



**Faculty of Built Environment**  
Construction Management and Property

15<sup>th</sup> April 2013

Professor Alan Robson  
Chair, Higher Education Standards Panel  
GPO Box 1672  
Melbourne, Victoria 3000

Dear Professor Robson,

Re: Draft Standards for Course Design and Learning Outcomes.

I am writing in my capacity as Discipline Scholar for Building and Construction on behalf of the Building and Construction disciplines. A representative stakeholder group of academics, professional bodies, university administrators and students met to review the draft Standards for Course Design and Learning Outcomes in Sydney, in March 2013.

Our comments on the Draft Standards for Course Design and Learning Outcomes – Discussion Paper 5th March 2013 are as follows:

Q1. Do you broadly support the proposed format for the standards? If not, why?

**Yes.**

Q2. Do you support the inclusion of Reference Points as proposed? If not, why?

**Yes.**

Q3. Do you wish to make any suggestions in relation to the format of the standards?

**No.**

Q4. Do you broadly support the proposed standards for Course design? If not, why?

**Yes.**

Q5. Do you wish to make any suggestions in relation to the specific content of the standards?

**No.**

Q6. Do you broadly support the proposed standards for Learning Outcomes? If not, why?

**Yes.**

Q7. Do you wish to make any suggestions in relation to the specific content of the standards?

- (i) [Learning Outcomes (3)] Clarification is sought on the intention of the term 'informed'. Something more specific is required.
- (ii) [Learning Outcomes (3)] Why make these four elements explicit and not others? Could they not be accommodated within a single reference such as 'relevant discipline stakeholder requirements'?
- (iii) [Learning Outcomes (3)] How are the requirements to be adjusted for different levels of qualification and/or different stages of industry readiness?
- (iv) [Learning Outcomes (10)] Is the process of periodic referencing expected to involve a direct comparison of grades, or can the referencing be more generalised – as would, for example, typically be the case if/where grades are reviewed as part of professional accreditation by an external examiner who has experience in the grading of comparable units or courses?
- (v) [Reference Points (general)] Is the intention to "require" reference to all, most, one or none of the three reference points given?
- (vi) [Reference Points (general)] Why are professional bodies listed in both ii. and iii.?
- (vii) [Reference Points (ii)] Is it the intention to reference all, at least one, or not necessarily any of the communities? Our strong preference is for the list of possibilities to be non-exclusive – ie. We do not favour any one stakeholder group having exclusive control of the learning outcome statements.
- (viii) [Reference Points (iii)] Which professional accreditation requirements are included under this item? Any professional body; only those professional/registration bodies with state registration requirements (some professional bodies only register in particular states); only those professional/registration bodies explicitly recognised by TEQSA? We do not favour a restricted list of professional bodies in this regard and do not see the need for reference point iii., given that professional bodies are included more generally in ii.

The Building and Construction discipline representatives particularly welcome and endorse the inclusion of Reference Points in the Standards document.

Yours sincerely,

Associate Professor Sidney Newton  
Discipline Scholar, Building and Construction