



## Draft Standards for Course Design and Learning Outcomes

### Course Design (Coursework)

- Statement 4 is ambiguous and could be read as if the AQF is awarding the qualification rather than the provider. Further, “informed by” may not be a strong enough statement to ensure consistency/compliance with the AQF but perhaps this is not the intent of this part of the Standards.

### Learning Outcomes:

- Terms such as encompass, embody, incorporate or similar could be used instead of “informed by”. The latter could be somewhat nebulous when it comes to interpreting these Standards. A provider may claim to provide evidence of having looked at these aspects, and therefore the course is informed by them, but in practice may not have effectively incorporated mastery of discipline knowledge, generic attributes etc.
- Whilst these Standards overall are perfectly adequate in requiring the provider to demonstrate that the course is internally consistent, they could be stronger in requiring a demonstration that the academic achievements of students who progress through the course are at a sufficiently high level when compared to external benchmarks.
- Perhaps statement 9 could state that the grades awarded reflect the acquisition of knowledge, skills and attributes expected at 3. Statement 10 could require something stronger than referencing of grading – benchmarking or a similar term might have more impact here. Referencing could imply simply situating the performance of the course’s students within the context of other students, while benchmarking could imply measuring the performance of students against other programs with a view to improving standards.
- What needs to be considered is how to avoid accrediting a program that might be packaged well but which aims low and achieves low, and whether a course can be held to some kind of objective measure of student achievement, even if this is difficult to achieve in practice.