

Course Reviews – Guidelines 2026

Purpose and Objectives

To provide a detailed and constructive review of courses owned by the College of Science & Medicine, per the [ANU academic programs and courses accreditation policy](#) which requires all courses to be reviewed within a maximum 5-year period. Course reviews are an essential component of Quality Assurance monitoring of ANU offerings. CoSM aims to review approximately 20% the course catalogue each year distributed evenly across all schools. The review process should comprise a comprehensive review of a course to provide an evidence-based evaluation of the viability, quality, structure, focus and outcomes of the course.

Difference from previous years:

In 2026, the College of Science and Medicine will undertake holistic course reviews on a new/revised course review proforma. Members of the Science Teaching and Learning Centre (Sub Deans, Ed Gov Officer, Ed Tech Officer & Academic Developer) will have undertaken a preliminary, compliance-based review of the course material available on the Programs & Courses website, course entry in the Curriculum Management System (CMS), most recently published class summary and summary overview of the Canvas Site. Observations and recommendations may provide direction and guidance for school reviewers.

The school reviewer/s should ideally review and respond to the recommendations as well as providing own insights, comments and findings.

Deadline for submission of the course review proforma to College:

- If the course is next offered in Semester 2: 30 June
- If the course is next offered in Semester 1: 1 September
- Non-standard session courses: before next delivery or 1 Sept, whichever comes first.

Any course amendments recommended as a result of the course review must be submitted through the CMS by 1 September. This deadline allows the Education Sub Committee time to review and progress course amendments to the College Education Committee for publication by 31st October in readiness for the delivery in the following academic year.

How to proceed:

Courses will be identified for review as follows:

- SELT trigger
- 5-year cycle (determined from date of course creation/first offering or previous review)
- Courses identified as compulsory in a program under formal review
- Nominated by College Associate Dean, School Director of Education or other authority

Data pack inclusions:

- Course review form (pre-populated)
- Data provided by Planning and Service Performance (PSP) Division
- Previous course review documentation (if available).

Holistic reviews also consider what previous reviews have shown (if applicable) and use available data to inform future directions and actions. Please consider including a range of short, medium and long term recommendations responding to the findings of the review as well as clear actions for implementation and reasonable timelines for completion.

College preliminary review:

Members of the Science Teaching and Learning Centre will consider the following:

- Alignment of course entry in the Programs and Courses website with current ANU accreditation policy and information in the CMS.
- Alignment of class summary with the course entry in P&C.
- Comparison of UGRD/PGRD co-taught courses where applicable.
- Canvas site set up including compliance with CoSM standards.

Tips for reviewers:

- Check all content published to P&C for currency.
- Compare information published in the course overview with the most recently published class summary.
- Review learning outcomes (Do they reflect the outcomes of the course? Are they articulated clearly but flexibly enough to allow for minor year-to-year variances? If this course is also used to achieve one or more of the Graduate Attributes under the Curriculum Framework, is this reflected in the Learning Outcomes?)
- Review of indicative assessments (Are they too vague/specific?)
- Mapping of learning outcomes to indicative assessment – has this been done considerably for each assessment and learning outcome (we would not expect all LO to align to every assessment).
- [Principles of academic integrity](#) – Is the assessment designed in a way that supports academic integrity? Are there other ways in which students can be assessed that might reduce potential for breaches? Are students made aware of these principles at the start or during the semester?
- Workload statement – is this information still correct? Does it set clear expectations for students but is flexible enough to allow for minor adjustments during the timetabling process?
- Does this course have any inherent requirements essential and non-negotiable (knowledge, skills ability) that must be met by a student? These are usually aspects of the course that are assessed through a Learning Outcome. It is important to note that attendance of any given activity is not an inherent requirement.

Useful reference material:

- [CHM/CoS Learning outcomes and assessment guidelines](#)
- [CHM/CoS HPO/HPC principles and processes](#)
- [Course Amendment – How to Guide for CMS](#)
- [Course amendment wireframe – example in CMS](#)

Governance:

- Step 1. College Education Subcommittee preliminary review
- Step 2: School-based review
- Step 3. College Education Subcommittee final review
- Step 4. College Education Committee (CEC) review and consideration for reaccreditation
- Step 5. College reports list of all reaccredited program Academic Quality Assurance Committee (AQAC) 2 of the following academic year

For help:

Please contact Science.Curriculum@anu.edu.au for further help and guidance.