Analyse course level data sets against quality, viability, relevance and strategic settings to identifying key issues and trends. 3.2. Prepare a self-assessment of the course using the course performance data and forward the self-assessment to Academic Board at least 60 working days prior to the scheduled review.	School Committee approves report prepared under authority of Head of School
4. Composition of Review Panel For each course a Review Panel will be convened. The Academic Board will determine the membership of the Review Panel after taking advice from the Executive Dean, the Heads of School and the Course Advisory Committee. The composition of the Review Panel will be: • The Executive Dean (or if unavailable, a nominee of the Chair of Academic Board), who will Chair the Panel; • At least two academics, external to the Institute, with expertise in the discipline or field; • At least one member from the relevant profession/industry, external to the Institute, with extensive experience and expertise in the discipline; • A member of the MIT teaching/academic staff from a discipline other than the course under review – preferably from another school; • One recent graduate from the course; • One senior student from the course; • An executive officer drawn from the Institute's administrative staff, who will support the preparation of the Panel's report; • plus an optional co-opted member, at the discretion of, and appointed by, the Chair, with the approval of the Chair of Academic Board. The Institute will aim to constitute a Review Panel with a minimum representation of at least 33% of each gender.	Academic Board
5. Review Panel Deliberations The Review Panel will consider the self-assessment report, and have an opportunity to meet with members of the Institute, relevant profession/industry/employers and members of the community. The Review Panel will also conduct site visits as part of its review, by sending one or two members of the panel to visit each site. The final Review Panel Report will be submitted to the Executive Dean for noting prior submitting to the Head of School within 50 working days of the completion of	Review Panel

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC): 06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB): 27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD) 5 Dec 2025
Current Version 5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page 14 of 18

the Review Panel's sitting. A draft of the report should be submitted within one month of the Panel's sitting, with the School given the opportunity to comment on any factual inaccuracies within the report, prior to its finalisation.	
6. Finalise Report The Review Panel Report and the Head of School response will be submitted to Academic Board within 20 working days of receipt of the final Review Panel Report. As a result of recommendations contained in Review Panel Report the School will review and update the School action plan.	Head of School
7. **Final action plan** The final action plan will identify and finalise School actions into a report to Learning & Teaching Committee and Academic Board.	Learning & Teaching Committee Academic Board
8. **Subsequent Accreditation** Following implementation of the action plan, and approval of this by the Learning and Teaching Committee, the school will, by the due date, submit a formal application for re-accreditation of the course by the Academic Board.	Academic Board

7.8.6. Note that the details of Mid-Cycle Reviews are similar, described in a Guidelines document approved by Academic Board, but the "Subsequent Accreditation" phase is replaced by submission of any proposed major changes for Academic Board approval

7.9. Unit Reviews

7.9.1. Units are reviewed using external moderators once every three years, as described in the Moderation Policy and Procedure. This moderation focusses on alignment with HESF requirements and evaluates appropriateness of assessments and marking of assessments.

7.9.2. Student evaluation of units are conducted each trimester with the aim of assessing delivery and learning experiences for quality improvement. They are used also to gauge the satisfaction of students with various aspects of their MIT experience and provide important data for quality assurance and benchmarking purposes.

7.9.3. Student feedback on all aspects of teaching and assessment is obtained through the administration of SEU and equivalent regular, systematic and methodologically sound student survey instruments, with the resulting data being analysed and interpreted to inform teaching and learning improvements.

7.9.4. All student surveys conducted for the purpose of informing teaching and learning and student experience outcomes are required to conform to the unit review framework.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed

Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 15 of 18

Framework for Review by Student Evaluations

Action	Responsibility
1. Evaluation of Units Each unit offered by the Institute will be evaluated every time it is offered using the SEU or equivalent as the survey instrument.	Head of School
2. Analysis and Reporting The numerical results from the completed SEUs will be entered into a database then returned to the Unit Coordinator. The Unit Coordinator will then provide a report on the performance of the unit to the Head of School, and make any recommendations for improvements in the unit, using both quantitative and qualitative data. The Head of School will ensure that the recommendations are implemented for the next offering of the unit. All unit reports for each trimester will be considered by the School Committee, who will provide a consolidated report to the Learning and Teaching Committee.	Unit Coordinator Heads of School School Committee
3. Review within Schools The School will track units that do not meet criteria for satisfactory performance and provide the Course Advisory Committees and the Learning and Teaching Committee with an annual report on progress against the previous year's feedback. The Learning and Teaching Committee will provide Heads of School with an annual report on its evaluation of the performance of units, which will include recommendations on actions the School needs to take.	School Committee

8. Discontinuation of Courses and Units

8.1. Discontinuation includes cessation or discontinuation of intakes to courses and the transition of students where courses are discontinued.

8.2. Courses will be discontinued through a process of giving sufficient advance warning of discontinuation of courses, by providing to all stakeholder staff, students, and to future students, in institute publications in such a way as to maintain a positive student experience and manage risk to the Institute's reputation and achievement of its strategic objectives.

8.3. A transition plan and discontinuation strategy recommended by Learning and Teaching Committee and approved by Academic Board will ensure that all applicants, students and any other stakeholders affected by the discontinuation are supported in a transition to the replacement course or to an alternative course within the Institute or elsewhere.

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):   06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):   27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)   5 Dec 2025
Current Version   5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page 16 of 18

8.4. A unit previously advertised as available may be discontinued. As for course discontinuation a process must be followed that includes giving sufficient advance warning of discontinuation, by providing to all stakeholder staff, students, and to future students, in institute publications in such a way as to maintain a positive student experience and manage risk to the Institute's reputation and achievement of its strategic objectives. Students must be offered an alternative pathway to completion of their course.

9. Course and Unit Suspensions

9.1. The Academic Board is responsible for approving course and unit suspensions (ie, not offering an intake to a course, or a normal trimester offering of a unit within a course).

9.2. Courses and units may only be suspended for a period of one year at a time. Any further suspension requires further Academic Board approval.

10. Professional Accreditation

10.1. The Academic Board is responsible for approving submissions for professional accreditation, where courses require professional accreditation by external bodies, to allow graduates admission to practise or admission to a professional association. Such submissions are generally prepared in a format mandated by the accrediting body.

10.2. Schools will prepare professional accreditation submissions, will submit them for Academic Board approval and report on management of professional accreditations to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

10.3. The Head of School takes authority for submission materials, which may be prepared by the Course Coordinator and other academic staff.

10.4. The Executive Dean reviews and endorses the accreditation submission materials

10.5. Submissions to professional accreditation bodies will be signed off by the CEO or nominee.

11. Publication of course and unit details

11.1. The Academic Registrar will publish the details of courses and units prescribed by the Academic Board each year prior to commencement of the enrolment/re- enrolment period for the following academic year.

11.2. The details of courses and units will not to be altered or added to without Academic Board approval after they have been approved for publication.

11.3. The website is the authoritative information source on courses, units, majors/minors/specialisations offered by the Institute.

12. Implementation and Communication

This policy and procedure will be implemented and communicated through the Institute via:

- Announcement on the Institute's webpage;

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue: 28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC): 06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB): 27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD) 5 Dec 2025
Current Version 5 Dec 2025
Review Date: 4 Dec 2030
Page 17 of 18

- Internal circulation to staff; and Staff professional development.

The Academic Board undertakes to maintain a curriculum management system to store all curriculum related materials to maintain strict version control of course and unit approvals.

13.   Supporting Documents

Legislative Context:

Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF)

Education Services for Overseas Student (ESOS) Act 2000 and National Code 2007

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Act

MIT's Policies and Procedures

MIT Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure

MIT Assessment Policy and Procedure

MIT Moderation Policy and Procedure

Warning: uncontrolled once printed
Original Issue:	28 Aug 2015
Reviewed by the Policy Committee (PC):	06 June 2025 & 30 Sept 2025
Approved by the Academic Board (AB):	27 Nov 2025
Endorsed by the Board of Directors (BoD)	5 Dec 2025
Current Version	5 Dec 2025
Review Date:	4 Dec 2030

Page 18 of 18