Program and Subject Development and Review Policy

Scope

This policy applies to all Kaplan Higher Education Pty Ltd, (KHE) pathway colleges (College).

Purpose

This policy outlines the required standards to be met when developing and reviewing all Award and Non-Award Programs and Subjects within the College. The Development and Review process is guided by the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021 (Threshold Standards), the Education Services for Overseas Students (Foundation Program Standards) 2021 Instrument, the English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS) Standards 2018 and the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) Guidance Notes.

The objective of the Development and Review process is to ensure that the College's Program offerings:

- meet professional, regulatory and legislative requirements.
- are delivered at the appropriate levels.
- are consistent with current employment outcomes.
- are aligned with good academic practice with improvements documented and actioned.

Definitions

AQF levels	means the criteria required to demonstrate the achievement of a Qualification as per the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF). For example, Level 5 = diploma, Level 7 = bachelor degree, Level 9 = masters degree.
Award Program	means Programs that are AQF Qualifications, specifically diplomas, associate degrees, bachelor degrees, graduate certificates, graduate diplomas or masters degrees.
Development	means the design and creation of new Award Programs and/or Subjects.
Moderation	means a quality control process in Non-Award Programs by a panel of internal and/or external professionals which normally includes the Director, Learning and Teaching, Assistant Director, Learning and Teaching, teachers, compliance staff and industry experts. The panel reviews and checks for consistency and/or inconsistencies in the assessment decisions and methods used between different assessors in respect to relevant Program curriculum of the same Program Subjects.
Non-Award Program	means Programs that are non-AQF Qualifications at the College. Examples of Non-Award Programs include ELICOS Programs, Foundation Studies Programs, Degree Transfer Programs and Pre-Master's Programs.
Program	means a structured combination of Subjects required to achieve defined learning outcomes. Depending on the provider, a Program may also be referred to as a *course*.
Program Management Documentation	means the Program documentation which outlines information about how Award Programs will be delivered and managed, such as the Program rationale and analysis, Program learning outcomes, associated mapping to the Subject learning outcomes and assessments, relationship with the graduate attributes, the underpinning Program content, Program structure, Subject outlines, assessment information and Program-related transition arrangements and/or implementation reports.
Qualification	means a certification or formal recognition of learning achieved through the successful completion of both Award and Non-Award Programs.
Review	means the formal evaluation and assessment of an existing Award Subject and/or Program taking into consideration feedback from stakeholders inclusive of employers, staff and students, and informed by cohort-based analyses, academic data, benchmarking and contemporary knowledge regarding subject matter, pedagogies and assessment strategies.
Subject	means a separate Subject of study that combined with other Subjects, makes up a Program of study. Depending on the provider, a Subject may also be referred to as a *unit* or *course*.
Validation	means the quality review process in Non-Award Programs by a panel of internal and/or external professionals which normally includes the Director, Learning and Teaching, Assistant Director, Learning and Teaching, teachers, and industry experts. The panel checks the assessment tools to ensure they meet the requirements of relevant curriculum aspects as well as the industry.

Policy Principles

This policy is based on the following principles of Program and Subject Development and Review to:

- meet regulatory requirements and standards including the Threshold Standards, AQF levels, Foundation Program Standards and the ELICOS Standards 2018.
- be developed and reviewed in a systematic approach which is a College wide, quality assured, collaborative approach with aligned student learning experiences, assessments and learning outcomes.
- include an evaluation that encompasses external and/or internal benchmarking, student and staff feedback, and data on metrics including but not limited to progression, retention, attrition and completion.
- identify any need to develop new materials or to revise existing materials.
- analyse market and industry trends.
- review the staffing related requirements of the Subject or Program.
- identify any need for updated pedagogies and/or assessment strategies.
- be designed, where relevant, to include opportunities for work integrated learning throughout Award Programs with a range of Subjects that support student learning and experience in this regard.
- offer students a range of learning opportunities including diverse experience and insights relating to their future employment.
- reflect principles of good practice in design and Review.
- reflect best teaching and learning practices.
- align to the College's Graduate Attributes and relevant learning outcomes.
- be supported by appropriate academic, administrative, staffing, physical and technological resources.
- be aligned with the College's Teaching and Learning Plan for Award Programs.
- meet relevant accreditation requirements including that of relevant industry and professional bodies.

Development Standards: Award Programs and Subjects

All College Award Program and Subject Development projects will:

- complete the applicable Program Management Documentation in full.
- be monitored regularly with records maintained to ensure the College meets all regulatory obligations and professional accreditation requirements, as required.
- engage external academic and industry experts to review and provide feedback in relation to substantial Program level Development.

Subjects are the building blocks of Programs with the Program learning outcomes achieved by completing a defined number of Subjects at specified levels.

To facilitate AQF level alignment, the correlation between Subject levels and AQF levels (Table 1) enables clear demonstration that Subject learning outcomes are at the appropriate level and that the relationship between Subject and Program learning outcomes is transparent.

Table 1. Correlation between College Subject Levels and AQF Levels

College Subject Level	AQF Level
100 & 200	5 - Diploma

Program Approval and Development

The Course Advisory Committees (CAC) and Course Development Panels (CDP) will undertake their functions as outlined in the *Academic Quality and Governance Framework* available on the website.

Subject Approval and Development

Where a single Subject is developed separate to the Program Development process, the following must occur:

- The Subject must be developed holistically with regard to the relevant Program learning outcomes and Program structure(s).
- The proposed new Subject outline is reviewed and endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee (T&L) and approved by the Academic Board.
- The relevant Program Management Documentation is updated to reflect the proposed Subject's integration into the Program(s).

Review Standards: Award Programs and Subjects

The following standards will be applied when Reviewing Award Programs and Subjects:

- Changes to a Program or Subject during an accreditation period must be monitored with records maintained by the College to ensure regulatory obligations and professional accreditation requirements are met, as required.
- Program and/or Subject delivery data must be used to inform decisions and changes made.
- The College must develop, maintain and provide an annual Program Review schedule to the Academic Board on an annual basis.
- The College must maintain a register of all Program and Subject changes.

Program Review

- All College accredited Programs are subject to a mid-cycle comprehensive Review during the Program accreditation period, overseen by peak academic governance processes and including external referencing and/or other benchmarking activities.
- A comprehensive Review is led by the Director, Learning and Teaching, steered by a CDP, and informed by an external and independent CAC consisting of academic experts and industry representatives. Staff and students may also be invited to provide feedback.
- The Review encompasses the following elements:
  - design and content of each Program of study
  - the expected learning outcomes
  - methods for assessment of those outcomes
  - the extent of students' achievement of the learning outcomes
  - emerging developments in the field of education, employer expectations, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the Program
- Comprehensive Reviews of Programs are informed and supported by regular interim monitoring of the quality of teaching, learning and assessment, student progress and the overall delivery of Subjects within the Program under Review.
- College Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable Programs of study, including but not limited to:
  - analyses of progression rates, attrition rates, completion durations and rates and, where applicable, a comparison of the different locations of delivery
  - the assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for selected Subjects within Programs
- Records of the Program Review process must be maintained by the College, together with evidence such as the Program Management Documentation.

Subject Review

- The College's Subjects are reviewed at least every two years.
- Subject Review documentation is maintained by the College and reported to the T&L.
- Where a single Subject is reviewed separate to the Program Review process, the Subject must be reviewed holistically with the relevant Program(s).

Validation and Moderation Sessions: Non-Award Programs

Validation sessions are completed twice each year with both internal and external panel members as part of a systematic Review, prior to a new Non-Award Program being placed on scope or when changes to the Non-Award Program curriculum have occurred.

Moderation sessions are completed twice each year by teachers and assessing staff under the guidance of the Director, Learning and Teaching. Moderation sessions are also completed twice each year with external parties and/or when changes to the Non-Award Program curriculum have occurred.

Records of Validation and Moderation sessions with associated actions must be retained for at least 5 years from the time they take place using the Program Validation/Moderation Schedule.

The Director, Learning and Teaching, in collaboration with the Assistant Director, Learning and Teaching is responsible for maintaining the Program Validation/Moderation Schedule and scheduling the Validation and Moderation sessions.

Validation Sessions

The Director, Learning and Teaching, will notify all internal and external panel members via email of the purpose of the session, what will be required, and how to prepare for the session.

The Director, Learning and Teaching, will provide further details to teachers and assessing staff on the exact type of materials to be collected for the Validation session.

- The panel members must be provided with the following documents a week prior to the session:
  - Agenda of the session
  - Minutes of the previous session
  - Items for discussion, length of discussion per item, principles to be adhered to
  - Program curriculum
  - Mapping document
  - Assessment tools
  - Study outline
  - Program Subjects
  - Exemplar assessments
  - Pre-enrolment Placement Test
  - Validation Report form

- The Validation session will include discussing the:
  - Associated documents provided earlier and purpose of Validation
  - Suggested changes to assessments to meet changes to industry and policy
  - Assessment methods and whether they are clear and meet current practices
  - Evidence of achievement and if it is sufficient to meet Program requirements
  - Verification of consistency of judgement between trainer/assessors in respect of the same Program Subject assessed
  - Suggestions for improving assessment tools and assessment judgements
  - Assessment methods and whether the tasks are clear to assessors and students
  - Verification of whether the marking criteria meets the learning outcomes in the Program curriculum, Reviewing the exemplars for alignment with industry
- Where Non-Award Programs are provided under a direct entry arrangement to a tertiary Program, measures will be taken to ensure that assessment outcomes are aligned to the other criteria used for admission to the tertiary Program,
- The panel must ensure assessment methods and tasks are mapped to learning outcomes, skills, and knowledge as detailed in the Program curriculum.
- A detailed report of the Validation is to be recorded in the Validation Report and then the outcome recorded on the Validation Feedback Summary.
- A final report is presented to the Director, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning.

Moderation Sessions

The Director, Learning and Teaching, will notify all internal and external panel members via email of the purpose of the session, what will be required, and how to prepare for the session.

The Director, Learning and Teaching, will provide further details to teachers and assessing staff on the exact type of materials to be collected for the Moderation session.

- The panel members must be provided with the items for discussion, length of discussion per item, and principles to be adhered to.
- The Moderation session will include discussing the:
  - Assessment methods and tasks used
  - Students' assessment outcomes against the learning outcomes
  - The Review of Program Subjects against assessor's marking guide and sample exemplars
  - Verification of consistency of judgement between teachers and assessing staff in respect of same Program Subject assessed
  - How assessment methods and tasks are mapped to the Program curriculum, skills, and knowledge and learning outcomes
  - Findings and recommendations for improvement from students and staff
- A detailed report of the Moderation is to be recorded in the Moderation Report and then the outcome recorded on the Moderation Feedback Summary.
- Agreed improvements are documented in the Continuous Improvement Register. The Director, Learning and Teaching, is responsible for ensuring corrective actions are completed within defined timelines, tabled at the management meetings, and feedback provided to the panel members.
- A final report is presented to the Director, Curriculum, Teaching and Learning.

Relevant Legislation

As a registered education provider, the College operates under strict laws and regulations. Policies and procedures are in place to ensure compliance with the legislative instruments referenced below:

- Australian Qualifications Framework
- Disability Standards for Education 2005
- Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000(ESOS Act)
- Education Services for Overseas Students (Foundation Program Standards) Instrument 2021
- Education Services for Overseas Students Regulations 2019
- ELICOS Standards 2018
- Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
- National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (TEQSA Act)

Related Policies and Documents

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

- Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy
- Academic Quality and Governance Framework
- Assessment Policy
- Benchmarking Policy
- Continuous Improvement Policy
- Course Progress Policy
- Program Validation/Moderation Schedule
- Diversity, Inclusion and Equity Policy
- Graduate Attributes
- Learning Facilities and Resources Policy
- Moderation Feedback Summary
- Moderation Report
- Validation Feedback Summary
- Validation Report

Version Control and Accountable Officers

It is the joint responsibility of the Implementation Officer and Responsible Officer to ensure compliance with this policy.

Policy Category	Academic
Responsible Officer	Vice President, Academic
Implementation Officer	Director, Learning and Teaching; Assistant Director, Learning and Teaching
Review Date	June 2025
Approved by	

Vice-President, Academic under a standing delegation from the KHE Academic Board

Version	Authored by	Brief Description of the changes	Date Approved	Effective Date
1.0	Quality, Regulations and Standards team	New Policy. Policy re-branded for new KHE college. Minor wording and formatting changes.	10.07.2025	11.07.2025