Course Accreditation Policy

Section 1 - Purpose

(1) This Policy explains the processes for the approval and review of awards, courses and fields of research within the Charles Sturt University (the University). The policy objectives which underlie these processes are as follows:

- a. to ensure the development of courses which:
    - i. are of high academic standard and which meet the needs of relevant professions or industry groups; and
    - ii. fit the University's planning profile;
- b. to ensure that existing courses continue to meet these objectives;
- c. to ensure that consistency with Academic policies is maintained across courses concerning nomenclature and structure;
- d. to ensure the effective documentation of proposals for both new and modified courses; and
- e. to ensure that course accreditation processes enable timely introduction of new or modified courses within the University's framework of student induction and course delivery.

Section 2 - Glossary

(2) A Glossary of Terms can be found in the CSU policy library.

Section 3 - Policy

Australian Qualifications Framework

(3) The Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) is the national policy for regulated qualifications in the Australian education and training system.

(4) The AQF provides descriptors for each qualification level. The descriptors define the qualifications in terms of:

- a. the characteristics of learning outcomes;
- b. the authority for those learning outcomes; and
- c. pathways to the qualification.

(5) Detailed descriptions of each qualification level may be found on the AQF website . Courses at the University are expected to comply with AQF guidelines, attested to by the approval of a course or modification/review of a course by the Academic Senate course accreditation policy and processes.

Academic Governance

University Council

(6) Under the Charles Sturt University Act (1989), the University Council is, in controlling and managing the affairs and

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 1 of 25

concerns of the University:

   a. to oversee the academic activities of the University. (19(1B)(c)), and

   may, for and on behalf of the University in the exercise of the University's functions:

   b. provide such courses and confer such degrees and award such diplomas and other certificates, as it thinks fit. (19(1)(a)).

University Course Planning Committee

(7) The University Course Planning Committee was established by the Vice-Chancellor to "assist in the planning and management of the University". With respect to the approval of awards and courses, the Committee:

   a. determines their compatibility with the University's mission statement and educational profile ;

   b. reviews evidence of their need and demand;

   c. evaluates their resource implications, including availability of required staff;

   d. determines their priority and date of introduction; and

   e. allocates load.

Academic Senate

(8) The Academic Senate is the principal academic body of the University. As such, the Academic Senate ensures on behalf of the University Council that:

   a. the structure and requirements of each course are consistent with the award to which it leads;

   b. the depth of content and standard of assessment of each course is appropriate to the award to which it leads;

   c. the methods of course delivery are appropriate in achieving the purpose of the course;

   d. the course and the award to which it leads are consistent with the Australian Qualifications Framework.

(9) In the case of undergraduate courses, postgraduate coursework courses and coursework professional doctorates, this work is carried out by the Faculty Courses Committees of Academic Senate, and reported to Academic Senate annually.

Research Advisory Committee

(10) The Research Advisory Committee is responsible for overseeing, and advising the Academic Senate on, the accreditation of research higher degree courses and research professional doctorates. In particular, the Research Advisory Committee is responsible for the final approval of all higher degree research program proposals and research professional doctorate proposals emanating from the Faculties and recommends changes to the Academic Senate policy on course accreditation.

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee

(11) The Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee has delegated authority from Academic Senate for oversight of all academic policy and outcomes relating to curriculum, learning and teaching. In particular, the Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee provides advice to the Academic Senate on all proposed changes to curriculum, learning and teaching academic policy, and has particular responsibility for recommending changes to the Academic Senate's policy on course accreditation .

Faculty Boards

(12) The Faculty Boards for the Faculties of the University have delegated authority for the oversight of

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 2 of 25

implementation of the policies of the Academic Senate, including this policy.

(13) Faculty Boards have specific course-related roles, to be found in their terms of reference.

Courses Committees of Faculty Boards

(14) The Faculty Courses Committees, as committees of the Academic Senate, approve all course documentation except master by research programs and research doctoral programs.

(15) The role of the Faculty Courses Committee for each Faculty Board is to:

   a. accredit and oversee additions and deletions to the course profile for the Faculty; and
   b. approve all proposals for new or revised courses submitted for accreditation, following any required University Course Planning Committee approval.

Faculty Research Committees

(16) Faculty Research and Higher Degree Committees may be used by Faculties to consider and make recommendations to the Faculty with respect to the approval of new and revised research courses proposed by the several Schools of the Faculty.

School Boards

(17) School Boards are the principal academic body of each School. School Boards consider and make recommendations to the Faculty Board and Faculty Courses Committee with respect to all matters relating to the subjects taught by the School and with respect to general matters relating to courses.

Course Committees

(18) A Course Committee may be established for each course or group of courses to advise the Faculty Board (or, for shared courses, Faculty Boards) through the Board's Faculty Courses Committee on the development and academic administration of the course or courses for which it is responsible.

Course Advisory Process

Objectives

(19) To ensure that the academic standing of courses remains high. To this end, the advisory process chosen for the development and review of a particular course or courses will be one that assists in ensuring that:

   a. the course is current and constitutes an intellectually challenging and stimulating learning experience;
   b. the course has clear and appropriate aims and objectives;
   c. the course content, including teaching and learning experiences and assessment strategies, is at an appropriate level and is consistent with the aims and objectives of the course; and
   d. the teaching methods are appropriate for the course.

(20) To ensure that courses remain relevant to the professions and industries they serve. To this end, the advisory process chosen for a particular course or courses will be one that can provide an awareness of:

   a. the changing needs of the community;
   b. the industry/professional reputation of the course;
   c. the changing focus of those professions and industries; and
   d. existing, emerging and potential markets.

Minimum Requirements

(21) The minimum requirements of the policy are that, for every course, there must be:

  a. an identified advisory process in place;
  b. experts from outside the University included in that process; and
  c. records of all aspects of the process.

(22) The advisory process chosen may be one that includes a number of courses or be specific to a particular course.

(23) The advisory process chosen may also:

  a. provide avenues for community input into the enhancement and further development of courses;
  b. encourage recognition of courses by relevant bodies; and
  c. assist in promotion of courses.

(24) It is the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that the advisory process chosen for each course meets the minimum requirements of the policy and that in the advisory process overall there is the expertise to address all of the objectives of the policy.

(25) Where a course includes specialisations, and a particular specialisation is being added to a course or is being reviewed individually, the advisory process requirements apply for that specialisation.

(26) The records of the advisory process for a particular course will be kept by the Faculty, according to its own internal processes.

(27) The details of the advisory process employed for a particular course will be set out in the CASIMS course documentation for the course.

Approval of Courses

(28) This section applies to award courses of the University.

Course Structures

Standard Courses

(29) For each level of award offered by the University there is a standard course structure. A standard course may be specified in terms of: the number of points required to complete the course; or the number of standard subjects or their equivalent required to complete the course. Variation to these structures is permitted, but should be justified in the CASIMS course documentation, and be within the boundaries set by the AQF for each course type.

(30) Charles Sturt University courses follow the AQF guidelines for duration, and a standard undergraduate full-time Charles Sturt University course is defined as 64 points of study in a year, or 8 standard subjects.

Standard Subject

(31) A standard subject is an 8 point subject taught over one session. An equivalent standard subject may be a half standard subject or a subject whose point value is a multiple of eight. Examples include:

  a. half standard subject 4 points;
  b. double standard subject 16 points;
  c. quadruple standard subject 32 points.

Subject Levels in Postgraduate Courses

(32) Prior to 2006, University policy on subject levels in postgraduate courses specified only that an identified proportion of undergraduate subjects may be included in graduate certificate (100 per cent), graduate diploma (50 per cent) and master degree (25 per cent) courses. These proportions have been replaced by the requirements set out below.

(33) Under the new AQF, there is no set amount of undergraduate study that is permitted within a postgraduate degree. However normally it would be considered inappropriate to include postgraduate study within an undergraduate degree. The AQF has published guidelines on this topic, which should be consulted when designing courses at Charles Sturt University. In each case the Faculty needs to have a clearly articulated rationale for its choice of subjects in a particular course design.

Double Degrees

Definition

(34) There are two types of double degree.

a. Type 1 - A program which combines all of the components of two separate bachelor degree courses (each referred to in this context as a constituent course) into a single program such that the overall duration of the program is shorter than the sum of the constituent courses whilst still meeting all of the requirements of each of those constituent courses.

(35) Students completing a double degree program graduate with a separate award for each of the constituent courses in the double degree program.

a. Type 2 - A degree leading to only one award, but which meets the requirements of two separate degree areas. Students completing this type of double degree receive a single testamur with a double nomenclature e.g. Bachelor of Sports Science/Bachelor of Teaching.

(36) Type 2 Double Degree Rules

a. Students enrolled in a Type 2 double degree may not exit with only one of the degrees, although may transfer to one of the constituent degrees where they exist separately as a standalone course. In such cases credit granted will be mindful of any differences between the course in the double degree, and as a standalone course.
b. Advertising & Course Information - Type 2 double degrees shall be clearly distinguished in course information and advertising from Type 1 double degrees;
c. Course requirements - there are no constituent courses in a Type 2 double degree. However the course shall allow students to meet the requirements of both degrees in the course nomenclature, as if they were independent awards;
d. Equivalence - a Type 2 double degree may be constructed in such a way that there is overlap between the two degree areas. This would allow a reduction in learning required by the student, and thus of course duration.

(37) Clauses 37-52 below refer only to Type 1 double degrees.

Requirements of the Constituent Courses

(38) The primary rule for a Type 1 double degree program is that all of the requirements of each of the constituent courses must be met. This means that, in a specific double degree program, every component of each of the constituent courses must be able to be found. Course components include one or more core subjects, any elective sequences (i.e., sets of specialisations, majors, minors or, for the Bachelor of Business and Bachelor of Accounting

courses, joint studies) and restricted elective or unrestricted elective options.

(39) For each component, this is achieved through either:

  a. the inclusion of that component of a constituent course in the double degree program exactly as it is in the constituent course; OR
  b. the identification, for the component in a constituent course, of an equivalent of that component in a component of the other constituent course, and the inclusion of that equivalent component from the other constituent course in the double degree program so that it serves to meet this requirement for both constituent courses.

Duration and Point Value

(40) There is no prescribed duration or point value for a Type 1 double degree program. Whilst the most common model is a four-year, 256 point (32 standard subjects) double degree program based on two three-year degree programs, the duration and point value of a specific double degree program is determined by those reductions in time and point value made possible by the presence of common subjects (i.e., the same subject is part of both constituent courses), identification of equivalent subjects or components, and/or genuine overlap of components.

(41) Thus, for example, the common features and/or equivalences for a specific double degree program may mean that that program comprises 248 points (31 standard subjects) and be of four year's duration, with one session in the program containing three subjects instead of four.

(42) Where a constituent course has specialisations, and some of these specialisations overlap more than do others with the components of the other constituent degree, students undertaking the more overlapping specialisations in the double degree program will be required to complete fewer points than those undertaking the other specialisations. This is because the corollary to the rule that all requirements of both constituent courses must be met is that no student in a double degree program can be required to undertake more than is required by the course requirements of each of the constituent courses.

Equivalent Components

(43) The identification, for components of one constituent course, of equivalents in components of the other constituent course relates to how specific the components of each constituent course are (and, in particular, whether individual subjects are specified in a component), and to the purposes for which each component is included in the course (for individual subjects that are core components of a course, this will also relate to the aims and objectives of the subject and to the level of the subject).

(44) Equivalence for each type of component may be met as follows:

  a. Core subject(s) - either an equivalent subject, or a number of subjects which together meet the aims and objectives of the core subject, in the other course must be identified. Where a core subject is a practicum subject, its equivalent in the other constituent course would also need to be a practicum subject, such that the practicum subject being included in the double degree program also serves to meet the requirements (aims and objectives, level, proportion of the course it represents, etc.) of the practicum subject that is not being included.
  b. An elective sequence component (i.e., a set of specialisations, majors, minors or (in the Bachelor of Business and Bachelor of Accounting) joint studies) - equivalence is possible either when some of the subjects in an elective sequence component in one constituent course are not specified by code/title or when the discipline areas only (rather than specific subjects) for an elective sequence component are specified, and there are subjects in the other constituent course that meet the specifications (subject or discipline area) of the elective sequence component. Where subjects in an elective sequence component are specified, these subjects would either have to also be offered in the other constituent course (i.e., they are common subjects, not equivalences)

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 6 of 25

or specific subject equivalence would have to be identified as for core subjects above. See also clauses 45-48 on minors.

    c. Restricted elective(s) - where these subjects are specifically identified in a constituent course, the same conditions for equivalence apply as for a core subject. Where the discipline area(s) only of the restricted elective(s) have been specified, then sufficient subjects in the other course in one or more of those discipline areas must be able to be identified to enable the requirements for number and type of restricted elective to be able to be met.

    d. Unrestricted elective(s) - any subject in the other constituent course will meet this requirement.

(45) Where equivalent subjects or components are identified for inclusion in a double degree program, any student who is enrolled separately in one of the constituent degree courses, and who has already completed that equivalent subject or component instead of the prescribed subject or component in their course, must be entitled to credit for that subject.

Variations to Requirements in Double Degree Programs

(46) For any component of one of the constituent courses of a Type 1 double degree program, a variation to that component may not be offered in the double degree program that is not also available to students enrolled in the constituent course offered separately. Note: this does not apply to equivalences that have been identified according to the guidelines in clauses 42-44 above.

(47) The single exception to this rule relates to minors. Where, for a specific double degree program, one component of one of the constituent courses comprises a set of minors, then a minor or choice of minors that is different from those offered in the constituent course may be included in the double degree program (i.e., available only to the students enrolled in that double degree program) provided that these double degree minors are consistent with the aims and objectives of the constituent course. The rationale for this is that it enables a specific double degree to be more effectively tailored to meet an identified need.

(48) Should the Faculty then wish to add one or more of the "double degree only" minors to students enrolled separately in the constituent course, this would need to be done through the standard approval process for the addition of a minor to a course.

(49) On the other hand, a component in a constituent course that includes choices (such as a set of elective sequences or a range of restricted electives) may be included in the double degree program in a more prescriptive form. For example, whereas in a constituent course the student may have a choice of five identified majors, only one of those majors might be available to the double degree student because the subjects in that major also comprise a component of the other constituent course in the double degree program (and so enable a reduction in the overall duration and point value of the program).

Courses Offered Only Within Double Degree Programs

(50) A Faculty may choose to offer a course only as a constituent course within one or more specific Type 1 double degree programs. Since the constituent course will still lead to a separate award, it will be required to meet all of the requirements for a bachelor degree course, including fitting within the guidelines of the Australian Qualifications Framework .

(51) Where a course is offered with a generic structure and with a set of specialisations, a Faculty may choose to offer just the generic course as a constituent course within a specified double degree program or programs, provided that the generic course is not also offered as a separate course. In such an instance, students in the separate course would be required to complete one of the specialisations in the course.

(52) See also clauses on shell courses for policy on shell courses in double degree programs .

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 7 of 25

(53) See below for the documentation and approval processes for double degree programs.

Nested Courses

These were previously called articulated courses at Charles Sturt University. Articulation now has a more general meaning in the Australian Qualifications Framework, meaning any pathway between qualifications that allows for admission and/or credit. Nested courses are articulated, but also include additional features, such as multiple entry and/or exit points for students.

(54) An articulated and/or nested set of courses where one or more of the courses is at a different Australian Qualifications Framework level or is of a different Australian Qualifications Framework type, or is from different sectors (for example vocational and higher education) are called integrated qualifications in the Australian Qualifications Framework.

With Multiple Entry Points

(55) A nested set of courses with multiple entry points is one in which the student may be admitted to any course in the set depending on the student's academic qualifications at the time of application for admission.

(56) A student who completes or has graduated from a course in a nested set of courses with multiple entry points must apply for admission to another course in the set through the University Admissions Centre (UAC), Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre (VTAC) or the Admissions Office as appropriate (that is, progression to the next course in the sequence is not automatic).

(57) A student who has completed a course in a nested set of courses with multiple entry points in a given session, then applies for admission and is admitted to another course in the next consecutive session, may at the same time apply to graduate with the first award as specified in the graduation policy.

(58) A student who chooses to exit a nested course with multiple entry points with an award or whose application for admission to another course in the set is unsuccessful, may graduate with the exit award.

(59) A student who has completed but has not graduated from a course in a nested set of courses with multiple entry points and who withdraws from or is excluded from other courses within the set, may graduate with the completed award.

With Single Entry Points

(60) A nested set of courses with a single entry point is one in which the student is admitted to the last course in the articulated sequence on the understanding that the student may exit with an earlier award in the sequence. In such cases the student must reapply for admission through the University Admissions Centre, Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre or the Admissions Office as appropriate, should the student wish to complete the final course in the articulated sequence at a later date.

(61) A student in a nested course with a single entry point, but which offers exit points, who has completed an earlier course in the sequence, may apply to graduate from that course as specified in the graduation policy and at the same time continue on in the last course in the sequence, to which they were admitted.

Credit in Nested Courses

(62) Nesting allows credit to be granted in the final course of an articulated sequence for the entire sequence of earlier courses within the articulated set. For courses not in an articulation arrangement credit limits will apply, as described in the credit regulations.

(63) For this reason any nested set must be designed to allow for learning equivalent to two or more degrees to be completed, according to the Australian Qualifications Framework requirement that each completed degree must be

able to stand alone, in meeting the Australian Qualifications Framework requirements for that degree.

(64) The critical requirement in designing any nested set of courses is that each course in the set must satisfy Australian Qualifications Framework requirements for that course type. So for example in a nested set comprising a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Master, the Australian Qualifications Framework requirements for each of these course types must be met, within the individual courses in the set, including consideration of any credit from other courses in the set.

Higher Degree Programs

(65) The Australian Qualifications Framework guidelines for higher degree types should be consulted for detailed information regarding these programs.

Shared Courses

(66) A shared course is one which is developed collaboratively between two or more Faculties and in which each of the Faculties contributes to the development, delivery and ongoing review of the course. One Faculty, designated as the "host" Faculty, is responsible for administering the course.

Shell Courses

Characteristics

(67) A shell course:

a. is structured by a number of parameters, which do not normally specify individual subjects;
b. has a flexible content that is determined by the parameters stipulated; and
c. has a nomenclature that is generic rather than course-specific to reflect the broad content, e.g. Graduate Certificate in Applied Science, Graduate Certificate in Commerce, except where the course is designed to be offered in double degree programs only. In such cases, a course-specific nomenclature is likely to be more appropriate.

(68) Notwithstanding the fact that the specific content of a shell course is not normally identified in the Course Approval course document, the parameters and the aims and objectives of a shell course must be consistent with each other and must be able to meet the same requirements concerning AQF learning outcomes that other courses at the same level must meet.

Shell Courses as Constituent Courses in Double Degree Programs

(69) A shell course structure may be appropriate where a course is designed to be offered only as a constituent course within specified double degree programs, and the content of the course will need to be varied (within identifiable parameters) for each double degree program.

Selection of Subjects

(70) The subjects to be included in the course for a specific double degree program will be selected by the Faculty and will be specified in course documentation as set out in clauses 93-94 below.

Nomenclature

(71) Where the parameters of the course are such as to allow significant variations for specific double degree programs, such variation will be indicated in the nomenclature of the course through the addition of a descriptor. For example, the descriptor (Birth to 5 Years) could be added to the nomenclature Bachelor of Early Childhood Teaching when that course is offered in a double degree program with the Bachelor of Nursing. In other double degree

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 9 of 25

programs, the content of the Bachelor of Early Childhood Teaching may cover different age ranges within the broad range of birth to 8 years (the range identified in the shell course document).

Specialisations in Shell Courses

(72) Where a shell course also includes specialisations, a separate set of parameters must be identified that will apply to all specialisations offered within that course.

Selection of Subjects

(73) In a standard specialisation in a shell course, the student will select from those subjects for the specialisation that have been identified by the Faculty as falling within the parameters for specialisations in that course. Where the Faculty has identified as one of the objectives of the course that each specialisation will be designed by the Faculty for an identified cohort of students with specific needs, the content of each specialisation will be specified by the Faculty and will be set out in the documentation for the specialisation as set out in clause 95 below.

Nomenclature

(74) The nomenclature for specialisations will follow the format of the nomenclature of the shell course, e.g. Graduate Certificate in Commerce (Business Banking).

Documentation

Standard Shell Courses

(75) The documentation required for a new shell course will be the standard documentation for the approval of a new course.

Shell Courses in Double Degree Programs

(76) Where a Faculty proposes a shell course for inclusion only within double degree programs, the parameters will be set out in the shell course documentation and the specific content for the shell course within a particular double degree program will be identified in the course documentation for that particular double degree proposal.

(77) In the shell course documentation, those fields for which completion is meaningful only for a specific double degree program will contain a reference to the documentation for the individual double degree program.

Specialisations in Shell Courses

(78) Where specialisations are being added to an existing shell course, this will constitute a modification to an existing course. The course modification document will identify all those specialisation subjects from which the student may choose or, for those specialisations that are designed for an identified cohort of students, the specialisation structure and content will be specified and will be tailored for the specific cohort.

Example 1: Standard generic course

Graduate Certificate in Applied Science

(79) Parameters: At least two of the four subjects must be selected from one discipline area. At least one of these two subjects must have a pre-requisite. The remaining two subjects may be chosen from any discipline in the Faculty. All subject combinations must receive Faculty approval.

Example 2: Standard specialisation in shell course

Graduate Certificate in Applied Science (specialisation)

(80) Parameters: All four subjects must be chosen from the specialisation discipline. [Faculty provides list of subjects within this category]

Example 3: Shell course as constituent in double degree programs

Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)

(81) Parameters:

  a. Foundations of Education subjects - minimum of 32 points, including one on adolescent development and one on adolescents with special needs;
  b. Curriculum Studies subjects - minimum of 24/maximum of 64 points (with details of coverage required);
  c. Teaching Practice subjects - minimum of 24 /maximum of 32 points (with details of possible coverage, practicum requirements);
  d. Discipline subjects - for a teaching major, minimum 48/maximum 80 points; for a teaching "minor", minimum of 24/maximum of 32 points.

Example 4: Specialisation for identified cohort in shell course

Graduate Certificate in Commerce (specialisation)

(82) Aims: The aim of the course is to provide a graduate qualification in management which will meet the vocational and professional requirements of specific cohorts of business and industry personnel who are seeking various "packages" of subjects relevant to their own workplace needs.

(83) Parameters:

  a. The 32 points are to be selected from the specialisation or from subjects in the same specialist area chosen with the concurrence of the course director or course coordinator;
  b. All subjects must be taken from the range of subjects offered by the Faculty of Commerce subjects at level 5 or equivalent;
  c. The student will not enrol in any subject which is substantially similar to a subject already completed; and
  d. The student will meet all pre-requisites.

Combined Courses

(84) A combined course comprises two existing courses which are combined to produce a single course. For example, a pass degree may be combined with its associated add-on honours degree to produce an integrated honours degree, with the pass and add-on courses remaining as separate courses.

Exit Point and Exit Point Only Courses

(85) See also the section on articulated sets of courses, for rules on graduation and the different methods of entry to courses containing articulated exit points.

(86) An exit point course is a course contained within another course, and which students may graduate from before completion of the course to which admission was made. The exit point award is an independent award requiring full approval as a course.

(87) Where admission is not permitted into an exit point course, that course is deemed to be an exit point only course. Exit point only courses do not require separate course approval, although they must meet all of the requirements of an independent award at that level (Bachelor, Graduate Certificate, etc.).

(88) Exit point courses may be at the same or different course levels (Bachelor, Graduate Certificate etc.). For example two bachelor courses may be articulated, although more commonly courses of different level are articulated, such as a Graduate Certificate, Graduate Diploma and Master Degree. In such cases they become 'nested' courses.

Approval Process

Two Stages of Approval

(89) The approval of a new course involves a two-stage process.

   a. The first stage is the course planning stage involving approval by the University Course Planning Committee (UCPC) of the inclusion of the course in the University's profile and approval of the date of introduction of the course and any resource support; and
   b. the second stage is the course approval or accreditation stage involving the approval of the academic components of the course by the appropriate Faculty Courses Committee, or the Research Advisory Committee, for research higher degrees.

(90) The Division of Marketing and Communication will only market a course with details provided as part of the two stages of approval.

Standard Courses

(91) For standard courses the approval process described above applies.

Courses Leading to Double Degrees

Where only one Faculty is involved

(92) Where the course being developed for a double degree involves one Faculty, the Course Accreditation Policy specified in clauses shall apply.

Where more than one Faculty is involved

(93) Where the course being developed for a double degree involves more than one Faculty, the following action will be taken:

   a. the appropriate Executive Deans will determine the host Faculty for the course, and where there is dispute will refer the matter to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for decision; and
   b. the Executive Dean of the host Faculty will appoint a person or group (satisfactory to the Faculties involved) to develop the planning documentation;
   c. the Executive Dean of the host Faculty will convene a working party to develop the Course Approval document. The Working Party will comprise up to three nominees of each Executive Dean plus a convenor nominated by the host Executive Dean.

(94) The Course Approval document shall be approved by the Faculty Courses Committee of the Faculties involved.

Shared Courses

(95) For a shared course:

   a. the Executive Deans of the collaborating Faculties will determine the host Faculty (i.e. the Faculty responsible for administering the course). In the event of a dispute, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) shall make the determination;
   b. the Executive Dean of the host Faculty will appoint a person or group (satisfactory to the collaborating

Faculties) to develop the planning documentation; and

c. the Executive Dean of the host Faculty will convene a working party to develop the Course Approval document (see the course approval section of this policy for requirements of this working party). The working party will comprise up to 3 nominees of each Executive Dean and a convenor nominated by the host Executive Dean.

(96) The proposal shall be approved by the Faculty Courses Committees of the collaborating Faculties before approval by the Research Advisory Committee, if it is a research higher degree course.

Courses Leading to Awards Conferred Jointly with Other Universities

(97) Faculties may develop proposals which result in an award being conferred jointly with another university or equivalent educational institution. Such an award may be at any level from diploma to doctoral level. The accreditation process would be the same as for standard courses, although it is expected that the agreement between the parties would specify the role the other institution would play in the development and delivery of the course in question, including its representation on a Course Committee constituted to manage the course.

Specific Offering of a Charles Sturt UniversityCourse in a Particular Language of Study

(98) Where, for a specific offering of a Charles Sturt Universitycourse, the primary language of study is a language other than English, the Faculty in question shall be required to provide details in the relevant course documentation of the means by which acceptable language proficiency will be ascertained. The Australian Qualifications Framework qualification issuance policy contains specific details about the offering of degrees in languages other than English, including how this must be recorded on official documentation such as the transcript, and what level of English language proficiency is required.

Course Planning Stage

Course Planning Documentation

(99) The initiative to develop a new course may come from within a Faculty or Division, or from senior management who may wish to respond to a Government or other external initiative. The person or group given responsibility for developing the course will prepare course planning documentation, in the format required by the University Course Planning Committee.

University Course Planning Committee

(100) The University Course Planning Committee will then approve or otherwise the proposal contained in the course planning documentation. If approved, the Executive Dean may then arrange for the Course Approval document to be prepared.

Marketing of a New Course

(101) The Division of Marketing and Communication will only market a course with details provided as part of the University Course Planning Committee and Academic Senate approval processes.

Course Approval Document Development Stage

Course Approval Document

(102) Once the University Course Planning Committee has approved a course, the Executive Dean may arrange for the Course Approval document to be prepared within the Faculty, via CASIMS.

(103) A Course Approval document must provide sufficient, specific information about the course to enable the Academic Senate, through its Faculty Courses Committee or the Research Advisory Committee to satisfy themselves

as to the academic standard of the course and the academic capacity of the Faculty to deliver it.

Working Party

(104) The Executive Dean will normally establish a working party to develop the Course Approval document. Such a working party may include academic staff from other Faculties particularly if the course will involve service teaching.

(105) In relation to courses leading to double degrees and shared courses, the Executive Dean of the host Faculty will convene a working party comprising nominees of each Executive Dean plus a convenor nominated by the host Executive Dean.

(106) Consultation with appropriate professional bodies must occur at this stage if professional accreditation of the course is required. An interim Course Advisory Committee (see the section in this policy on the course advisory process) may be established for this purpose.

School Boards

(107) When the Course Approval document is developed the Executive Dean may refer it to the appropriate Schools of the Faculty for comment. School Boards might be asked to comment on the design of the subjects which comprise the course although their comments need not be confined to subjects.

Faculty Courses Committee

(108) All Course Approval documents for undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs and coursework professional doctorates must be referred to the Faculty Courses Committee. The Faculty Courses Committee will not approve the Course Approval document until the course proposal has been approved by the University Course Planning Committee. The Faculty Courses Committee may:

a. approve the document unamended for its inclusion in the University Register of Awards and Courses; or
b. request amendment of the document; or
c. not approve the course document, in which case the Faculty would have to decide whether to develop a new course document or have the course deleted from the University's educational profile.

(109) Before approving an undergraduate or postgraduate coursework document, the Faculty Courses Committee must satisfy itself that the course is of a standard appropriate to an undergraduate or postgraduate award. The Committee is empowered, therefore, to examine the course documentation in detail.

(110) In particular, the Faculty Courses Committee shall satisfy itself that:

a. the course is consistent with University policy on standard course structures or the reasons advanced for a departure from the standard are appropriate;
b. the course is consistent with the Academic Policies and other University Policy;
c. the Faculty or Faculties involved in teaching the course have the academic depth to offer the course at the level of award proposed;
d. the disciplines included in the course will be taught by the appropriate Faculties;
e. the Faculty and Divisions involved in the delivery of the course have the necessary resources to support the course;
f. the Course Approval document is consistent with the proposal approved by the University Course Planning Committee;
g. the course structure is consistent with those described in this policy, or the reasons advanced for a departure from the requirements of this policy are appropriate;
h. the course structure and content will meet the objectives of the course;

i. any issues or risks are escalated appropriately to Academic Senate, and

j. the course or courses are compliant with external requirements, in particular the Australian Qualifications Framework.

(111) The Faculty Courses Committee shall also recommend to the Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee(CLTC) and University Course Planning Committee (UCPC) the period of accreditation for the course, where a non-standard accreditation period is proposed.

Research Advisory Committee

(112) All Course Approval documents for higher degree research or research professional doctorate programs must be referred after Faculty consideration to the Research Advisory Committee. The Research Advisory Committee will not consider a Course Approval document until the proposal has been approved by the University Course Planning Committee. The Research Advisory Committee may:

a. approve the document without amendment for inclusion in the University Register of Awards and Courses; or

b. request the Faculty to amend the document and approve that the program as amended, be included in the University Register of Awards and Courses; or

c. refer the document back to the Faculty Board for revision.

(113) Before approving that a program be placed on the University Register, the Research Advisory Committee shall satisfy itself that the program is of a standard appropriate to a higher degree award. The Research Advisory Committee is empowered therefore to examine the documentation in detail, and will also refer any perceived risks or issues as appropriate to the Academic Senate.

(114) In particular the Research Advisory Committee shall satisfy itself that:

a. the program structure is consistent with course structures described in this policy, or the reasons advanced for a departure from the requirements of the policy are appropriate;

b. the program is consistent with the Academic Policies and other Charles Sturt University policy;

c. the Faculty or Faculties involved in teaching the program have the academic depth to offer the program and, in particular, to provide adequate supervision at the level of award proposed;

d. the disciplines included in the program will be taught by the appropriate Faculties; and

e. the Faculty and Divisions involved in the delivery of the program have the necessary resources to support the program.

Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee

(115) The Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committeeshall monitor the implementation of this policy and recommend any changes to the policy to Academic Senate. It is also the arbiter of any disputes arising out of course approvals at Faculty Courses Committees, and provides definitive advice on application of policies, including coursework course policies.

(116) The Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee also approves accreditation periods for coursework courses, outside the standard five-years between course reviews.

Lead Times for New Courses or Specialisations, New Subjects, Major Reviews and Other Course Modifications, Subject Revisions and Course and Subject Phase-outs

(117) The University Course Planning Committee approves the composition of the University's course profile, including the addition and deletion of all courses. Subjects added or removed from the profile are approved by the Faculties, although the University Course Planning Committee has ultimate authority for which subjects may be offered.

(118) Approval by the University Course Planning Committee of a proposed date of introduction for a new course or specialisation, or for the modifications proposed as a result of a major review is related to a number of critical factors. These include the following, which may change from time to time:

  a. timely approval of the Course Approval document or proposal, the Course Review document or proposal or other relevant documentation or proposals (for other types of modification);
  b. inclusion in the University Admissions Centre (UAC) and Victorian Tertiary Admission Centre (VTAC) guides (where appropriate);
  c. inclusion in the University Handbook and other University publications;
  d. advertising and promotion of courses;
  e. production of study notes, subject outlines and any online teaching sites;
  f. admission processes;
  g. textbook ordering; and
  h. internal timetabling (where appropriate).

(119) Each of these critical factors has either a "critical date" (e.g., the deadline specified by UAC, for inclusion in the UAC handbook) or a standard lead time (e.g. period required for production of subject outlines and online subject teaching material).

(120) When a new course or course review is being prepared, each of these dates or lead times shall be taken into account in determining the proposed date of introduction for the new or revised course or specialisation.

(121) The University Course Planning Committee shall approve either the proposed date of introduction or some later date and advise the Faculty accordingly.

(122) Variations to sessions of offering of a course may be approved as part of the Course Availability List (CAL) process.

(123) Approval by the University Course Planning Committee of the dates for discontinuation of intakes in courses, specialisations, majors or offerings in particular modes and/or locations is also related to critical factors, including:

  a. consultation with staff and students;
  b. adjustment of entries in the University Admission Centre (UAC) and Victorian Tertiary Admissions Centre (VTAC) guides (where appropriate);
  c. adjustments to advertising and promotion publications; and
  d. timely documentation and approval of appropriate phase-out arrangements for enrolled students.

Timelines for Course and Subject Approval

(124) In the schedules given below, the year of introduction is called Year X. The year of introduction refers to the year in which a new course is introduced or in which proposed modifications to an existing course are introduced or, for phase-outs, to the first year in which there will be no intakes for the course, specialisation, etc. Where a date is given in a year preceding the year of introduction, it is indicated as Year X-1, Year X-2, etc.

Approval of new courses, specialisations and subjects

(125) The approval schedule has been developed to provide for appropriate course promotion and preparation of learning materials. For internal courses advertised through UAC/VTAC, see the Exceptions note below the timelines schedule.

Timelines

(126) All programs and subjects except research higher degree programs (this includes all undergraduate programs, postgraduate coursework programs and coursework professional doctorates):

Course planning approval by the University Course Planning Committee will be dependent upon evidence being provided that an effective marketing strategy is in place.

Course Approval document approval by the Faculty Courses Committee; and/or

(127) Subject Profile document approval by the Faculty Courses Committee, is required as follows:

For introduction of course, specialisation or subject at any time in Year X: by that date determined by the Office of Academic Governance which will allow this approval to be finalised to meet the relevant Federal Government Department deadline for publication of courses and subjects to be offered in Year X.

(128) Research higher degree programs:

a. Course planning approval by the University Course Planning Committee will be dependent upon evidence being provided that an effective marketing strategy is in place.
b. Course Approval document approval by the Research Advisory Committee; and
c. Subject Profile document approval, where applicable, is required as follows:
    i. For introduction of course, specialisation or subject at any time in Year X: by that meeting of the Academic Senate which will allow this approval to be finalised to meet the Federal Government Department deadline for publication of courses to be offered in Year X (currently August 31 of Year X-1).

Exceptions

(129) New internal courses to be included in Year X UAC/VTAC guides - the Course Approval document (or, for a double degree program with two existing courses with no revision required, University Course Planning Committee approval of the proposed course) must be approved by the date of Year X-1 to allow updating of the relevant UAC and VTAC guides (normally around April).

(130) Note: In all instances, the Course Approval proposal must be approved by the Faculty Courses Committee, or the Research Advisory Committee for research higher degrees, prior to the date of introduction of the course.

(131) Major reviews of courses or specialisations are to follow the same time-lines as approval of a new course or specialisation. That is, the date of approval of the Course Review document determines the session/trimester in Year X in which proposed modifications will take effect.

(132) Where a course is being approved in a discipline area that is new to Charles Sturt University, subjects in these courses must be approved within the timelines below.

(133) New Undergraduate Courses in a New Discipline Area:

a. May of year prior to introduction: Course Approval document to be submitted. New Subject Profiles for all 1st year subjects to be submitted;
b. Feb-May of year of introduction: New Subject Profiles for all 2nd year subjects to be submitted;
c. Feb-May of year 2: New Subject Profiles for all 3rd and subsequent year subjects to be submitted.

(134) New Postgraduate Courses in a New Discipline Area:

a. May of year prior to introduction: Course Approval document to be submitted. New Subject Profiles for all 1st

year subjects to be submitted.

b. Feb-May of year of introduction: New Subject Profiles for all 2nd and subsequent year subjects to be submitted.

Review and Modification of Courses

Review

(135) The reviewing of courses is, in practice, a process of constant monitoring to ensure that any course offered by the University maintains its academic standing and remains up to date and relevant to any industries and professions it may serve.

(136) A number of critical factors may influence the scheduling of a major review of a given course, such as the requirements of a professional body which accredits the course, sudden changes in the marketplace, resource factors or individual factors identified by a particular Faculty.

(137) The purpose of a major review is to evaluate the quality and performance of the course or specialisation in terms of a number of factors, including academic performance, efficiency and the capacity of the Faculty to support its profile. This process of evaluation is done for the period of time since the introduction of the course or since the previous major review (whichever is the more recent) and on the basis of the outcomes of the advisory process, of a number of indicators and of other relevant information.

(138) The date of the first course review will be a minimum of five years Full-time Equivalent (FTE) from the first year of offering of the course and for courses that are longer than five years (FTE) the date of the first course review will be the length of the course plus one year from the first year the course is offered. The period of time between reviews of any given course shall be five years (FTE). If periodic accreditation by a professional body is needed there is an expectation that the dates for course accreditation and review will be aligned. Professional accreditation of a course does not remove the need for an internal CSU course review.

(139) A Faculty may apply to the Curriculum, Learning and Teaching Committee for extension of the review period (first or subsequent review) where exceptional circumstances apply.

(140) Each Faculty shall report to the University Course Planning Committee and to the Academic Senate each year its schedule of reviews for a normal five year review cycle. This schedule should include all courses offered by the Faculty.

(141) Notwithstanding this, where a course review is not finalised (including final approval) within twelve months of the scheduled year of review, intakes into the course may be suspended by the University Course Planning Committee effective immediately.

Major and Minor Modifications to Courses

(142) The review of courses is an ongoing process. Faculty Courses Committees also have delegated authority to approve revisions or modifications to existing courses.

(143) For the guidance of Faculties, the following sections define more precisely course modifications which may be approved by Faculty Courses Committees and those that must be approved by the Research Advisory Committee and/or the University Course Planning Committee.

Modification Approvals

(144) The following proposed modifications to a course must be approved by the Faculty Courses Committee of the relevant Faculty, or Academic Senate (on recommendation from the Research Advisory Committee) in the case of higher degree research or research professional doctorate programs, and/or the University Course Planning Committee. The approvals required are given in brackets after each type of modification.

a. change of nomenclature (FCC, or RAC for Research Higher Degrees);

b. change of duration (usually only master courses - includes shortening or lengthening of course by altering the length of the dissertation or by deleting coursework subjects, but may also apply to a double degree program as a result of changes to a constituent course) (FCC, or RAC for Research Higher Degrees, and UCPC if any resource issues);

c. creation or deletion of an exit point only course (FCC);

d. change or addition of a location (UCPC);

e. change or addition of a funding source (UCPC);

f. change to or addition of a mode (UCPC, and FCC if adding DE mode with new subjects);

g. change of Faculty ownership (UCPC);

h. addition of a major or minor or phase-out of a minor (FCC, and UCPC if any resource issues);

i. addition or phase-out of a joint study in the Bachelor of Business and Bachelor of Accounting (FCC, and UCPCif any resource issues);

j. addition of a specialisation (FCC, or RACfor Research Higher Degrees, and UCPC if any resource issues);

k. variation to the content or structure of a course specifically for an identified category of students (FCC, and UCPC if any resource issues);

l. change of session type/pattern e.g. from session-based to trimester-based (UCPC);

m. addition of a specialisation to a shell course (FCC, and UCPC if any resource issues).

(145) For the phase-out of a specialisation, a major or an offering in a particular mode and/or location, see below.

Phase Out of a Course, Specialisation, Major or Mode and/or Location

(146) The phase-out process includes both the process of determining that there will be no further intakes and the approval of phase-out arrangements for students and subjects in a course, specialisation, major or offering in a particular mode and/or location.

(147) Proposals to phase out a course, specialisation, major or offering in a particular mode and/or at a particular location may be initiated either by the University, as part of its annual course profile review, or by a Faculty. In all cases approval for phase out must come from the University Course Planning Committee.

Annual Course Profile Review

(148) At the discretion of the University Course Planning Committee, the University may conduct a course profile review of courses, disciplines and professional fields for possible modification or discontinuation of intakes.

Preliminary Course Profile Meeting and Faculty Responses

(149) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) will identify courses, disciplines and professional fields for possible review on the basis of data (including demand, attrition, graduation, Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) and load and funding data) provided by the Office of Strategic Planning and Information. The University Course Planning Committee, at its course profile review preliminary meeting, will consider the recommendations of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and will determine courses, disciplines or professional fields to be reviewed for modification or discontinuation of intakes. Faculties will then be advised of these determinations and requested to respond, with responses addressing the fit with the University's strategic directions, sustainability, links with research, demand, attrition, and academic critical mass.

Major Course Profile Meeting and Consultation Period

(150) The Committee's course profile review meeting will consider the Faculty responses and will make determinations on discontinuation of intakes (or, alternatively, modification) to courses, disciplines or professional fields. Faculties,

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 19 of 25

relevant divisions (including Division of Human Resources, Division of Marketing and Communication and Division of Student Administration), staff and students will then be notified and a consultation period with same will be coordinated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

Final Confirmation and Notification of Determinations

(151) The University Course Planning Committee will consider determinations for confirmation, followed by notification to all sections of the University and to applicants in the system who are affected by determinations, and amendment, where appropriate, to the UAC/VTAC guides.

Faculty-Initiated Proposals

(152) Faculty-initiated proposals for phase-out shall be forwarded to the University Course Planning Committee. Processes for phase out are the same as a full course profile review.

Approval of Phase Out Procedures

(153) These procedures will involve the University Course Planning Committee, and, as appropriate, the Research Advisory Committee. These bodies will ensure that phasing-out arrangements are appropriate.

Final Year of Intake

(154) For all proposals which result in a decision to discontinue intakes in a course, specialisation, major or offering in a particular mode and/or location, discontinuation of intakes will take effect in the year plus one following the proposal. For example, a proposal put forward in 2003 will mean that intakes will be discontinued from 2005. See above for the full schedule of lead times.

Timeline for course phase out

(155) Note that the University Course Planning Committee may decide to not have a review of the course profile in any given year.

(156) April/May of Year X-2 Planning & Audit prepare course, discipline and professional field data and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) identifies courses, disciplines and/or professional fields for possible review.

Mid-June of Year X-2 University Course Planning Committee course profile review preliminary meeting considers recommendations of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and determines courses, disciplines and/or professional fields to be reviewed for modification or discontinuation of intakes.

End June of Year X-2 Faculties are advised of determinations regarding reviews and requested to provide responses by end of August which address the factors outlined below.

Mid-September of Year X-2 UCPC course profile review major meeting receives and considers Faculty responses, and determines discontinuation of intakes (or, alternatively, modifications) to courses, disciplines and/or professional fields.

End September of year X-2 Notification of UCPC determinations to Faculties, students, Division of Human Resources and Division of Marketing and Communication, Division of Student Administration and other Divisions.

October-December of Year X-2 Consultation period co-ordinated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic).

February of Year X-1 UCPC considers determinations for final confirmation.

February-March of Year X-1 All sections of the University are notified, UAC and VTAC guides are amended and all applicants in the University's admission system who are affected by determinations are notified. Faculties commission Phase-out documents for all courses, specialisations, majors or offerings in a particular mode and/or location for which

discontinuation of intakes in Year X has been determined.

July-August of Year X-1 Final meeting of FCC/RACto which Phase-out proposals may be submitted.

Faculty-initiated proposals for discontinuation of intakes or modifications to a course, discipline or professional field are to be forwarded to the University Course Planning Committee by the meeting in September-October of Year X-2. Those submissions approved by the UCPC then follow the timelines for consultation and confirmation outlined above.

Phasing Out of Subjects

(157) All subjects being phased out must follow the relevant Federal Government deadline for reporting of subjects for the following year.

(158) Where continuing students remain enrolled in subjects in a course after it has been phased out and is receiving no further intakes, the following principles shall apply:

a. full communication with students is required in all decisions to phase out subjects within a phased out course, with an expectation that there will be no disadvantage to them, wherever possible;

b. where there is no newer version or related course to which students may transfer, a Faculty shall continue to offer the subjects in that course for the time necessary to allow continuing students to complete it. Students in this situation will need to complete the course within the standard course duration. For example, if the course duration is 3 years full-time, then full-time continuing students in their second year will have one further year to complete the course, etc. The normal academic progress rules relating to maximum time of enrolment will not apply;

c. where a newer version of a phased out course does exist, the Faculty may choose whether to continue to offer subjects servicing the phased out course, or to require that all continuing students transfer to the other course. Where transfer is given as the only option, the student should wherever possible experience no disadvantage, for example in terms of duration or cost of study;

d. where a subject being made obsolete is inter-Faculty ("service") taught into other courses, the Faculties concerned shall negotiate the phasing out according to the Academic Senate inter-Faculty teaching policy ;

e. if a Faculty wishes to expedite or extend the phasing out of a subject or subjects, consultation with the students involved should be a critical concern and also documented;

f. where the students affected are international students, any visa, regulatory or other conditions pertaining to such students shall be taken into account.

Obsolescing of Subjects

(159) Subjects may be deleted (made obsolete) at any time prior to the relevant Federal Government Department deadline for reporting of subjects for the following year.

Advertising of Courses

Inclusion in UAC/VTAC Guides

(160) A new course may not be included in the UAC/VTAC guides until approval of the Course Approval document (unless the UCPC explicitly gives approval for a new course to be included in the UAC/VTAC guides prior to approval of the Course Approval document). A new course includes any proposed double degree program in which one or both of the constituent courses is new or requires a revised structure.

(161) A double degree program comprising two existing courses neither of which will be altered as a result of the proposed double degree program may be included in the UAC/VTAC guides following approval by the UCPC.

(162) Confirmation of the inclusion of a new course in the UAC/VTAC guides will be provided to the Division of

Marketing and Communication by staff in the Office of Academic Governance and Office of Strategic Planning and Information.

Inclusion in the University Handbook

(163) A new course may not be included in the next year's University Handbook unless the course proposal has been given approval or provisional approval by the Faculty Courses Committee. Where there has been provisional approval only, the relevant course entry shall clearly indicate that the course is "subject to final approval".

Inclusion in other Promotional Literature

(164) New courses may only be included in promotional literature such as advertisements and course brochures after the UCPC has given approval for the course to be offered but before approval of the Course Approval document if the Faculty has provided the Division of Marketing and Communication with the detailed information it requires for promotion. This includes information on admission criteria, course structure and course content, content of subjects, employment prospects, starting salaries and practicums. Entries made before a course has received final approval must carry the proviso "subject to final approval" until final approval has been given.

Correct Course Nomenclature

(165) The Faculties and the Division of Marketing and Communication are required to have in place mechanisms to ensure that, where specific courses are being identified in promotional literature such as course brochures or advertisements, the correct course nomenclature is used.

(166) For inclusion of a new course in the UAC/VTAC guides or the University Handbook, the course nomenclature will be taken from the Course Approval document (or, for new double degree programs with existing, unchanged courses, from UCPC documentation).

Approval of Fields of Research

(167) This section applies to courses as defined in (c) of the definition of "award course" in the glossary which are courses by research and thesis. The approval of coursework only or coursework and dissertation courses is covered in Section 4.

Fields of Research (as defined by the Australian Research Council)

(168) The Research Advisory Committee shall recommend to the Academic Senate for approval fields of research within Faculties. Candidates wishing to pursue research in fulfilment of the requirements of higher degrees by research may be admitted to candidature and enabled to complete that research work in designated fields of research. A field of research (as defined by the Australian Research Council) will normally be contained within a University Centre for Research but may be separately identified and approved by the Academic Senate after considering a nomination initiated by a Faculty.

Process

(169) Before a higher degree student can be admitted to candidature, an appropriate field of research must have been approved by Academic Senate. Fields of Research should be reviewed every seven years.

Field of Research Approval

(170) No field of research may be publicly advertised or promoted until approved by the Academic Senate.

Documentation

(171) The initiative to have a new field of research approved shall come from within a Faculty. The Executive Dean of

This document may be varied, withdrawn or replaced at any time. Printed copies, or part thereof, are regarded as uncontrolled and should not be relied upon as the current version. It is the responsibility of the individual reading this document to always refer to the CSU Policy Library for the latest version.

Page 22 of 25

a Faculty shall prepare a Field of Research Approval Submission for consideration first by the Faculty Board, then by the Research Advisory Committee and finally to the Academic Senate.

Research Advisory Committee

(172) The Research Advisory Committee shall assess whether a proposed field of research conforms to the research and research training triennial plan and the University Strategic Plan and if it does so whether the Faculty or Research Centre has the capacity and the strategic commitment to maintain the field of research. In making this assessment the Research Advisory Committee should be guided by:

    a. The general research activity of the Faculty.

the number and seniority of staff, including the number of professoriate staff, in the field of research and the number of staff in a University Research Centre(s) and/or Faculty(s) with higher degree qualifications apposite to the specified field of research;

the level of research activity in the proposed field of research as measured by:

- the number of research workers in the field of research including University research students, research officers, visitors or affiliates;
- the number of staff with experience and/or training in supervision and/or examination of research degrees;
- publications recorded including current publications on topics apposite to the field of research; and
- income from competitive research grants, consulting work etc.
- Strategic Commitment to the Field of Research by the Faculty or the University.

The Committee will assess the emphasis that the Faculty or University places in its internal planning on developing the field of research, by considering:

- staffing priorities apposite to the field of research;
- purchase of equipment and assignment of technical and other staff to support the field of research;
- the provision of library and other research infrastructure to support the field of research;
- availability of space to the field of research; and
- staff development initiatives as these relate to developing the field of research.

(173) The Research Advisory Committee will advise the Academic Senate on whether a nominated field of research meets the criteria detailed in clause 162 a and b above.

Academic Senate

(174) Academic Senate will assess whether or not the Faculty proposing the field of research has the academic capacity to support higher degree by research students in the nominated field of research.

Section 4 - Procedures

(175) N/A

Section 5 - Guidelines

(176) N/A

Status and Details

Status	Historic
Effective Date	22nd June 2015
Review Date	22nd February 2020
Approval Authority	Academic Senate
Approval Date	2nd June 2015
Expiry Date	13th February 2016
Unit Head	Cassandra Webeck University Secretary +61 2 6338 4258
Author	Nicholas Drengenberg Deputy Director Governance and Academic Secretary +61 2 63384831
Enquiries Contact	Academic Secretary +61 2 63384831