

Higher Education Standards Panel

Draft Standards for Course Design and Learning Outcomes

Monash University Response

Call for Comments:

Feedback on the proposed format (eg style, clarity, pitch) for the revised standards (including the use of reference points), as represented by the two standards examples given, is invited by the Panel. It would be helpful if feedback could be framed around the following questions:

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

Monash broadly supports the proposed format for the Standards and looks forward to receiving the remaining standards throughout 2013.

Monash strongly supports the Panel's intention to eliminate duplication across Standards which has been an issue in the first round of re-registration.

We note that there remains some potential duplication in the revised structure outlined in Communique No.4. For example, some of the items listed under student experience would seem to be performance outcomes that should then be analysed in their relevant context (entry, progression and completion rates are examples). A recurring issue during the TEQSA re-registration process was the fragmentation of functions across several standards and the need to cross-reference documents. An example is course accreditation from a governance perspective and the evidence of this in action for each sampled course. These matters are best considered together. Another potential example of this in the proposed structure is risk oversight in Corporate Governance and risk management under Management.

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

Monash supports the inclusion of Reference Points to assist providers in determining the types of documents that may demonstrate compliance with standards. We welcome frameworks like the Australian Qualifications Framework, professional accreditation processes and international models such as the Bologna Accord being designated as "Reference Points". This affords improved flexibility for course development within an international context.

We agree that the Reference Points should not be deemed to be standards or be presented in such a way that they are treated as "de facto" standards. The definition statement needs to be strengthened to ensure that this does not occur.

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

The succinct nature of the draft standards is welcomed by Monash.

Call for Comments:

*Feedback on the proposed draft standards for **Course Design (Coursework)** is invited by the Panel. It would be helpful if feedback could be framed around the following questions:*

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?

The content of the Course Design Standard will necessarily inform course accreditation practices and again raises the potential for overlap if a discrete Standard for course accreditation is developed.

There is reference to course review processes in Standard 7. While the University supports a 5 year review cycle for courses of up to three years duration, there is the need for more flexibility for reviewing courses of greater than three years duration.

Call for Comments:

Feedback on the proposed draft standards for Learning Outcomes (Coursework) is invited by the Panel. It would be helpful if feedback could be framed around the following questions:

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

The proposed standards for Learning Outcomes reflect contemporary practice for establishing, assessing and monitoring learning outcomes and are supported by Monash.

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

As noted in the response to the Course Design standards, there may be overlap with any accreditation standards that may be developed in future.

Standard 7 - Appears to refer to 5 yearly review of learning outcomes that would be best achieved through course review processes (Course Design Standard 7 refers). Again, while the University supports a five year review cycle for courses of up to three years duration, there is the need for greater flexibility for courses of greater than three years duration.

Standard 10 - Monash supports the periodic external verification of grading for selected units within courses of study and that each provider makes arrangements appropriate to its context. Monash would not support the creation of external marking systems that are present in a number of overseas jurisdictions.