



Charles Sturt
University

UNIVERSITY COURSES COMMITTEE Meeting No. 35

NOTICE OF MEETING

Date Wednesday 12 March 2025

Time 9.00am – 12.00pm

Location Zoom -
<https://charlessturt.zoom.us/j/67471825295?pwd=86Ve5BFkn15eyrVGXaf1fFwaGalU1v.1>

Meeting ID: 674 7182 5295

Passcode: 962510

Members	22
Quorum	12

Members	Position	Committee Term Ends
Professor Graham Brown	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)	Ex-officio
Professor Janelle Wheat	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) or nominee	Ex-officio
Mr Mike Bryant	Academic Director, Education Strategy	Ex-officio
Mr Mike Ferguson	Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) or nominee	Ex-officio
Ms Sandra Sharpham	Executive Director, Student Experience or nominee	Ex-officio
Ms Heather McGregor	Pro Vice-Chancellor, Student Success or nominee	Ex-officio
Mr Matthew Granfield	Executive Director, Customer Experience	Ex-officio
Dr Mark Bassett	Director, Academic Quality and Standards	Ex-officio
Professor Lucie Zundans-Fraser	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Arts and Education	Ex-officio
Professor Jenny Kent	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Science	Ex-officio
Associate Professor Brendon Hyndman	Acting Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Arts and Education	Ex-officio
Dr Julia Lynch	Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences	Ex-officio
Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed	Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Science and Health	Ex-officio
Associate Professor Christopher Orchard	Acting Chair, Indigenous Board of Studies or Nominee	Ex-officio
Dr Kelly Tribolet	Elected member, Faculty of Arts and Education	30 June 2026
Dr Jason Howarth	Elected member, Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences	30 June 2025
Dr Michelle Eastwood	Elected member, Faculty of Science and Health	30 June 2026
Ms Rebecca Acheson	Nominated member, Educational Design Lead, Division of Learning and Teaching	30 June 2025
Dr Annabel Matheson	Nominated member, Faculty of Science and Health	30 June 2025
Mr Simon Wakeling	Nominated member, Faculty of Arts and Education	30 June 2026
Ms Rebecca Frauenfelder	Acting Manager, Course Administration Team, Faculty of Science and Health	30 June 2025
(Vacant)	Student Member	30 September 2026
Members (Attendance as required. Not part of quorum)		
Associate Professor Matthew Winslade	Associate Dean (Research), Faculty of Arts and Education	Ex-officio
Professor Zahid Islam	Associate Dean (Research), Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences	Ex-officio
Associate Professor Sandra Savocchia	Acting Associate Dean (Research), Faculty of Science and Health	Ex-officio
Attendees		
Ms Natasha Bailo	Executive Officer, Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	
Mr James Elibank Murray	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation	
Ms Verinnia Lansom	Governance Officer and Committee Secretary	

No	Item	Responsibility	Purpose	Time	Page
1	Welcome and Apologies *	Chair	Noting	9.00am	4
2	Declaration of Interests *	Chair	Decision		5
3	Confirmation of Agenda *	Chair	Decision		6
4	Action Sheet *	Chair	Discussion		7
For Decision/Discussion					
5	Chair's Report *	Chair	Noting	9:15	8
6	Course Documents *	Chair/ADAs	Decision		9
7	2024 Third Party Annual Review Report	Chair	Discussion		10
8	Professional Accreditation Risk Rating Framework Review	Director, AQ&S	Decision		17
9	Annual Assurance Report	Chair	Discussion		30
Matters Taken as Read					
10	Previous UCC and UCC SC Minutes *	Chair	Decision		35
11	Academic Senate Minutes *	Chair	Noting		44
12	Minutes of the Committees Reporting to UCC *	Chair	Noting		45
13	Annual Plan *	Chair	Noting		46
14	Statement of Role and Responsibilities - Committee Members	Chair	Noting		48
Close					
15	Other business *	Chair	Discussion		51
16	Next meeting *	Chair	Noting		52
Meeting Close				12.00pm	

* Standing Item



Item 1: Welcome and Apologies

Acknowledgement of Country

“We acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the Lands on which we are meeting today and recognise their continuing connection to land, waters and culture. We pay our respects to their Elders past and present.”

Membership of the University Courses Committee

The University Courses Committee (UCC):

- i) noted Academic Senate approved the amendment to the UCC Membership and Terms of Reference to include the position of Director, Academic Quality and Standards as an ex-officio member of the committee (AS197/13, 31/10/2024 refers);
- ii) welcomed:
 - a. Dr Mark Bassett as the Director, Academic Quality and Standards;
 - b. Associate Professor Christopher Orchard to the position of Acting Chair, Indigenous Board of Studies (IBS) and thanked Dr Susan Mlcek for her role as Acting Chair;
 - c. Associate Professor Brendon Hyndman, Acting Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Arts and Education; and
 - d. Mr Mike Bryant, Academic Director, Education Strategy.

Membership of the University Courses Committee Standing Committee

In relation to the membership of the UCC Standing Committee (SC) the UCC:

- i) noted the vacancy ‘one member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee’;
- ii) noted the current membership of the UCC SC is as follows:
 - Professor Graham Brown Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair).
 - Professor Janelle Wheat Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching).
 - Professor Jenny Kent Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee.
 - Vacant Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee.
 - Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee,
- iii) welcomed to the membership of the UCC SC with a term of office ending 30 June 2025.

Apologies

The following apology was received:

- Dr Jason Howarth, Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences



Item 2: Declaration of Interests

Members are responsible for disclosing circumstances that give rise or may give rise to actual, potential or perceived conflicts of interest.

Declarations should be submitted to Governance prior to the meeting

The University Courses Committee will determine the appropriate course of action, which may include the member leaving the meeting for the duration of the item or abstaining from discussion and/or decision. If the meeting is held by flying minute a determination will be made by the Chair in consultation with Governance.



Charles Sturt
University

Item 3: Confirmation of Agenda

Action Sheet - University Courses Committee

Meeting Date	Action Number	Action	Responsible Officer	Due Date	Status	Status Information
23-Oct-24	UCC34/3	Discuss Comprehensive Course Review reporting for 2025 and the possibility of a faculty combined report for future reporting with the ADA's.	Director AQ&S	24-Feb-25	In progress	
23-Oct-24	UCC34/4	Amend the Comprehensive Course Review report to identify delayed courses before submission to AS.	Director AQ&S	24-Feb-25	In progress	
23-Oct-24	UCC34/2	Request a more streamlined workflow to progress research proposals with the University Secretary and the Director Governance.	DVCA	24-Feb-25	Complete	Requested to consider review of process.
21-Aug-24	UCC33/4	Review the risk ratings, conditions, and definitions in the Professional Accreditation report to provide more insightful data.	Director, AQ&S	24-Jan-25	Complete	Report included in agenda papers 12 March UCC.
23-Oct-24	UCC34/1	Ensure the Master of Islamic Studies (Research) proposal was endorsed by URC before progressing to Academic Senate.	Manager Governance	24-Jan-25	Complete	



item 5: Chair's Report

The Chair may provide a verbal report as required.



Item 6: Course Report

PURPOSE

To:

- consider submissions for accreditation and discontinuance (teach-out arrangements) for courses of study leading to degrees and awards offered by the University; and
- approve major changes to an award course of study.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to:

1. **endorse and recommend** to Academic Senate the following Accreditation -Coursework proposals, for approval:
 - Master of Advanced Medical Radiation Practice - Proposal-36675
 - Master of Inclusive Education (with specialisations) - Proposal-32411
 - Master of Nursing - Proposal-36677
 - Master of Arts (Theological Studies) - Proposal-32401
 - Undergraduate Certificate in Food and Nutrition - Proposal-36676
 - Bachelor of Theology (Honours) - Proposal-32394
 - Graduate Certificate in Digital Health - Proposal-36590
 - Bachelor of Paramedicine and Bachelor of Paramedicine (Honours) - Proposal-36504
 - Graduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education - Proposal-23188
2. **approve** the Major Change -Coursework proposal Bachelor of Veterinary Biology/Bachelor of Veterinary Science - Proposal-37427

KEY MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION

As per Faculty Board minutes and CDAP.

KEY MATTERS FOR NOTING

As per Faculty Board minutes and CDAP.

LINK

Please refer to the courses for endorsement via CDAP at the following link:

[University Courses Committee – Meeting UCC-35](#)

Prepared by: 19/02/2025 Verinnia Lansom, Governance Officer

Approved by: 03/03/2025 Professor Graham Brown, Chair University Courses Committee

Cleared by: 03/03/2025 Professor Graham Brown, Chair University Courses Committee



Charles Sturt
University

Item 7: 2024 TPA Review Summary

The 2024 TPA Review Summary is a confidential paper.

Item 8: Professional Accreditation Risk Rating Framework Review

PURPOSE

To provide the University Courses Committee with a review of the Professional Accreditation Risk Rating Framework (action UCC33/4).

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to:

1. **note** the attached Professional Accreditation Risk Rating Framework Review; and
2. **approve** the recommendations of the report.

BACKGROUND

Effective risk management is critical for maintaining professional accreditation in higher education, as accreditation status directly affects institutional credibility, student outcomes, and program sustainability. At Charles Sturt, the Professional Accreditation Risk Ratings Framework (PARRF) serves as the primary tool for assessing accreditation risks. However, its three-tier risk classification system (Low, Medium, High) has been found to oversimplify risk assessments, failing to differentiate between minor compliance conditions and serious deficiencies.

Concerns regarding the PARRF's effectiveness have been raised within CSU's governance structures. The Academic Senate (Resolution AS196/8) noted that the current risk ratings are retrospective, primarily based on the number of conditions imposed and their financial impact, rather than a forward-looking risk lens that assesses the actual risk of losing accreditation or the broader impact of conditions. The Senate acknowledged that many accrediting bodies are now adopting risk-based assessment models, and revised risk ratings would better align with these evolving standards.

Further, the University Courses Committee (UCC), under action item UCC33/4, has requested a review of the risk ratings, conditions, and definitions to ensure that the framework provides more insightful and actionable data. This directive underscores the need for a more nuanced and predictive approach to accreditation risk assessment.

Best-practice risk management in the sector includes Likelihood × Consequence models, which assess both the probability and impact of accreditation risks. Charles Sturt's University Risk Framework (URF) and the School of Rural Medicine's accreditation model both apply this approach, incorporating financial sustainability, reputational considerations, and student outcomes—critical factors that the PARRF currently overlooks. The disconnect between the PARRF and broader institutional risk management further limits its strategic value.

The attached report evaluates the strengths and limitations of the PARRF, compares it with the URF and the School of Rural Medicine's approach, and outlines key recommendations for improvement. In response to Academic Senate Resolution AS196/8 and UCC action UCC33/4, this review proposes revisions to risk classifications, improved differentiation of risk severity, and a broader assessment scope to ensure that Charles Sturt's accreditation risk management is forward-looking, strategically aligned, and responsive to evolving accreditation standards.

KEY ISSUES

The Professional Accreditation Risk Ratings Framework (PARRF) at Charles Sturt is inadequate for accurately assessing accreditation risks, which creates compliance, reputational, and academic risks. The current three-tier rating system (Low, Medium, High) fails to distinguish between minor administrative conditions and serious deficiencies, leading to misaligned risk assessments and resource misallocation. This creates a risk of non-compliance if programs with critical issues do not receive the attention they require, while routine conditions may be overstated.

A significant concern is the framework's retrospective nature, which defines risk based on the number of conditions imposed rather than their likelihood or impact. The Academic Senate (Resolution AS196/8) has identified this as a weakness, emphasising the need for a forward-looking model that assesses the real risk of losing accreditation. Many accrediting bodies already use risk-based assessment approaches, and CSU's framework is misaligned with sector best practices.

The PARRF’s narrow focus on timelines and resource allocation further limits its effectiveness. It does not consider reputational damage, student experience, or long-term financial sustainability, despite accreditation decisions having direct consequences on student enrolments, industry trust, and institutional viability. Additionally, the medium-risk category lacks differentiation, grouping programs with vastly different risk levels and making it difficult to prioritise interventions appropriately.

The disconnection between the PARRF and the University Risk Framework (URF) is another issue, as it prevents accreditation risks from being assessed in alignment with broader institutional governance. Without integration, accreditation risks are treated in isolation, leading to inconsistencies in risk management. Furthermore, the absence of proactive risk mitigation and continuous monitoring means that risk conditions are not systematically tracked, reassessed, or managed over time, leaving CSU reactive rather than strategic in its accreditation management.

Analysis of Options

A Likelihood × Consequence model, already used in the URF and the School of Rural Medicine’s accreditation model, presents a viable alternative to the current system. It offers a more granular assessment, allowing CSU to distinguish between minor compliance conditions and serious accreditation threats. This approach aligns with industry best practice and provides a clearer picture of risk severity, ensuring that resources are allocated effectively.

Maintaining the current PARRF without modification poses increasing compliance and reputational risks, as accrediting bodies shift towards risk-based frameworks. The university risks falling behind sector standards, and programs could face greater uncertainty in accreditation assessments.

Recommendation and Alignment with University Strategy

To ensure compliance, improve risk accuracy, and align with best practice, the PARRF should be revised to incorporate a Likelihood × Consequence model and integrate risk factors such as student outcomes, reputational impact, and financial sustainability. This approach supports the University’s strategic goals by promoting insightful risk management, impactful decision-making, and sustainable accreditation processes.

The Committee’s guidance is sought on the proposed shift to a risk-based model and how best to integrate accreditation risk assessments with CSU’s broader institutional governance framework.

Major Risk	Risk Monitoring and Management	Does this sit within risk appetite?
<p>Teaching and Learning Charles Sturt University has a Low Appetite to take risks with the potential to compromise student outcomes and progression through to graduation, teaching excellence, course accreditation, academic integrity, and educational standards by the University or its third party education arrangements.</p>	<p>Faculties monitor professional accreditation monthly. PARM manages records centrally and provides a single source of truth.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Proposed Enterprise Action Register Items

The Director, Academic Quality and Standards will lead the revision of the Professional Accreditation Risk Ratings Framework (PARRF) in consultation with key stakeholders, incorporating the outcomes of this review. Progress updates will be provided to the University Courses Committee (UCC) at its next meeting, ensuring continued oversight and alignment with institutional risk priorities.

Once the revised framework is ready, it will be formally submitted to the UCC for review and endorsement, before proceeding to the Academic Senate for final approval. This process ensures that accreditation risk management improvements are rigorously assessed, strategically aligned, and integrated into the university’s broader governance framework.

COMPLIANCE

Legislative Compliance	This decision contributes to compliance with: Standard 3.1 of the <u>Higher Education Standards Framework 2021</u>
Policy/TOR Alignment	This decision is made in accordance the <u>Course and Subject Policy</u> from the <u>Policy Library</u> .

ATTACHMENTS

A. Att A - Professional Accreditation Risk Framework - Review

Prepared by: 12/02/2025 Mark Bassett
Director, Academic Quality and Standards

Approved by: 12/02/2025 Mark Bassett
Director, Academic Quality and Standards

Cleared by: 12/02/2025 Graham Brown
Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)



Charles Sturt
University

Professional Accreditation Risk Rating Framework - Review

Office of Academic Quality and Standards

For further information please contact

Dr Mark Bassett

Director, Academic Quality and Standards

Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) Portfolio

Charles Sturt University - TEQSA Provider Identification:

PRV12018 (Australian University). CRICOS Provider: 00005F.

Executive summary

Effective risk management is crucial for maintaining professional accreditation in higher education, as accreditation status impacts institutional credibility, student outcomes, and program sustainability. The Professional Accreditation Risk Ratings Framework (PARRF) at Charles Sturt University is designed to assess accreditation risks, yet its classification system and approach to risk differentiation require refinement. This report evaluates the PARRF, compares it with the University Risk Framework (URF) and the School of Rural Medicine's accreditation risk model, and recommends improvements to enhance its effectiveness.

The PARRF employs a simplified three-tier risk rating system (Low, Medium, High), which, while facilitating communication, fails to capture the complexity of accreditation conditions. It does not adequately distinguish between minor administrative conditions and serious deficiencies, leading to misaligned risk assessments. Furthermore, the framework does not integrate reputational and student impact risks, limiting its strategic value. Given that professional accrediting bodies apply conditions differently—often as routine measures rather than indicators of deficiencies—a more nuanced risk classification model is necessary.

Comparative analysis highlights the advantages of the URF and the School of Rural Medicine's approach, both of which apply a Likelihood × Consequence risk model. This methodology allows for a more granular assessment of risks by incorporating probability and impact dimensions, ensuring that accreditation challenges are classified with greater accuracy. Additionally, the School of Rural Medicine's approach integrates financial sustainability, reputational considerations, and student outcomes, making it a more comprehensive risk management tool.

To improve accreditation risk assessment at Charles Sturt University, this report recommends the following key refinements to the PARRF:

- **Refining Risk Classification:** The existing three-tier model should be replaced with a Likelihood × Consequence framework, ensuring that risks are assessed based on both probability and impact. This will allow for better differentiation between minor and critical risks.
- **Expanding Risk Scope:** Accreditation risks should be evaluated beyond timelines and resource allocation. The revised framework should incorporate reputational risks, student outcomes, and financial sustainability to provide a holistic view of accreditation threats.
- **Implementing Dynamic Risk Mitigation:** Risks should not be treated as static conditions but monitored continuously. The framework should include structured mitigation plans, accountability mechanisms, and reassessment processes to ensure proactive risk management.
- **Aligning with the University Risk Framework:** Integrating the PARRF with the URF will ensure consistency in institutional risk management, reducing discrepancies between accreditation-specific risks and broader governance priorities.

The current PARRF is insufficient for effective accreditation risk management due to its oversimplified classification and narrow scope. A transition to a more strategic, proactive framework that aligns with institutional risk management best practices will enhance Charles Sturt University's ability to maintain accreditation, safeguard institutional reputation, and ensure long-term sustainability. By adopting a refined risk assessment approach, the university will be better equipped to navigate the complexities of accreditation compliance in an evolving regulatory landscape.

Table of contents

Introduction	4
Analysis	4
Strengths	4
Limitations	5
Oversimplification of the accreditation risk	5
Narrow focus	5
Omission of student outcomes	5
Lack of differentiation in medium-risk ratings	5
Summary	5
Comparative Analysis	5
Overview	5
Purpose and scope	6
Structural differences	6
Criteria and methodology	6
Usability and accessibility	6
Risk sensitivity and comprehensiveness	6
Flexibility and Adaptability	7
Effectiveness in Practice	7
Comparison Against Best Practices	7
Summary	7
School of Rural Medicine’s approach	8
Overview	8
Strengths	8
Granular risk classification	8
Proactive mitigation strategies	8
Integration of financial sustainability	8
Recognition of reputational risk	8
Alignment with accreditation standards	8
Consideration of student impact	8
Alignment with the University Risk Framework	9
Recommendations	9
1. Refine risk classification for greater precision	9
2. Expand the scope of risk assessment	9
3. Implement a dynamic risk mitigation and monitoring system	9
4. Align with the University Risk Framework	9
Conclusion	10

Introduction

Effective risk management is essential for maintaining professional accreditation in higher education, as accreditation status influences institutional credibility, student outcomes, and program sustainability. Accreditation processes assess whether educational programs meet professional and regulatory standards, ensuring that graduates are prepared for industry expectations. However, the classification of accreditation risks requires careful scrutiny, as conditions imposed by accrediting bodies do not necessarily equate to risk for the university. Some new courses, for example, receive conditions as part of standard accreditation processes rather than due to deficiencies.

The Professional Accreditation Risk Ratings Framework (PARRF) at Charles Sturt is designed to assess accreditation risks, but its classification system and approach to risk differentiation require evaluation. This report examines the strengths and limitations of the PARRF, compares it with the University Risk Framework (URF) and the School of Rural Medicine's accreditation risk approach, and considers how differences among professional accrediting bodies impact the interpretation of conditions. The objective is to determine whether the existing framework provides an accurate and strategic method for identifying and managing accreditation risks or whether refinements are required.

While the PARRF provides a structured method for categorising accreditation risks, its reliance on a simplified three-tier rating system presents key limitations. It does not adequately distinguish between minor and severe accreditation challenges, fails to integrate reputational and student impact risks, and does not align with broader institutional risk management practices. Furthermore, professional accrediting bodies vary in how they classify conditions, meaning that a uniform risk rating approach may misrepresent the actual significance of accreditation conditions.

Comparisons with the URF and the School of Rural Medicine's approach suggest that a more sophisticated Likelihood × Consequence model would provide a nuanced and adaptable risk assessment methodology. This report recommends refinements to the accreditation risk framework to ensure greater accuracy, alignment with institutional risk management, and responsiveness to differences in accreditation processes across disciplines.

Analysis

Strengths

The PARRF is a structured and accessible tool for assessing accreditation risks. Its use of three distinct risk levels—Low, Medium, and High—facilitates communication among university stakeholders, including faculty and administrative staff. The framework also incorporates practical considerations such as resource requirements and timelines, ensuring that risk assessments account for operational constraints.

Additionally, it provides consistency in risk categorisation, helping to create a shared understanding of accreditation assessment criteria. However, this structure assumes a uniformity in accreditation conditions that does not always exist, as professional accrediting bodies apply conditions differently. Some conditions are routine, particularly for new programs, and do not indicate heightened risk.

Limitations

Oversimplification of the accreditation risk

The framework's simplicity aids communication but does not fully capture the complexities of accreditation conditions. It does not differentiate between minor conditions that require straightforward administrative responses and critical deficiencies that could jeopardise accreditation. The assumption that all conditions signal increased risk can lead to misaligned assessments, where minor issues receive undue emphasis while more serious risks are not sufficiently prioritised.

Narrow focus

The framework primarily assesses accreditation risks based on timeliness and resource needs. While these are important considerations, they are not the only factors relevant to accreditation. The framework does not explicitly consider reputational risks, such as the impact of accreditation conditions on student enrolments, industry partnerships, or public confidence in the university's programs.

Omission of student outcomes

Accreditation is directly linked to educational quality, and failures in accreditation can affect student learning experiences, professional pathways, and career opportunities. The framework does not incorporate student impact into its risk assessments, limiting its ability to provide a comprehensive evaluation of accreditation risk.

Lack of differentiation in medium-risk ratings

The framework's medium-risk category is too broad, grouping together programs with significantly different risk profiles. It includes both:

- Programs with conditions that require no additional resources and are part of routine accreditation processes.
- Programs that require substantial additional resources but are still on track to meet accreditation timelines.

These scenarios present distinct challenges, yet they are treated equivalently. A more refined classification system is needed to account for these differences.

Summary

The PARRF provides a structured and accessible approach to risk assessment, but its oversimplifications and omissions limit its effectiveness. Expanding the framework to differentiate risk severity, incorporate reputational considerations, and account for student outcomes would enhance its ability to support informed decision-making and effective accreditation management.

Comparative Analysis

Overview

The PARRF and the URF serve as institutional risk management tools, but they differ in scope, structure, and application. The PARRF is designed specifically for accreditation risk assessment, while the URF provides a broader institutional risk management structure. A key distinction is that the PARRF assumes that all accreditation conditions indicate risk, whereas in reality, some conditions are routine, particularly for new programs, and do not necessarily signify a heightened threat to accreditation status. Differences in how professional accrediting bodies define and apply conditions further complicate risk assessment.

This analysis compares the key features of the PARRF and URF to identify strengths, limitations, and potential areas for improvement in accreditation risk management.

Purpose and scope

The PARRF is focused on assessing accreditation risks by evaluating whether programs meet accreditation conditions within set timeframes and whether additional resources are needed. However, it does not consider variations in the nature of conditions across professional accrediting bodies, some of which impose conditions as a standard part of program approval rather than as an indication of risk.

By contrast, the URF has a broader remit, encompassing financial, operational, reputational, and educational risks. It is not limited to accreditation but integrates risk considerations across multiple domains, allowing for a more comprehensive institutional risk management approach.

Structural differences

The PARRF employs a simplified three-tier risk rating system (Low, Medium, High), primarily based on timelines and resource needs. While this structure allows for quick assessments, it lacks the granularity needed to distinguish between routine accreditation conditions and serious deficiencies that could threaten accreditation status.

The URF, in contrast, applies a Likelihood × Consequence matrix, allowing for a more precise evaluation of risks. This model enables better prioritisation by assessing both the probability and impact of risks, rather than treating all unmet accreditation conditions as equivalent in severity.

Criteria and methodology

The PARRF uses categorical risk ratings (Low, Medium, High) derived from qualitative judgments about deadlines and resource allocation. This approach lacks the flexibility to account for differences in how professional accrediting bodies classify conditions. It does not distinguish between accreditation conditions that indicate significant deficiencies and those that are procedural or administrative in nature.

The URF, on the other hand, incorporates both qualitative and quantitative assessment methods, using a matrix to evaluate risks based on probability and severity. This structured approach allows for a more detailed differentiation of risks and ensures that minor compliance issues are not conflated with significant threats to accreditation.

Usability and accessibility

The PARRF is straightforward for stakeholders to apply with minimal training. However, its simplicity can lead to misinterpretations, as it does not account for differences in how accreditation conditions are imposed or classified by different accrediting bodies.

The URF is more analytically rigorous and requires a higher level of expertise to implement effectively. While it demands more effort in application, its detailed risk classification system ensures that risks are assessed with greater precision and contextual awareness.

Risk sensitivity and comprehensiveness

The PARRF does not differentiate between minor and major risks, treating all unmet conditions as indicative of the same level of concern. This approach fails to reflect the reality that some conditions are standard components of the accreditation process and do not necessarily signal an elevated risk.

The URF, by contrast, is more sensitive to risk variations. By incorporating Likelihood × Consequence analysis, it provides a nuanced assessment of risks, distinguishing between minor, moderate, and severe threats. This ensures that institutional responses are proportionate to the actual level of risk presented by accreditation conditions.

Flexibility and Adaptability

The PARRF is rigid in its application, focusing exclusively on accreditation risks without considering broader institutional risk factors. It does not allow for adjustments based on differences in how professional accrediting bodies apply conditions or the routine nature of some conditions.

The URF is more adaptable due to its Likelihood × Impact structure. It can be applied to various risk scenarios beyond accreditation, making it a more versatile tool for institutional governance.

Effectiveness in Practice

The PARRF is overly simplistic and not well-suited for managing accreditation risks effectively. Its focus on timelines and resource needs overlooks critical considerations such as risk severity, reputational impact, and long-term institutional consequences. The assumption that all accreditation conditions indicate risk is problematic, as it does not account for routine conditions that are part of normal accreditation cycles.

The URF, though more complex, provides a more effective and adaptable approach to identifying, assessing, and mitigating risks. Its structured methodology ensures that accreditation risks are evaluated in relation to broader institutional priorities, rather than being treated in isolation.

Comparison Against Best Practices

When compared to best-practice risk management models, the URF aligns more closely with industry standards due to its structured and flexible approach. The PARRF, while useful for accreditation-specific risk categorisation, lacks the comprehensiveness needed for proactive risk management. It does not incorporate reputational, financial, or student-related risks—factors that play a crucial role in accreditation sustainability.

To enhance the effectiveness of accreditation risk assessment, the PARRF should integrate elements of the URF, including:

- A Likelihood × Consequence model to provide a more precise and adaptable risk classification.
- Consideration of reputational and student impact risks, rather than focusing solely on timelines and resource needs.
- A differentiated approach to accreditation conditions, recognising that some are routine while others indicate serious deficiencies.

Summary

The PARRF is inadequate for effective risk management due to its narrow scope, lack of differentiation in risk severity, and failure to incorporate reputational and long-term institutional risks. Its rigid classification system assumes that all accreditation conditions signal heightened risk, which is not always the case. Some conditions are a standard part of the accreditation process, particularly for new programs, and should not be treated as indicators of deficiencies.

In contrast, the URF provides a more structured and adaptable model for institutional risk management. It accounts for variations in risk severity, aligns with broader institutional priorities, and integrates reputational, financial, and student-related risks.

To ensure a more strategic and effective approach to accreditation risk, the university should revise the PARRF by incorporating elements of the URF. A refined accreditation risk model should move beyond a static three-tier classification system and adopt a Likelihood × Consequence model that recognises the differences in accreditation conditions, ensures accurate risk differentiation, and aligns with best-practice risk management standards.

School of Rural Medicine's approach

Overview

The School of Rural Medicine adopts a structured and detailed approach to professional accreditation (PA) risk assessment, integrating a Likelihood × Consequence model based on the TEQSA risk matrix and the Australian and New Zealand Risk Standard. This method allows for a granular evaluation of accreditation risks, differentiating minor compliance issues from serious deficiencies that could threaten accreditation status.

A key feature of their approach is the individualised assessment of accreditation standards, where risks are classified and assigned specific ratings (e.g., C4 Moderate, D3 Low). Each identified risk is accompanied by a targeted mitigation plan aimed at reducing its severity through clear institutional actions. Unlike broader institutional risk models, their framework also considers financial sustainability, reputational impact, and student outcomes, ensuring a holistic approach to accreditation risk management.

Strengths

The School of Rural Medicine's PA risk framework offers a more sophisticated and comprehensive approach to accreditation risk management compared to traditional models. Its strengths lie in its structured methodology, focus on proactive mitigation, and alignment with institutional priorities.

Granular risk classification

Rather than relying on broad, undifferentiated categories such as Low, Medium, and High, the framework applies a Likelihood × Consequence model, allowing for a more precise assessment of risks. This ensures that minor administrative issues are not conflated with critical deficiencies that threaten accreditation status.

Proactive mitigation strategies

Each identified risk is accompanied by a clear, actionable mitigation plan, ensuring that potential issues are addressed before they escalate. The framework also includes risk tracking over time, allowing for ongoing assessment and adjustment as circumstances evolve.

Integration of financial sustainability

Accreditation compliance is explicitly linked to long-term financial planning, reducing uncertainty around program viability. By incorporating budget projections, cost structures, and revenue dependencies, the framework provides a realistic assessment of financial risk to accreditation status.

Recognition of reputational risk

Unlike many accreditation risk models that focus solely on compliance, this approach considers external stakeholder confidence, industry partnerships, and institutional credibility. It acknowledges that accreditation failures can have long-term reputational consequences that extend beyond immediate compliance concerns.

Alignment with accreditation standards

Risks are mapped directly to specific accreditation criteria, allowing for precise tracking of compliance gaps. This structured approach ensures that risk assessments are not generic but instead tied to clearly defined accreditation requirements, improving accountability and transparency.

Consideration of student impact

The framework goes beyond regulatory concerns to assess how accreditation risks affect student experience, learning quality, and professional pathways. By incorporating student outcomes into risk assessments, it strengthens the university's ability to safeguard educational quality and graduate success.

This **evidence-based, forward-looking model** enhances accreditation risk management by providing greater clarity, accountability, and adaptability, ensuring that compliance efforts align with broader institutional objectives.

Alignment with the University Risk Framework

The School of Rural Medicine's risk approach aligns well with the URF, particularly in its use of a Likelihood × Consequence risk model. This ensures a consistent methodology across institutional risk assessments, reducing discrepancies between accreditation-specific risks and broader university risk management strategies.

However, key differences remain:

- The URF applies to financial, operational, and reputational risks across the institution, while the School of Rural Medicine's model is focused solely on accreditation.
- The URF allows for greater flexibility in risk categorisation, whereas the accreditation model is standards-based and prescriptive, mapping risks to specific accreditation criteria.
- The PARRF currently lacks clear integration with the broader university framework, particularly in areas such as institutional strategic planning and governance-level risk oversight.

By adopting elements of the School of Rural Medicine's approach—granular risk classification, mitigation tracking, and student impact analysis—the PARRF could be significantly strengthened, offering a more precise and adaptable model for accreditation risk management

Recommendations

1. Refine risk classification for greater precision

The current three-tier classification system is too simplistic and does not differentiate between minor compliance issues and serious accreditation threats. Replacing it with a Likelihood × Consequence model will allow for a more nuanced assessment, ensuring that risks are classified based on both their likelihood and potential impact. This will prevent minor administrative issues from being conflated with critical deficiencies that could jeopardise accreditation status.

2. Expand the scope of risk assessment

The framework's current focus on timelines and resource allocation overlooks key factors that shape accreditation outcomes. A more comprehensive approach should incorporate reputational, financial, and student-related risks. Accreditation challenges affect institutional credibility, student enrolments, and long-term program sustainability, making it essential that these dimensions are included in risk assessments.

3. Implement a dynamic risk mitigation and monitoring system

Accreditation risks should not be treated as static conditions but as evolving challenges requiring continuous oversight. A structured mitigation plan with defined actions, accountability, and measurable progress indicators should accompany each identified risk. A regular reassessment process should be embedded into the framework, ensuring that risks are actively managed and not just categorised.

4. Align with the University Risk Framework

The URF already applies a Likelihood × Consequence model across institutional risk assessments. Aligning the PARRF with this model will ensure consistency between accreditation-specific risks and

broader university governance. A more integrated approach will also enhance the framework's adaptability, allowing it to respond to changing accreditation standards and evolving institutional priorities.

The PARRF will evolve from a static classification tool into a proactive, strategic risk management system by implementing these changes. Accreditation risks will not only be assessed but actively managed, ensuring greater institutional preparedness, stronger compliance, and improved long-term sustainability.

Conclusion

The current PARRF lacks the sophistication needed to manage the complexities of accreditation risk effectively. Its rigid classification system does not account for varying levels of severity, leading to an oversimplified approach that treats minor compliance issues the same as serious deficiencies. The narrow focus on timelines and resource requirements further limits its usefulness, as it fails to incorporate the reputational, financial, and student-related risks that shape accreditation outcomes. Without these broader considerations, the framework cannot provide a full picture of the risks facing accredited programs.

Comparisons with both the URF and the School of Rural Medicine's approach highlight the need for a more structured and adaptable model. A Likelihood × Consequence model would offer a more precise risk assessment methodology, ensuring that accreditation risks are classified and mitigated based on their actual impact. A more **flexible, forward-looking framework** would also allow for **continuous monitoring** and **strategic intervention**, rather than simply assigning static risk ratings.

Shifting from a compliance-driven model to a **proactive risk management approach** will strengthen the university's ability to maintain accreditation, protect its institutional standing, and uphold educational quality. A revised framework that integrates more **detailed risk classification, broader risk considerations**, and **structured mitigation tracking** will enable the university to manage accreditation risks with greater confidence and strategic foresight in an increasingly complex regulatory environment.

Item 9: Annual Report Against UCC Terms of Reference 2024

PURPOSE

To report on the activities and outcomes from the University Courses Committee (UCC) against its Terms of Reference.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to **endorse** and **recommend** University Courses Committee 2024 Assurance Report to Academic Senate.

BACKGROUND

This report documents the activities of the UCC in discharging its duties against its Terms of Reference for 2024. It identifies areas of particular focus for 2025.

PREVIOUS CONSIDERATION

Previous consideration	Key issues and outcomes
UCC30/9 – UCC approved and recommended the 2023 UCC Annual Report to the Academic Senate for noting.	The format of the report to Academic Senate has been updated to align with the format used by the Council Committees, which is more of an assurance report rather than a report against the terms of reference.

KEY ISSUES

This University Courses Committee 2024 Assurance Report provides an assurance to the Academic Senate that UCC has discharged its functions in accordance with the UCC - Membership and Terms of Reference.

Major Risk	Risk Monitoring and Management	Does this sit within risk appetite?
<p>Teaching and Learning Charles Sturt University has a Low Appetite to take risks with the potential to compromise student outcomes and progression through to graduation, teaching excellence, course accreditation, academic integrity and educational standards by the University or its third-party education arrangements.</p> <p><i>If the University Courses Committee does not properly discharge it's duties against the Terms of Reference, then it may result in non-compliance with standard 6.3 of the Higher Education Standards Framework.</i></p>	<p>Undertake assurance processes to confirm the UCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -delivers on its functions as defined in the Membership and Terms of Reference. -ensures the functions of the committee are within defined university governance policies and procedures. 	Yes

ACTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Submit the University Courses Committee 2024 Assurance Report to Academic Senate.

COMPLIANCE

Legislative Compliance	This submission contributes to compliance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Standard 6.3 of the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021
Policy/TOR Alignment	This submission is made in accordance with: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Governance (Academic Senate) Rule 2018 and University Courses Committee Membership and Terms of Reference in the Policy Library.

ATTACHMENTS

A. University Courses Committee Annual Assurance Report to AS

Prepared by: 27/2/2025 Verinnia Lansom, Academic Governance Officer

Approved by: 3/3/2025 Graham Brown, Provost and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic.

Cleared by: 3/3/2025 Graham Brown, Provost and Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic.



2024 Annual Assurance Report from the University Courses Committee to Academic Senate

FEBRUARY 2025

Summary

This report provides an assurance to the Academic Senate that the University Courses Committee has discharged its functions in accordance with the University Courses Committee - Membership and Terms of Reference.

The Committee continues to ensure that Academic Senate is briefed on all matters it considers. Reports on the business of the Committee have been regularly provided to Academic Senate and minutes of meetings are also provided following each meeting.

The University Courses Committee Terms of Reference relate to the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021, in particular Domain 5 Institutional Quality Assurance, and Domain 6 Governance and Accountability. (All Standards – 1.4.2, 3.1, 3.1.5, 5.1, 5.3, 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.4, 5.4, 6.2.1.i, 6.3 and 7.1) The Committee is confident that its activities meet the governance of these standards.

The purpose of the University Courses Committee is to provide critical academic scrutiny relating to the course profile within the University and to provide advice to the Academic Senate on strategies, policies, initiatives and innovation that promotes development of an innovative course profile of the highest quality.

Core Responsibilities of the University Courses Committee (from the Terms of Reference)

(9)The University Courses Committee will undertake a systematic overview of the course profile and internal and external course accreditation and provide recommendations to the Academic Senate on standards and measures of quality in relation to the course profile.

(10)The committee has the following responsibilities in relation to the course profile:

- a. provide strategic academic oversight,
- b. receive advice from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on approved authorities to proceed and business cases, including for new courses, new offerings of a course or decisions to suspend or phase out a course (delegation E2 – authority to approve business case etc.),
- c. monitor admissions and course enrolment trends, and
- d. oversee the course profile and course development of partner and Educational Delivery (Award) Partners.

(11)The committee has the following responsibilities in relation to internal accreditation:

- a. undertake critical scrutiny of course proposals, as defined in the [Course and Subject Policy](#), and make recommendations to the Academic Senate for approval as appropriate,
- b. receive reports on approved minor changes to courses (delegation E5 – authority to approve minor changes to a course of study),
- c. oversee inclusion of graduate learning outcomes in course design,
- d. receive and consider minutes and reports from the Indigenous Board of Studies on achievements against institutional targets for Indigenous Australian content,
- e. oversee the schedule of comprehensive course reviews,

- f. receive and review summary reports on annual course reviews, and
- g. receive reports from Faculty Boards:
 - i. confirming that relevant policy and procedures have been met,
 - ii. relating to courses in accordance with the [Delegation Schedule E - Academic and Research](#), and
 - iii. addressing mapped [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021](#) responsibilities including those relating to admissions, credit and recognition of prior learning; orientation and progress; learning outcomes and experience; qualifications and certification; diversity and equity; course design, approval and accreditation; monitoring, review and improvement; and course and subject representation, information and information management.

(12) The committee has the following responsibilities in relation to external (professional) accreditation:

- a. receive and consider the register of professional accreditation,
- b. receive and consider reports from faculties on the progress of courses undergoing accreditation, and
- c. receive advice from faculties on conditional approvals and failures, and faculty plans for meeting conditions or re-applying.

(13) The committee will monitor compliance with the [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021](#) and receive and consider reports on this relevant to the Committee and ensure appropriate actions where required.

(14) The committee will identify and oversee risks and solutions associated with the course profile and course accreditation, including those associated with internal accreditation, external (professional) accreditation and partner or Educational Delivery (Award) Partner.

(15) The committee will review relevant policies and procedures and make recommendations to the Academic Senate or the policy owner in accordance with the [Delegation Schedule A - Governance and Legal](#), including but not limited to policies and procedures for course development and review, admissions, curriculum and credit where required.

The full Terms of Reference for the Committee are located [here](#).

Compliance with the University Courses Committee Terms of Reference

The University Courses Committee can advise Academic Senate that during 2024 it has discharged its responsibilities against the Terms of Reference, in relation to:

- Executed its primary delegated responsibility by undertaking critical scrutiny of course proposals:
 - Reviewing and approving relevant changes to courses; and
 - Reviewing and endorsing courses/changes to courses and making recommendations to Academic Senate for final approval.
- Reviewed and made recommendations on relevant policy and procedures including:
 - Course and Subject Policy;
 - Course and Subject Quality Assurance and Review Procedure; and
 - Indigenous Australian Content in Courses and Subjects Policy.
- Considered and recommended action on pertinent items including:
 - Mechanisms designed to reduce the number of year-long subjects;
 - Third-Party Arrangements;
 - Impact of AI;
 - Comprehensive Course Reviews;
 - Professional Accreditation; and
 - Inherent Requirements.
- Reviewed and remedied CDAP as required including around year-long subjects, subject substitution, GPS exemption and TechnologyOne Student Management System Opportunities.
- Received reporting from committees reporting to the University Courses Committee:
 - Faculty of Arts and Education Faculty Board;

- Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences Faculty Board;
- Faculty of Science and Health Faculty Board; and
- Indigenous Board of Studies.

Commentary

The purpose of this report is to assure Academic Senate that the University Courses Committee (the Committee) has undertaken the work required by the Membership and Terms of Reference. In conjunction with the MToRs the Committee regularly considered the requirements of the Annual Plan and the committees governance responsibilities of the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021.

The clearly defined functions of the Committee and the effective use of supporting systems such as CDAP have enabled university staff to efficiently and impactfully maintain its course profile.

Throughout 2024 the committee aligned its discussion, decisions and recommendations to the aspirations and objectives of the University so that the work undertaken maintained purpose and relevance for committee members and stakeholders.

Actions arising from committee meetings have followed common trends, falling roughly into two categories; addressing specific items that must be resolved as a condition of being approved or recommended to Academic Senate and to follow up on items as needed at a higher level so that course profiles, process improvements, policies and procedures addressed by the Committee will contribute to the university achieving its strategic objectives and KPIs.

In assuring Academic Senate that the University Courses Committee has discharged its function I would like to identify some specific items the Committee will aim to address in 2025.

- We will continue to identify opportunities to reduce and eliminate complexity in governance processes and reporting.
- Refine processes and engagement with Research Institutes who are seeking to implement and deliver courses for teaching with the aim to resolve any residual barriers that might be in-place as a result of this work being undertaken outside of the reporting lines of our Faculties, who are the primary bodies reporting into University Courses Committees.
- Refine the proactive identification of items that need to be referred to University Research Committee ahead of their submission to Academic Senate.

In 2025 and beyond, there is a clear connection between the role of the Committee and our impact in a period of significant disruption from external factors such as Generative AI, the impact of government policy decisions as well as broad economic market pressures. This enduring impact is an important consideration when we examine the role that the University Courses Committee will have to facilitate the implementation of changes arising from the Models of Engagement and Assessment.

The Committee can assure Academic Senate that it will continue its critical academic scrutiny of the course profile and will advise Academic Senate on strategies, policies, initiatives and innovation that support course profile of the highest quality.

Professor Graham Brown
Chair, University Courses Committee
 February 2025



Item 10: Previous Minutes (UCC and UCC SC)

PURPOSE

To approve the minutes of the previous UCC and UCC SC meetings.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to **approve** the minutes of the University Courses Committee meeting held on 23 October 2024 as a true and accurate record.

ATTACHMENTS/LINKS

A. [AS UCC 34 241023 Minutes](#)



Charles Sturt
University

UNIVERSITY COURSES COMMITTEE
Meeting No. 34

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 23 October 2024 by videoconference.

1. Welcome and Apologies

The Chair opened the meeting at 9.03pm with an Acknowledgement of Country and welcomed members and attendees.

Members Present

Professor Graham Brown	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair)
Professor Lisa Cary	Dean (Learning and Teaching Innovation)
Mr Matthew Granfield	Executive Director, Customer Experience
Associate Professor Lucie Zundans-Fraser	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Arts and Education
Professor Jenny Kent	Deputy Dean, Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Science
Associate Professor Christopher Orchard	Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Arts and Education
Associate Professor Julia Lynch	Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences
Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed	Associate Dean (Academic), Faculty of Science and Health
Dr Susan Mlcek	Acting Chair, Indigenous Board of Studies
Dr Kelly Tribolet	Faculty of Arts and Education
Dr Jason Howarth	Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences
Dr Michelle Eastwood	Faculty of Science and Health
Ms Rebecca Acheson	Nominated member, Educational Design Lead, Division of Learning and Teaching
Dr Annabel Matheson	Nominated member, Faculty of Arts and Education
Ms Rebecca Frauenfelder	Acting Manager, Course Administration Team, Faculty of Science and Health

Attendees

Mrs Steph Daskein	Course and Subject Accreditation Officer
Dr Mark Bassett	Director, Academic Quality and Standards
Ms Kate Hayden	Manager, Governance

Minutes

Ms Verinnia Lansom	Governance Officer
--------------------	--------------------

Apologies

Professor Janelle Wheat	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)
Mr Mike Ferguson	Pro Vice-Chancellor (International)
Associate Professor Matthew Winslade	Associate Dean (Research), Faculty of Arts and Education
Ms Sandra Sharpham	Executive Director, Student Experience
Ms Heather McGregor	Pro Vice-Chancellor, Student Success
Mr Simon Wakeling	Nominated member, Faculty of Science and Health

Membership of the University Courses Committee Standing Committee

In relation to the membership of the University Courses Committee (UCC) Standing Committee (SC) the UCC:

- i) noted the vacancy 'one member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee';
- ii) thanked Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed, outgoing SC member; and
- iii) noted the current membership of the UCC SC was as follows:
 - Professor Graham Brown Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (Chair).
 - Professor Janelle Wheat Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching).
 - Professor Jenny Kent Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee.
 - Professor Lisa Cary Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee.
 - Vacant Member of the UCC, nominated by the Committee.

iv) welcomed Associate Professor Rachel Whitsed, to the membership of the UCC SC for an additional term of office ending 30 June 2026.

2. Declaration of Interests

There were no interests raised or declared by members or attendees.

3. Confirmation of Agenda

The agenda was confirmed.

4. Action Sheet

The Board reviewed the Action Sheet and noted the following:

Item Ref	Action	Update
UCC34/4 21 Aug 2024	Review the risk ratings, conditions, and definitions to provide more insightful data.	The Director, Academic Quality and Standards (AQ&S) confirmed that the risk framework review was in progress and stakeholders would be contacted shortly.

5. Chair's Report

The Chair confirmed it was business as usual and the curriculum processes were progressing with no major developments to report.

6. Course Documents

Faculty Boards provide endorsement of course changes within Faculty Board minutes and assure the University Courses Committee of the Board's consideration of issues, progress, and monitoring of associated actions.

Prior to the University Courses Committee meeting, members reviewed Course Documents and recorded questions, comments, and suggested amendments via the comments field in CDAP. The UCC referred to these comments to guide discussion.

The course proposals before the UCC were discussed, and the following points were noted:

Associate Degree in Human Services [Exit point only]

Members discussed the 2025 reaccreditation date for the proposals before the UCC for endorsement and the following was noted:

- The Associate Degree in Human Services suite was predominantly to endorse new exit points to align with the Bachelor of Human Services, and Bachelor of Social Work's common 1st year, to provide an early exit point for students in those programs.
- An Undergraduate Certificate (UC) was included in the suite pending confirmation of UCs. The Chair confirmed that discussions around UCs were continuing.

Master of Project Management and Leadership (Professional Practice), Graduate Diploma of Project Management and Leadership and Graduate Certificate in Project Management and Leadership

The proposals related to the introduction of 2 new partner requested postgraduate articulated sets for delivery at Navitas Sydney and Melbourne campuses. The following was noted:

- CRICOS approval was pending.
- Conditional approval has been given by the Indigenous Board of Studies (IBS). The Associate Dean (Academic) (ADA) thanked IBS for their early review.

- While it would be doubtful if a potential student would be granted a visa for a Graduate Certificate (GC), it could be included.
- A shorter Master's degree could be offered to domestic students or online overseas students. It was further noted that the domestic version would be revisited in the future.
- The wording in brackets, (Professional Practice) refers to the add on to the Masters of Project Management and Leadership in the 12-subject model.
- The entry requirements field, 'undergraduate degree' would be reviewed in the suite of Navitas offerings to clarify the level of degree as 'Bachelor'.

Master of Business Data Analytics and Graduate Diploma of Business Data Analytics

The two proposals were also Navitas requested, and the following was noted:

- This suite does not have a GC as the GC already exists and was successfully offered to domestic students.
- CRICOS approval was pending.
- Wording around course learning outcomes would be amended for consistency.

Bachelor of Engineering (Honours) including new majors Electrical, Mechanical and Civil Engineering

The restructure of the Bachelor of Engineering and the introduction of new majors was designed to broaden its appeal to prospective students and addresses the needs of the workforce in our region and broader communities. In addition, the following was noted:

- The modification allowed CRICOS registration for international enrolments, which would be sought for 2026 entry. It was further noted that endorsement had been sought from International and from Risk and Compliance to confirm that the structure met CRICOS requirements.
- The modification also included IKC101, and conditional approval had been given by IBS for embedding additional Indigenous knowledge throughout the degree.
- Subject weightings have been amended to fit into the more standardised 4, 8, and 16 subjects.
- While accreditation was not a requirement it had already been flagged with Engineers Australia that it would be sought. It was further noted that the current accreditation for the Bachelor of Engineering Civil could not be transferred and would be maintained for the duration of the teach out under the old structure.
- Students who had applied through the old structure would be automatically transferred to the new structure following approval from Academic Senate.
 - All communication from admissions and marketing specifically addresses modifications to the course structure to clearly advise potential students of these changes.
- Electives in the civil major, in particular Spatial Modelling, would be discussed further with the Course Director to ensure alignment.
- All MCATs were reminded that courses may be grouped in proposals in CDAP.

Master of Ageing and Health

This proposal was returned from the last UCC: the resolution from IBS was now included in the proposal and compliance with the Curriculum Architecture Principles was confirmed.

Discontinuation of specialisations in the Master of Information Technology - Business Analysis, Systems Analysis and Network Security

The discontinuation of these specialisations in the Master of Information Technology was based on the recommendation of the Australian Computer Society as the professional accreditation body and it did not have students. It was requested that for future discontinuations where there were no students and therefore a teach out plan was not required, that a note was included in the proposal at the 'Impact on existing cohorts' field in the Executive Summary to confirm.

Discontinuation of specialisations in the Master of Education - Contemporary Literacies, Curriculum and Professional Practice, Digital Technology, Indigenous Education and Higher Education

While a previous UCC endorsed the new specialisations in the Master of Education, the discontinuations before this meeting would condense the program to meet industry needs. It was expected that students

in the existing specialisations were on track to graduate in 2024 60. A copy of the teach out plan was included at 'Attachments' in the proposal and was noted in the 'Impact on existing cohorts' field.

Discontinuation Master of Ageing and Pastoral Studies, Graduate Certificate in Ageing and Pastoral Studies [Exit point only] and Graduate Diploma of Ageing and Pastoral Studies

It was conformed there were no active students in the course.

Discontinuation Master of Islam, Culture and Society, Graduate Certificate in Islam, Culture and Society and Graduate Diploma of Islam, Culture and Society

Due to ongoing low enrolment numbers the course would be discontinued with no real impact on students given that another program in the area maintains the majority of subjects. Members agreed that greater consideration should be given to course names, noting a broader title, possible Islamic Theology, may have been more appealing to a broader range of students.

Master of Islamic Studies (Research)

It was confirmed that there was a market for students specialising in Islamic studies as a research area within the school and has been used to progress to a PHD. Members questioned the demand for this course given fee waivers on PhD's.

Members discussed the workflow for proposals with a research link and the role of the UCC and University Research Committee (URC) and the following was noted:

- The Associate Dean (Research) (ADR) from each faculty were members of the committee, and the relevant ADR was invited to each UCC when required.
- The Chair:
 - Confirmed that approval was a dual process and that higher degree research courses were submitted to the UCC and URC for supporting endorsement and recommendation.
 - Requested the Manager Governance ensure the proposal was endorsed by URC before progressing to Academic Senate (AS).
 - Undertook to request a more streamlined workflow to progress research proposals with the University Secretary and the Director Governance.

Members confirmed endorsement of the proposal and that the proposal would go to the URC before progressing to AS.

ACTION UCC34/1 Ensure the Master of Islamic Studies (Research) proposal was endorsed by URC before progressing to Academic Senate. (Manager Governance)

ACTION UCC34/2 Request a more streamlined workflow to progress research proposals with the University Secretary and the Director Governance. (DVCA)

RESOLUTION UCC34/1 The University Courses Committee resolved to:

1. **endorse and recommend** to Academic Senate the following Accreditation -Coursework proposals, for approval:

- Associate Degree in Human Services [Exit point only] – New
- Master of Ageing and Health – Reaccreditation
- Master of Information Technology (Selected Specialisations) – Discontinuation
 - Business Analysis
 - Systems Analysis
 - Network Security
- Master of Education (Selected Specialisations) – Discontinuation
 - Contemporary Literacies
 - Curriculum and Professional Practice
 - Digital Technology
 - Indigenous Education
 - Higher Education
- Master of Ageing and Pastoral Studies – Discontinuation

- Graduate Certificate in Ageing and Pastoral Studies [Exit point only]
- Graduate Diploma of Ageing and Pastoral Studies
- Master of Islam, Culture and Society – Discontinuation
 - Graduate Certificate in Islam, Culture and Society
 - Graduate Diploma of Islam, Culture and Society.

RESOLUTION UCC34/2 The University Courses Committee resolved to **endorse** and **recommend** to Academic Senate the following course proposals, as amended, for approval:

- Master of Project Management and Leadership (Professional Practice) – New
 - Graduate Diploma of Project Management and Leadership – New
 - Graduate Certificate in Project Management and Leadership – New
- Master of Business Data Analytics – New
 - Graduate Diploma of Business Data Analytics – New
- Bachelor of Engineering – New majors
 - Electrical Engineering
 - Mechanical Engineering
 - Civil Engineering.

RESOLUTION UCC34/3 The University Courses Committee resolved to **endorse** the Accreditation -Research proposal Master of Islamic Studies (Research) – Reaccreditation to the University Research Committee.

RESOLUTION UCC34/4 The University Courses Committee resolved to **approve** the Major Change- Coursework proposal Bachelor of Engineering (Honours), as amended.

7. Annual Plan

The Chair noted that the work involved in the curriculum migration from banner into TechOne and the required downtime for migration would be planned to align with an appropriate time when no curriculum changes were required. This would also align with the existing CDAP lockdown for the handbook migration and the plan would come to a future meeting of UCC for noting.

RESOLUTION UCC34/5 The University Courses Committee resolved to **endorse** the University Courses Committee Annual Plan for 2025.

8. Comprehensive Course Reviews Report 2024

The Director, AQ&S undertook to:

- Reword the submission around the Faculty of Science and Health to clarify that while work on the comprehensive course reviews was being undertaken early, they would still be reviewed as per schedule.
- Remove '0' data in both bar charts 'Reaccreditation by year' and 'Reaccreditation by faculty' from the submission.
- Members asked if the information in the report was raw data from CDAP, or if the feedback from the Faculty Boards had been cross referenced and incorporated into the report.
 - The Director AQ&S undertook to discuss reporting for 2025 and the possibility of a faculty combined report for future reporting with the ADA's.
 - The ADAs were requested to provide an update on the data to the Chair who would provide a verbal update on any changes to AS.
- Members agreed that the data in the 'Reaccreditation by faculty' was unclear in identifying courses that had a delayed start to reaccreditation. It was agreed a table to identify the number

of all courses including those delayed courses would be useful. The Chair requested the Director amend the report accordingly before submission to AS.

ACTION UCC34/3 Discuss Comprehensive Course Review reporting for 2025 and the possibility of a faculty combined report for future reporting with the ADA's.(Director AQ&S)

ACTION UCC34/4 Amend the Comprehensive Course Review report to identify delayed courses before submission to AS. (Director AQ&S)

RESOLUTION UCC34/6 The University Courses Committee resolved to:

1. **endorse** the schedule of comprehensive course reviews,
2. **endorse** the faculty summary reports on annual course reviews, and
3. **approve** submission of a subsequent summary report to the Academic Senate and Audit and Risk Committee.

9. Previous Minutes (UCC and UCC SC)

RESOLUTION UCC34/7 The University Courses Committee resolved to **approve** the minutes of the University Courses Committee meeting held on 12 June 2024 as a true and accurate record.

10. Academic Senate Minutes

RESOLUTION UCC34/8 The University Courses Committee resolved to **note** the minutes of the Academic Senate meetings held 14 August and 25 September 2024.

11. Minutes of the Committees reporting to UCC

RESOLUTION UCC34/9 The University Courses Committee resolved to **note** the following minutes of the Committees that report to the University Courses Committee:

- Faculty of Arts and Education Faculty Board 12 August and 30 September 2024
- Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences Faculty Board 13 August and 1 October 2024
- Faculty of Science and Health Faculty Board 12 August and 30 September 2024
- Indigenous Board of Studies 4 September 2024.

12. Action Item Update (subject substitution, GPS exemption and Student Management System opportunities)

RESOLUTION UCC34/10 The University Courses Committee resolved to **note** the update regarding subject substitution, GPS exemption and Student Management System opportunities. (action Item UCC30/9, 6 March 2024 refers)

13. Third Party and Partner Annual Summary Report

The Director Risk and Compliance confirmed that the Third Party and Partner Annual Summary Report scheduled for the 23 October 2024 meeting, would be submitted to the 12 March 2025 UCC meeting.

14. Other Business

Committee Membership

The Chair advised the committee that a submission would be forwarded to AS to amend the membership of the UCC to include the Director, Academic Quality and Standards position as a member of the committee in lieu of an attendee.

There were no other items of business.

15. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the University Courses Committee was scheduled to be held from 9:00 am – 12:00 pm on Wednesday, 12 March 2025 by videoconference. The agenda for this meeting closes on 24 January 2025.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 10:15am.

Signed as a true and accurate record:

Chair

Date

Item 11: Academic Senate Minutes

PURPOSE

To provide the University Courses Committee with the record of business considered by Academic Senate at its recent meeting.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to **note** the Minutes of the Academic Senate meeting held on 18 November 2024 and 19 February 2025.

KEY ISSUES

The Chair will highlight items of relevance to the University Courses Committee.

COMPLIANCE

Legislative Compliance	This decision contributes to compliance with: 1. Standard 6.3 of the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021
Policy Alignment	This decision is made in accordance with the Faculty Boards – MTOR and Governance (Academic Senate) Rule 2018

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk appetite according to the Risk Appetite Statement.	Legislative and Regulatory Compliance: Charles Sturt University is committed to high level of compliance with relevant legislation, regulatory compliance obligations and internal policies and procedures. Charles Sturt University has a Very Low Appetite for any intentional behaviours which result in non-compliances with any of its relevant legislative requirements, regulatory compliance obligations and internal policies and procedures.
Consequence of decision in relation to risk appetite	This decision sits within the current risk appetite.

LINK

A. [AS196 & 197 Minutes 18 November 2024 and 19 February 2025.](#)

Prepared by: 18/2/2024 Verinnia Lansom, Governance Officer
 Approved by: 27/2/2024 Kate Hayden, Manager, Governance
 Cleared by: 3/3/2024 Professor Graham Brown, Chair University Courses Committee



Item 12: Minutes of the Committees Reporting to the University Courses Committee

PURPOSE

To provide the minutes from meetings of committees that report to the University Courses Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to **note** the minutes of the Committees that report to the University Courses Committee.

KEY ISSUES

The minutes for meetings of committees that report to the University Courses Committee are provided for the information of members:

Faculty of Arts and Education Faculty Board	10 February 2025
Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences Faculty Board	11 February 2025
Faculty of Science and Health Faculty Board	10 February 2025
Indigenous Board of Studies	4 December 2024

Any items that require specific consideration and or decision by the University Courses Committee will appear as separate items on the agenda.

COMPLIANCE

Legislative Compliance	This decision contributes to compliance with Standard 6.3 Higher Education Standards Framework 2021 .
Policy Alignment	This decision is made in accordance with the University Courses Committee Membership and Term of Reference and the relevant sub-committee Membership and Terms of Reference in the Policy Library .

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk appetite according to the Risk Appetite Statement.	Legislative and Regulatory Compliance: Charles Sturt University is committed to high level of compliance with relevant legislation, regulatory compliance obligations and internal policies and procedures. Charles Sturt University has a Very Low Appetite for any intentional behaviours which result in non-compliances with any of its relevant legislative requirements, regulatory compliance obligations and internal policies and procedures.
Consequence of decision in relation to risk appetite	This decision sits within the current risk appetite.

LINKS

- A. [Faculty of Arts and Education Faculty Board](#)
- B. [Faculty of Business, Justice and Behavioural Sciences Faculty Board](#)
- C. [Faculty of Science and Health Faculty Board](#)
- D. [Indigenous Board of Studies Minutes](#)

Prepared by: 18/02/2025 Verinnia Lansom, Governance Officer
Approved by: 27/02/2025 Kate Hayden, Manager Governance
Cleared by: 3/03/2025 Professor Graham Brown, Chair University Courses Committee

University Courses Committee

Report / Item	Responsible Officer/s	2025					Action / Committee Pathway	TOR	HESF	Comments	Committee Timings
		12-Mar	30-Apr	18-Jun	27-Aug	22-Oct					
Course Profile											
Major Changes to an award course of study.	Associate Deans Academic	As required					Approve (Submit to Senate for noting)	11(a)	5.1 5.3 5.4		UCC and AS - as required
Reaccreditation (accreditation) - Review Report for individual courses	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation / Course Directors / Associate Deans (Research) / Associate Deans (Academic)	As required					Endorse Full Report (from ADAs to Senate for approval)	11(e)	5.1 5.3 5.4		UCC and AS - as required
Reaccreditation (accreditation) - Annual Review of Schedule and Progress	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation / Associate Deans (Academic)					x	Endorse Summary Report to Senate	11(f)	3.1.5 5.1 5.3.1 5.3.2 7.1		UCC - Oct AS - Nov
Comprehensive Course Review Summary	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation / Associate Deans (Academic)					x	Endorse Summary Report to Senate and ARC	11(e)	1.4.2 3.1 5.1	To provide a snapshot of where the previous years' CCRs are up to and any key themes that emerged.	FBs - Sep UCC - Oct AS - Nov ARC - Nov CNL - Dec (via ARC and AS reporting)
Third Party Provider and Partner Annual Summary Report (including risks and relevant actions & annual update on Charles Sturt University Sydney campus)	Risk and Compliance Unit	x					Note	10(d)	5.3 5.4 7.1	To include reporting on the Charles Sturt University Sydney and Charles Sturt University Melbourne campuses.	FBs - Sep AQSC - Oct UCC - Oct ARC - Nov AS - Nov CNL - Dec
Risk and Compliance Report - Academic Risks (relevant risks)	Risk and Compliance Unit	As required					Note	14	5.3 5.4 7.1		
Internal Accreditation											
Accreditation and discontinuance (teach-out arrangements) for courses of study leading to degrees and awards offered by the University.	Associate Deans Academic	As required					Endorse Summary Report to Senate	11(a)	5.1 5.3 5.4	Research courses are to go to URC as well as UCC, prior to going to Senate. Policy is being reviewed.	UCC and AS - as required
External (Professional) Accreditation											
Professional Accreditation Report (including HDR courses and faculty updates on progress, conditional approvals, and plans for meeting conditions or re-applying)	Manager, Course and Subject Accreditation				x		Approve Summary Report to Senate and ARC	(12)	3.1.5 5.1 6.2.1.i 7.1.2		FBs - Jun UCC - Aug AS - Nov ARC - Nov
Delegate Reports / Referrals											
Report from Faculty Boards - 1. confirming that relevant policy and procedures have been met; ii. relating to courses in accordance with the Delegation Schedule E - Academic and Research;	Chairs, Faculty Board / Governance Officer	As required					Note / Endorse / Approve	11(g)	6.3		
Items referred to and from UCC, AQSC, URC, AS and other committees or officers on all matters relevant to the course profile and the academic governance of the courses of the University.	Chair, UCC	As required					Note / Endorse / Approve	(17) & (19)	6.3		
Indigenous Board of Studies - Minutes	Chair, IBS	When available					Note	11(d)	5.3.2 5.3.4		
Indigenous Board of Studies - Annual Report on Progress against Indigenous Australia Content in Courses and Subject Policy	Chair, IBS			x			Note	11(d)	5.3.2 5.3.4		
Governance											
Policy Reviews (relevant policies)	Policy owners	As required					Endorse Full Report to Senate	(15)	6.3		

Report / Item	Responsible Officer/s	2025					Action / Committee Pathway	TOR	HESF	Comments	Committee Timings
		12-Mar	30-Apr	18-Jun	27-Aug	22-Oct					
Review of Annual Plan	UCC / Manager, Governance	x	x	x	x	x*	Note *Approve for the following year.	All TOR	6.3	*For the following year.	
Annual Assurance Report	Chair / Governance Officer	x					UCC to AS. Full Report to Senate	All TOR	6.3		
Statement of Role and Responsibilities	Governance	x									

Item 14: University Courses Committee – Role and Responsibilities of Members

PURPOSE

To provide a copy of the Statement of the Role and Responsibilities of Members to refresh University Courses Committee member’s familiarity with this information and to provide a reference point for the Committee’s deliberations during the year.

RECOMMENDATION

The University Courses Committee resolves to **note** the University Courses Committee - Role and Responsibilities of Members.

PREVIOUS CONSIDERATION

Previous consideration	Key issues and outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Senate considered the 2023 Administrative Review of Academic Governance Report and the Supplementary Report on the Implementation of the Recommendations from the Winchester Review 2018 (Reports) at its meeting on 21 February 2024. A Management Response and Action Plan (Action Plan) was developed to address the 13 recommendations outlined in the Report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This paper addresses Recommendation 10 of the Reports.

KEY ISSUES

The 2023 external review of academic governance by Dr Jeanette Baird identified a number of recommendations to improve the operations of Academic Senate and its committees.

Recommendation 10 suggested the University ‘explore additional methods to ensure that all members of Senate and its committees are well prepared to engage in critical reflection of matters, for example, by assigning ‘readers’ to introduce particular reports or papers’.

The Action Plan arising from the review undertook to include the *Role and Responsibilities of Members* on the Annual Plan for each academic governance sub-committee, for submission to the first meeting of each year, this will align with the process already in place for the Council committees.

The attached document is provided as a reminder and reference point for members in advance of the Committee’s deliberations during the year.

The *Role and Responsibilities of Members* will be referenced in the University Governance Framework, and it is currently provided to new members of academic governance committees as part of the induction process.

Major Risk	Risk Monitoring and Management	Does this sit within risk appetite?
<p>Legislative and Regulatory Compliance Charles Sturt University is committed to a high level of compliance with relevant legislation, regulatory compliance obligations and internal policies and procedures. Charles Sturt has a Low Appetite for behaviours and conduct potentially leading to legislative and regulatory non-compliance.</p>	Regular reminders to members of their fiduciary duties.	Yes

COMPLIANCE

Legislative Compliance	This decision contributes to compliance with Standard 6.1.3 of the Higher Education Standards Framework 2021 .
Policy Alignment	This decision is made in accordance with the Governance (Academic Senate) Rule 2024 .

ATTACHMENTS

A. Statement of Role and Responsibility of Members

Prepared by: 5/2/25	Kate Hayden, Manager, Governance
Approved by: 5/2/25	Mark Smith, Director, Governance
Cleared by: 3/3/25	Professor Graham Brown, Chair University Courses Committee



Role and Responsibilities of Members of Academic Senate and its Committees

Regardless of their category of membership (that is, elected, nominated, ex officio etc.) all members of Academic Senate and its committees have the following roles and responsibilities:

- a) To understand the purpose and functions of the committee;
- b) To regularly attend and actively contribute to meetings and to the work of the committee;
- c) To read and critically review all agenda papers before each meeting;
- d) To ensure due care and diligence is taken in decision making;
- e) To act honestly and in the best interests of the committee and the University;
- f) To maintain confidentiality, where required;
- g) To declare any conflict of interest that they may have with any matter on an agenda;
- h) To be the communication point between the committee and the member's school, faculty, division or other area in relation to discussions, decisions, policies and other developments of the committee; and
- i) To comply with the law and the University rules, policies and procedures.

Elected, nominated or appointed members of Academic Senate or one of its committees are encouraged to bring to that committee their own experience and expertise and the views of the particular group or electorate that they represent (such as the student body or a school or faculty). However, as a member of the committee, their decisions and input into the committee must reflect the interests of the University as a whole. Once they assume membership of the Academic Senate or committee, they are subject to the overriding duty to serve in the best interests of Academic Senate or the committee (*Bennetts v Board of Fire Commissioners of New South Wales* (1967) 87 W.N. (Pt1) (NSW) 307 at 311 refers). (AS 10/69 on 28.7.10 refers).



Item 15: Other Business



Item 16: Next Meeting

No.	Date	Time	Location	Agenda Close
35	Wednesday 12 March 2025	9.00am – 12.00pm	Videoconference	24 February
36	Wednesday 30 April 2025	9.00am - 12.00pm	Videoconference	14 April
37	Wednesday 18 June 2025	9.00am - 12.00pm	Videoconference	2 June
38	Wednesday 27 August 2025	9.00am - 12.00pm	Videoconference	11 August
39	Wednesday 22 October 2025	9.00am - 12.00pm	Videoconference	3 October