

## 2. Accreditation of AQF Curriculum

### 2.1 Program accreditation

1. Academic Board, on advice from the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework programs) or University Research Committee (Higher Degree Research (HDR) programs) (via the HDR Committee), accredits new programs and amendments to programs for a maximum period of five years. Program amendments are accredited until a program is due to be reviewed. Professional accreditation is the responsibility of the relevant managing ANU College(s). [HESF 5.1.1-2, 6.3.2.c]
2. Program proposals provide evidence of alignment with the Higher Education Standards Framework, ANU Strategic Plan, demand, academic merit and of research-led approaches to education. [HESF 5.1.3a]
3. Program proposals that have two or more disciplines in the program name must demonstrate how the disciplines are integrated within the program.

### 2.2 Proposals for the introduction or amendment of an academic program

1. Proposals for the introduction or amendment of academic programs are first considered by the relevant ANU College(s). Proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College.
2. If endorsed by the ANU College(s), program proposals are submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or HDR Committee (HDR) consideration via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) in line with scheduled dates.
3. If endorsed by Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or the University Research Committee (HDR) (via the HDR Committee) by a majority, the proposal is submitted for Academic Board accreditation. Academic Board considers the accreditation of academic programs in line with the ANU Strategic Plan and academic standards, as articulated in University policy. [HESF 5.1.3.b-c]
4. Once accredited by Academic Board, the Academic Standards and Quality Office publishes the program on [Programs and Courses](#).
5. Enrolled students must be informed of an amendment to the program orders of an academic program by the relevant managing ANU College(s) through the usual University means of communication and must be notified of their options and the transitional arrangements that will be put in place.
6. The following types of programs, based on compliance requirements and on previous ANU experience, present higher risks to the University and require special scrutiny in approval processes. Proposals for the creation or amendment of the following program types will not be considered for endorsement or approval out of session, including by executive approval:
  - a. All programs at AQF Level 5
  - b. All programs at AQF Level 6

- c. All transnational education programs
- d. All programs taught in a language other than English
- e. Programs that have been identified by Academic Board as leading to child-related occupations and so required to include education “to increase awareness and understanding of the prevention of child sexual abuse and potentially harmful sexual behaviours in children”.

### 2.3 Transnational education programs

1. Approval for transnational education programs is only given where, in addition to other requirements outlined in (2)-(6) below, any transnational partnerships are consistent with the *Policy: International partnerships and agreements* and *Procedure: International partnerships and agreements*.
2. Approval for transnational education programs is contingent on fulfilment of additional requirements.
3. Proposals for transnational education programs include the completed Transnational Education Programs checklist and a cover memo outlining strategic alignment and intent, overseas government authorities’ approval information, if applicable, and indication of potential financial viability.
4. The Academic Standards and Quality Office (ASQO) and International Admissions Office endorse the transnational program and the agreement for the transnational program prior to submission for Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or University Research Committee (HDR) consideration.
5. The agreement for the transnational program is reviewed and endorsed by responsible areas and officers as per the *Procedure: International Partnerships and Agreements*, prior to submission for Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or University Research Committee (HDR) consideration.
6. Once accredited by Academic Board, a yearly program health check that considers enrolments, student evaluation data and quality assurance arrangements will be undertaken by the relevant college(s) and submitted to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or University Research Committee (HDR) for endorsement and Academic Board for approval. [HESF 5.4.2]

### 2.4 Programs delivered in a language other than English

1. Approval for programs and courses to be delivered in languages other than English that do not have as their primary purpose education in language proficiency is contingent on fulfilment of additional requirements.
2. Records of results, testamurs, and graduation certification documents must state if more than 50% of courses in a program were delivered and assessed in a language other than English, except for the use of another language to develop proficiency in that language [HESF 1.5.6-7].

3. Proposals for such programs must address the following requirements:
  - a. Admission standards to the program, with the expectation that standards will be the same as for programs delivered in English, but with the exception of English language requirements for admission; and
  - b. The appointment of an external examiner who is proficient in English and the language of instruction who is an expert in the relevant discipline. Where required a registered translator may also be engaged to ensure the accurate translation of course materials; and
  - c. Staff proficiency in both English and the language of instruction; and
  - d. Quality assurance arrangements proposed for monitoring the equivalence of any teaching and or assessment tasks that are completed in English with those in the language of instruction and student outcomes for the program; and
  - e. Provision of examination conditions that satisfy University requirements.
4. The ANU International Office and the Academic Standards and Quality Office must endorse the proposal prior to submission for Academic Quality Assurance Committee consideration.
5. Where the program is, under the English Language Admission Requirements and Post-Admission Policy, exempt from the university's English language admission requirements, the managing College is responsible, including for the costs, for certified translations into the target language of ANU documents including policy documents to which students may need access.

## 2.5 Program review and reaccreditation

1. Each academic program may be accredited for a maximum of 5 years. If accreditation expires, the Academic Standards and Quality Office will place a last term admit date on the program until such time as it is reaccredited.
2. Each academic program is, based on the recommendations of a program review, considered for reaccreditation by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee; the Academic Quality Assurance Committee then makes a recommendation on reaccreditation to Academic Board [HESF 5.1.2]. If a program is not recommended for reaccreditation, the Academic Standards and Quality Office will place a last term admit date on the program.
3. The Academic Quality Assurance Committee determines the regular review cycle. Programs listed in Table 5: Professionally Accredited Programs will, at the request of the relevant Associate Dean (Education), be scheduled to follow the review schedule of the accrediting body so long as this does not breach HESF requirements.
4. Nested programs (e.g. Graduate Certificate/Graduate Diploma/Master); or the Master/Master (Advanced); pass degree/direct-entry Honours/+1 Honours; or in-person/online versions of a

program should normally be reviewed together as a single review unless the Associate Dean (Education) deems this to be not appropriate.

5. In cases, other than resource constraints, that are endorsed by Academic Board as being beyond the control of the College, a College Associate Dean (Education) may request in writing to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee that it approve an extension to the review date of up to 12 months; an extension will not be granted that results in a cumulative extension of more than 12 months past the original review date.
6. The Academic Quality Assurance Committee may trigger programs for early review based on one or more of the following criteria:
  - a. evidence of student retention rates under 80% (excluding transfers from Diploma to Bachelor; Bachelor to Bachelor (Honours); Graduate Certificate to Graduate Diploma and/or to Master; Master to Master (Advanced)); and/or
  - b. a majority of the courses listed in the program orders with an agreement rate of <50% for overall satisfaction in SELT.
7. Each of the University's academic programs is reviewed using the University's proforma, however programs subject to professional accreditation may use the proforma of the relevant accreditation body and submit a supplementary statement covering any HESF, AQF, and ANU requirements that have not been covered in the accreditation review.
8. For the purposes of University policy, the programs listed in *Table 5*, which excludes disestablished programs, are regarded as professionally accredited programs.

**Table 5: Professionally accredited programs**

Code	Name	Accrediting Body
7410XMACTS	Master of Actuarial Studies	Chartered Financial Analysts Institute
7413XMPACC	Master of Professional Accounting	CPA Australia and CA ANZ
7414XMACCT	Master of Accounting	CPA Australia and CA ANZ
7418XMFIN	Master of Finance	Chartered Financial Analysts Institute
7420XMACTP	Master of Actuarial Practice	Chartered Financial Analysts Institute
7601XMCPSY	Master of Clinical Psychology	Australian Psychology Accreditation Council
7706XMCOMP	Master of Computing	Australian Computer Society
8950XMCHD	Doctor of Medicine and Surgery	Australian Medical Council
9064XCLPSY	PhD (Clinical Psychology)	Australian Psychology Accreditation Council
AACOM	Bachelor of Advanced Computing (Honours)	Australian Computer Society
AENGI	Bachelor of Engineering (Honours)	Engineers Australia

AENRD	Bachelor of Engineering (Rsch & Dev)	Engineers Australia
ALLB	Bachelor of Laws (Honours)	ACT Legal Practitioners Admission Board
APSYC	Bachelor of Psychology (Honours)	Australian Psychology Accreditation Council
BACCT	Bachelor of Accounting	CPA Australia and CA ANZ
BACTS	Bachelor of Actuarial Studies	Chartered Financial Analysts Institute
BCOMP	Bachelor of Computing	Australian Computer Society
BFINN	Bachelor of Finance	CPA Australia and CA ANZ
BSPSY	Bachelor of Science (Psychology)	Australian Psychology Accreditation Council
BSTAT	Bachelor of Statistics	Statistical Society of Australia
MBINS	Master of Business Information Systems	Australian Computer Society
MJD	Juris Doctor	ACT Legal Practitioners Admission Board
MPPSY	Master of Professional Psychology	Australian Psychology Accreditation Council
MSTAT	Master of Statistics	Statistical Society of Australia
VCOMP	Master of Computing (Advanced)	Australian Computer Society

### *Review scope*

9. The purpose of a program review is to support the University's commitment to continuous improvement. The purpose of a review is not remedial: known problems, concerns, or non-compliance should be addressed as soon as they become known through standard program amendment processes, but where identified during a review process should be addressed.
10. The scope of a program review must include, at a minimum, consideration of the following, each drawing as far as possible on external referencing or other benchmarking [HESF 5.3.1]:
  - a. design and content [HESF 5.3.2],
  - b. expected learning outcomes [HESF 5.3.2],
  - c. methods for assessment of those outcomes [HESF 5.3.2],
  - d. extent of students' achievement of learning outcomes [HESF 5.3.2],
  - e. emerging developments in the field of education [HESF 5.3.2],
  - f. modes of delivery [HESF 5.3.2],
  - g. the changing needs of students [HESF 5.3.2],
  - h. identified risks to program quality [HESF 5.3.2],
  - i. analyses of progression rates, attrition rates, completion times and rates and, where applicable, comparing different locations of delivery [HESF 5.3.4.a], and

- j. the assessment methods and grading of student' achievement of learning outcomes for selected courses within the program [*HESF 5.3.4.b*];
  - k. whether the resources required to deliver the program as accredited will be available when needed [*HESF 5.1.3.c*], and
  - l. student feedback on their educational experiences [*HESF 5.3.5*].
11. The review will also consider:
- a. employability, employment outcomes, and progression to further study,
  - b. strategic fit within the College and University,
  - c. linkages, where they do or can exist, between the program and the University's unique national responsibilities, including to national policymakers and national institutions, and
  - d. whether the Inherent Requirements statement (if applicable) is appropriate and reflects good practice.
12. The recommendations of the review will include, as per *HESF 5.3.7*:
- a. mitigation and continuous monitoring of any identified future risks to the quality of the education provided, and
  - b. guidance on specific improvements, and on monitoring the effectiveness of any subsequent action, including any identified improvements relating to admission criteria and approaches to program design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support.

#### *Review panel membership*

13. The HESF requires that the decision to reaccredit is informed by overarching academic scrutiny of the program that is competent to assess the design, delivery and assessment of the program independently of the staff directly involved in those aspects of the program [*HESF 5.1.3.b*]. The decision will be based on the recommendations of an expert panel.
14. The expert panel will, except in the case of clause 15 below, consist of at least the following three members:
- a. the Associate Dean (Education) of the managing College, or nominee who is neither a staff member of any Research School (or a School that is not a constituent part of a Research School) with more than an incidental academic or administrative involvement in the program, nor a current or past program convenor, as chair; an incidental involvement is defined as a School having no subplans and only non-compulsory courses in the program orders (other than as ANU free electives) where the unit value of those courses is not more than 5% of the total unit value of courses in the program orders.
  - b. one independent member external to the university who is an academic in a relevant discipline, appointed by the Chair.
  - c. one independent member external to the university who is a practicing professional in a relevant area, appointed by the Chair.

15. Programs that are exit only, that is, where students are enrolled in another ANU program and are admitted into the exit only program solely for purposes of graduation and students in the exit only program cannot enrol in any other courses between admission and graduation, may replace the requirement for two external members (14b, 14c) with two internal members who meet the requirement for additional members in clause 16.
16. The Associate Dean (Education) of the managing College may appoint up to four additional members to a panel who are not:
  - a. a staff member of any Research School (or a School that is not a constituent part of a Research School) with more than an incidental academic or administrative involvement in the program; an incidental involvement is defined as a School having non-compulsory courses in the program orders (other than as ANU free electives) where the unit value of those courses is not more than 5% of the total unit value of courses in the program orders; or
  - b. a current or past convenor of the program.
17. When appointing additional members, the Chair will have regard to the range of experience of members (for example, current students, alumni, employers, external regulators) and of the demographic makeup of the panel.
18. The panel must have a minority of members who are staff internal to the College/s offering the program.
19. For clarity, the Secretariat and other support staff are not members of the expert panel.
20. Where a review of an externally accredited program listed in Table 5: Professionally Accredited Programs is undertaken by a panel appointed by the accrediting body, that panel may serve as the review panel on condition that no panel members have a significant conflict of interest, and that the panel must not have a majority of members who are staff internal to the College/s offering the program.

#### *Meeting procedure*

21. The Chair will, after consultation with the external members, decide whether meetings are held in person or by videoconference.
22. Once constituted, the panel will determine its own meeting protocols.
23. Where a review of an externally accredited program listed in Table 5: Professionally Accredited Programs is undertaken by an accrediting body, the accrediting body may determine the meeting procedure.

#### *Written documentation*

24. The University is to publish, not later than 24 December two years preceding the year in which the program reviews are due (e.g. 24 December 2024 for 2026 reviews), a list of all program reviews to be undertaken in a calendar year, the deadline for written submissions to the review, the contact details of the Chair of the review to whom submissions should be sent, and a statement that submissions may be marked confidential.

25. The following written documentation is to be available to panel members by a date determined by the Panel Chair:
- a. A consolidated submission from the managing College/s, including analysis of alignment with University and College strategy, sustainability of staffing for the program, and external referencing necessary to support the review scope;
  - b. ASQO, on compliance with internal and external legislation, rules, and policies;
  - c. PSP, on data held by the University that relates to the program including 5 years time series data on load, student success, and feedback from students, and data relating to employability that is as far as possible disaggregated to program level;
  - d. CGRO on the previous review of the program, and the implementation of its recommendations as reported to AQAC; and
  - e. Any other submissions that have been received.

### *Interviews*

26. The panel may, at its discretion, interview relevant stakeholders.
27. The panel will consult with the College Dean and the Program Convenor before finalising its recommendations.
28. Where a review of an externally accredited program listed in Table 5: Professionally Accredited Programs is undertaken by an accrediting body, the accrediting body may determine whether or not any interviews are held and, if so, with whom.

### *Governance Process*

29. The Chair of the Review Panel is responsible for ensuring and certifying that all panel members have agreed to the final text of the review or, if they do not, that they have their disagreement with all or part of the report explicitly noted in the report.
30. No changes may be made to the Final Report other than by the Review Panel.
31. Once the report is finalised, the Chair of the Review Panel sends the review report to the Secretary to the College Education Committee for noting by the College Education Committee.
32. Following noting by the College Education Committee, the report together with any comments or conditions, are sent to the Secretary of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee for consideration by the Committee.
33. Following consideration by AQAC, the report together with any endorsement, comments or conditions, are sent to the Secretary of the Academic Board for consideration by the Board.
34. Any recommendations approved by Academic Board are then added to the AQAC Program Review Recommendations Monitoring Report, with progress against implementation to be recorded by the relevant College.



## 2.6 Admissions standards accreditation

1. Academic Quality Assurance Committee endorses, and Academic Board approves coursework admissions standards for a maximum period of five years. Admissions standards include:
  - a. minimum English language requirements [HESF 1.1.1], and
  - b. minimum academic qualification [HESF 1.1.1].
2. The University's academic colleges may propose additional program-specific eligibility criteria and prerequisites, which are endorsed by Academic Quality Assurance Committee and approved by Academic Board.
3. Admissions standards for each of the University's coursework programs are reviewed at least every five years, although Academic Quality Assurance Committee or Academic Board may trigger a shorter review cycle on the basis of evidence relating to student outcomes, breaches, conflicts of interest or quality assurance.
4. Any breaches in admissions standards are reported to Academic Quality Assurance Committee, Academic Board, and the Vice Chancellor.

## 2.7 Disestablishing programs

1. Programs may be disestablished by Academic Board on the advice of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework programs) or University Research Committee (HDR programs), via the HDR Committee.
2. Prior to initiating a disestablishment, the relevant managing ANU College(s) must investigate any possible adverse effects that the change may have and:
  - a. consult with ASQO whether under the terms of the *Funding Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia as represented by the Minister for Education and The Australian National University regarding funding under the Higher Education Support Act 2003* the University must consult the Commonwealth and obtain the Commonwealth's approval for the closure of the program;
  - b. identify current students and propose any transitional arrangements or alternative equivalent programs;
  - c. identify potential enrolments or potential student cohorts in pathway programs who may be affected by the decision to disestablish an academic program and propose alternative program options and/or any transitional arrangements that will be put in place;
  - d. time-limits on the transitional arrangements; and
  - e. may add a temporary last admit term for the program on [Programs and Courses](#) to prevent new applications or offers during the decision process.
3. The default period for transitioning students out of a disestablished program is the full-time duration of study for the final cohort of students admitted, where an equivalent program for

students to transition into can be identified, and the part-time duration of study for the final cohort of students where no equivalent program can be identified.

4. Proposals for the disestablishment of an academic program are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s) and considered for endorsement by the relevant ANU College(s) Education Committee.
5. Proposals are submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework programs) or University Research Committee (HDR programs) (via the HDR Committee) consideration via [the](#) Curriculum Management System (CMS).
6. If endorsed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee or University Research Committee the proposal is submitted for Academic Board approval.

## 2.8 Disestablishing Programs: actions post approval

1. Following approval by the Academic Board, the managing ANU College(s) must:
  - a. if not already done so, add a last admit term for the program on Programs and Courses;
  - b. notify current students via their ANU email account and provide:
    - i. the effective date of disestablishment;
    - ii. options to transfer to equivalent ANU programs (if relevant);
    - iii. the transitional arrangements put in place and the duration of such arrangements;
  - c. notify potential enrolments or potential student cohorts in pathway programs of their options and any transitional arrangements that will be put in place; and
  - d. commence teachout of the program.

## 2.9 Major, minor, and specialisation accreditation

1. Academic Board, on advice from the Academic Quality Assurance Committee, accredits new majors, minors, and specialisations for a maximum period of five years. Professional accreditation is the responsibility of the relevant managing ANU College(s).
2. All majors, minors, and specialisations are managed and taught by one or more of the Colleges. They cannot be managed or taught outside one of those academic structures.
3. Academic Board, on advice from the Academic Quality Assurance Committee, approves amendments to the admission requirements for Honours Specialisations; the host ANU College will approve all other amendments to majors, minors, and specialisations.

## 2.10 Proposals for the introduction of majors, minors and specialisations

1. Proposals for the introduction of majors, minors or specialisations are first considered by the relevant ANU College(s). Proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).

2. If endorsed by the ANU College(s), the major, minor or specialisation proposal is submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee consideration via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) in line with scheduled dates.
3. If endorsed by Academic Quality Assurance Committee by a majority, the proposal is submitted for Academic Board accreditation. Academic Board considers the accreditation of majors, minors and specialisations in line with the ANU Strategic Plan and academic standards, as articulated in University policy.
4. Once accredited by Academic Board, the Academic Standards and Quality Office publishes the major, minor or specialisation on [\*Programs and Courses\*](#).

#### 2.11 Proposals for the amendment of majors, minors and specialisations

1. Proposals for the amendment of majors, minors or specialisations are considered by the relevant ANU College(s). Proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).
2. Once accredited by the ANU College(s), the Academic Standards and Quality Office publishes the major, minor or specialisation on [\*Programs and Courses\*](#).
3. Proposals to amend Honours specialisation admission requirements follow the process for new majors, minors and specialisations detailed in section 2.11.

#### 2.12 Major, minor, and specialisation review and reaccreditation

1. All sub-plans must be reviewed at least once every 5 years.
2. ANU Colleges may propose an appropriate review schedule for sub-plans that aligns with the 5 year program review schedule reported to and endorsed by AQAC, and approved by Academic Board annually.

#### 2.13 Disestablishing majors, minors and specialisations

1. Majors, Minors, and Specialisations may be disestablished by Academic Board on the advice of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee. If a major, minor or specialisation is to be disestablished, the relevant managing ANU College(s) must, for majors, consult with ASQO whether under the terms of the *Funding Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia as represented by the Minister for Education and The Australian National University regarding funding under the Higher Education Support Act 2003* the University must consult the Commonwealth and obtain the Commonwealth's approval for the closure of the major; and for all sub-plans investigate any possible adverse effects that the change may have on students currently enrolled in the program, with particular regard to:
  - a. any transitional arrangements required; and
  - b. time-limits on the transitional arrangements.

2. If a major, minor or specialisation is listed in the orders of a program, its removal must be approved before the major, minor or specialisation can be disestablished. The disestablishment date cannot be before the effective date of its removal from the program. Disestablishment of majors, minors and specialisations is permanent on approval.
3. Proposals for the disestablishment of a major, minor or specialisation are first considered by the relevant ANU College(s). The proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).
4. If endorsed by the ANU College(s), proposals are submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee consideration via the Curriculum Management System (CMS).
5. If endorsed by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee by majority, the proposal is submitted for Academic Board approval.
6. If approved, teach out is commenced, including processes of notifying affected students.

#### 2.14 Course accreditation

1. All courses are governed and taught by an academic College. Courses are not owned or taught outside of those academic structures.
2. The relevant ANU College Education Committee (or equivalent) accredits new courses and amendments to courses for a maximum period of five years, with the exception of courses that are not taught in the English language and which do not provide education that aims to develop proficiency in languages other than English, as described in clause 2.16.
3. Course amendments are accredited until the course is due to be reviewed.
4. Professional accreditation is the responsibility of the relevant managing ANU College.
5. To ensure that our course handbook reflects what we teach, each taught course, other than special topics courses, must be taught at least once over each three calendar year period. Towards the end of each year, Planning and Service Performance (PSP) provides to College Associate Deans (Education) a list of courses not taught at least once over a three calendar year period. Courses on that list are to be disestablished as at 01 January of the year following that period unless the Associate Dean (Education) of the managing College approves a case as to why the course should not be disestablished. A list of any retained courses together with the rationale for retention of each provided by Colleges is tabled at the first meeting each year of the Academic Quality Assurance Committee for discussion and consideration of any policy changes suggested by the responses. For clarity, co-taught courses are not aggregated for this process.
6. Each year, Planning and Service Performance (PSP) provides to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee a list of courses not taught at least once over a six year period. All courses on this list are, after confirmation of accuracy of the list with the Associate Deans (Education), automatically disestablished. For clarity, co-taught courses are not aggregated for this process.

7. Proposals to establish, modify or disestablish courses that involve either the academic content or resources of another ANU College must include documentary evidence of consultation with that ANU College.
8. Colleges will report their list of new, reaccredited and disestablished courses to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee once a year.

#### 2.15 Proposals for the introduction or amendment of a course

1. Proposals for the introduction or amendment of courses, other than courses taught in a language other than English and which do not provide education the primary purpose of which is to develop facility in that language, are considered by the relevant ANU College(s) Education Committee. The proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).
2. Proposals for the introduction or amendment of courses taught in a language other than English and which do not provide education the primary purpose of which is to develop facility in that language, are first considered by the relevant ANU College(s) Education Committee for endorsement and if endorsed are sent to the Academic Quality Assurance Committee for consideration for approval. The proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).
3. Once accredited, the relevant ANU College publishes the course on [\*Programs and Courses\*](#).

#### 2.16 Courses delivered in a language other than English

1. All ANU courses that are not taught in the English language and which do not provide education that aims as its primary purpose to develop proficiency in languages other than English must be considered for accreditation by the Academic Quality Assurance Committee.
2. Approval for courses to be delivered in languages other than English that do not have as their primary purpose education in language proficiency is contingent on the fulfilment of the following additional requirements:
  - a. The appointment of an external examiner who is proficient in English and the language of instruction who is an expert in the relevant discipline. Where required a registered translator may also be engaged to ensure the accurate translation of course materials; and
  - b. Staff proficiency in both English and the language of instruction; and
  - c. Quality assurance arrangements proposed for monitoring the equivalence of any teaching and or assessment tasks that are completed in English with those in the language of instruction and student outcomes for the programs or courses; and
  - d. Provision of examination conditions that satisfy University requirements.
3. Where the course is in a program that is exempt from the university's English language admission requirements, the managing College is responsible, including for the costs, for certified translations

into the target language of ANU documents including policy documents to which students may need access.

## 2.17 Course review and reaccreditation

1. Each course will be reviewed at least once every 5 years on the review proforma or equivalent document using one of the following methods [HESF 5.3.3-4b]:
  - a. Comprehensive review, which is a review of all aspects of the course and includes the design and content, the learning outcomes, the methods for assessment of those outcomes, SELT data, grade distribution, enrolment patterns and modes of delivery. It also reviews the Course page in the LMS and course materials. It may include a peer review and convenor self-assessment.
  - b. Streamlined review, which is a compliance-based review focusing on constructive alignment of course description, learning outcomes, assessment, and most recent class summary, as well as compliance with university policy and AQF requirements. It may include SELT data at the discretion of the College.
  - c. External accreditation review, which is a review of a program carried out by an external professional body for the purpose of accrediting that program so that graduates are entitled to practice or become a member of that profession. Such a review satisfies course review requirements if the College Education Committee reviews the accreditation documentation and determines that the accreditation documentation satisfies either the comprehensive or streamlined course review process, other than completion of the Compliance Checklist for compliance with HESF, AQF, and ANU policy which must always be completed for each course.
2. A shorter review and reaccreditation cycle for courses may be triggered by the ANU College Dean, Associate Dean (Education), Heads of School, or College Education Committee or equivalent, or by the Course Convenor, on the basis of evidence relating to viability, quality assurance, or student outcomes or experience. Courses triggered for a shorter review cycle must follow the comprehensive review process.
3. A course must follow comprehensive review process if:
  - a. The previous review of the course followed the streamlined review process;
  - b. It had a SELT agreement rate in the bottom 5% for that College on its most recent offering; and/or
  - c. Concerns education “to increase awareness and understanding of the prevention of child sexual abuse and potentially harmful sexual behaviours in children”.
4. Outcomes of the course review, including all documentation prepared for or by the review, are reported to the relevant ANU College Education Committee (or equivalent). If approved, the course is reaccredited for a maximum of 5 years. ANU Colleges are responsible for maintaining records of course review outcomes.

## 2.18 Proposals for the disestablishment of courses

1. The relevant ANU College may disestablish a course that is not listed in the orders of any program, major, minor, or specialisation; if a course is listed, its removal must be approved before the course can be disestablished. The course disestablishment date cannot be before the effective date of its removal from any program, major, minor, or specialisation. Disestablishment of courses is permanent on approval, that is, the course cannot be reactivated and the course code cannot be reused; this does not preclude creation of a similar course with a different course code. Proposals for the disestablishment of courses are first considered by the relevant ANU College(s). The proposals are initiated on the appropriate template in the Curriculum Management System (CMS) by the relevant ANU College(s).
2. If endorsed by the ANU College(s), proposals are submitted via the Curriculum Management System (CMS) to the Academic Standards and Quality Office for action.
3. If approved, the course must continue to be taught until all requirements of the Procedure: Course/Class Cancellation have been met.

## 2.19 Responsibility for implementation

1. Academic Board has responsibility for approving the introduction, amendment to, or disestablishment of academic programs. It has responsibility for monitoring the University's academic programs accreditation framework to ensure quality assurance for academic standards, and the identification of opportunities for quality enhancement. *[HESF 5.1.2]*
2. The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality) has responsibility for monitoring and reporting to Academic Board on the University's academic programs accreditation framework to ensure quality assurance for academic standards and the identification of opportunities for quality enhancement.
3. College Deans have responsibility for ensuring that proposals align with University policy and ANU College resource strategy before they are submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee (coursework) or University Research Committee (HDR) (via the HDR Committee) and Academic Board accreditation.
4. Academic Quality Assurance Committee has responsibility for endorsing for Academic Board the introduction, amendment to, or disestablishment of academic coursework programs. Members of Academic Quality Assurance Committee have responsibility for monitoring the University's academic programs and course accreditation process and recommending and reviewing improvements to that process.
5. University Research Committee, via the HDR Committee, has responsibility for endorsing for Academic Board the introduction, amendment to, or disestablishment of HDR programs. Members of the University Research Committee have responsibility for monitoring the University's HDR programs and course accreditation process and recommending and reviewing improvements to that process.

6. Associate Deans (Education) or equivalent are responsible for ensuring that proposals are fully completed, in line with University policy and supported by documentation before they are submitted for Academic Quality Assurance Committee or University Research Committee (via the HDR Committee), and Academic Board consideration. They are also responsible for ensuring that changes approved by Academic Board are implemented, and for communicating opportunities to improve the University's accreditation policy framework.
7. Academic and Professional Staff completing proposals are responsible for ensuring that proposals are fully completed, in line with University policy and supported by documentation before they are submitted to the Associate Dean. They are also responsible for ensuring that changes approved by Academic Board are implemented.
8. Division of Student Administration and Academic Services (DSAAS) has responsibility for ensuring that proposals are fully completed with correct nomenclature, in line with University policy, compliant with legislation (HESF, ESOS), and supported by documentation before they are submitted to Academic Quality Assurance Committee or HDR Committee, and publishing curriculum changes approved by Academic Board.