

## Academic Quality Assurance Statement

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Approved by                             | Council/ Academic Board  |
| Approval date                           | 19/04/2021   |
| Previous approval date(s)               | 16/11/2016, 25/10/2012   |
| Date for Review                         | 2026   |
| Responsible Officer(s) and Committee(s) | Academic Dean  |
| Related documents                       |  |
| Higher Education Standards (2021)       | 1.3.2,3,4, 1.4,3,6; 3.2; 4.2.5; 5.1, 5.3.2,3, 5.4.1; 6.2.1, 6.3; 7.2.2.d |
| National Code (2018)                    | NA   |

### 1. Purpose

#### Preamble

This Statement is a revision of the 'Academic Quality Assurance' document submitted to TEQSA in two previous forms, with the 2012 Renewal of Accreditation application and the 2016 Self-Accrediting Authority application.

The standards of the Sydney College of Divinity (SCD) are based on the current Higher Education Standards, with reference as appropriate to the various TEQSA guidance notes. SCD understands that its structure, for the greater part as a consortium of Member Institutions (MIs) and roughly 25% as two centrally run Schools, has the potential to raise questions about the equivalence and consistency of the quality of delivery of the same courses across SCD, and this factor is addressed extensively in the Statement below.

### 2. Scope

The performances of all SCD teaching bodies continues to be measured against the Higher Education Standards, which are in turn expressed in the SCD policies and procedures by which the academic programs are governed. The term 'teaching body' refers technically to the collective of the individual Member Institutions (MIs) and the two centrally managed Schools, the SCD Korean School of Theology and the SCD Graduate Research School.

As the MIs deliver various of the SCD coursework awards in the normal medium of English, so the SCD through its Korean School of Theology (KST) delivers, centrally, Korean-medium versions of fourteen of the same coursework awards, and the same academic policies and

procedures apply for SCD KST as for the MIs. Since the research degrees are delivered only through the centrally managed SCD Graduate Research School, not by the MIs or KST, however, the specific question of equivalence with other parts of SCD does not arise, only the essential adherence to relevant parts of the Higher Education Standards.

In the following overview of SCD's academic quality assurance, an outline of the key factors is followed by focussed comment on three specific matters that distinguish the SCD from many other providers: Third-Party Involvement, Offshore Delivery, and Delivery in a Language other than English.

### 3. Statements and Objectives

#### 1. Academic Governance and the Office of the Dean

The SCD fully centralized system of academic governance, in both its 2013-approved and its newly refreshed form (Att. B2.2.i-xv), lies at the heart of its academic quality assurance. Each of the teaching bodies is involved in the common entity with the others, and each has an inherent responsibility to the others for observing SCD's shared policies and procedures. The relationship of each teaching body to the Office of the Dean supports and is supported by the interrelationships of each teaching body with the others through SCD's academic governance and its instruments. These two relational approaches, through academic governance and through Office activity, come together in the membership of one or more Officers on Academic Board and each of its committees:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Academic Board                               | Dean, Academic Director, Research Director, Academic Registrar                          |
| Coursework Committee                         | Academic Director   |
| Discipline Coordinators Committee            | Academic Director   |
| Research Committee                           | Research Director   |
| Standing Committee                           | Dean, and possibly one further Officer, currently the Academic Registrar/Associate Dean |
| Student Support and Administration Committee | Academic Registrar  |

The broad role of the Dean and Officers in relation to these bodies is to provide information, offer guidance, and support the reporting process: see Att. B2.2f.xi: Protocol for Academic Governance.

Academic Board is non-representational: its membership is determined by categories of person, not representation of any teaching body. That said, however, the membership provisions for its committees means that each of the MIs and the SCD KST necessarily provides a member to the Student Support and Administration Committee, is very likely to provide a member to the Coursework Committee (no teaching body excluded) and Research Committee (no teaching body with requisite research capacity excluded), and may from time to time provide a member to the Discipline Coordinators Committee and Standing Committee, as, indeed, to Academic Board itself. The academic governance system

operates through the shared contributions of teaching body staff and academic Officers working together. This dynamic contributes significantly to academic quality assurance.

For Committee Terms of Reference, see Att. B2.2c Academic Board and Att. B2.2f.ix AB Committees. For current members of Academic Board see Att. B2.2d Academic Board Appointments; for current members of the committees see Att. A10 Committee Members.

## **2. Instruments of Academic Governance**

The Terms of Reference for the respective Committees of Academic Board point to the essential links between academic process and quality assurance across SCD's academic operation. These include, with regard to all coursework delivered across SCD (in updated forms of what was previously approved by TEQSA), the following key instruments:

- a. accreditation of teachers with reference to the one set of criteria in accord with national Higher Education Standards (Coursework Committee);
- b. academic classification and promotion for permanent faculty and, optionally, sessional faculty (Classification and Promotions Committee, through the Dean to Academic Board);
- c. required use of a common set of Course Unit Outlines (CUOs) as the basis for all units taught, with agreed allowance for addition and adaptation but preserving the key elements including outcomes (Discipline Coordinators Committee);
- d. required use of a common Course Unit Booklet (CUB) template with unit and staff information and expectations of students for all units delivered, together with verification of CUBs each semester (Discipline Coordinators Committee);
- e. monitoring of student results each semester (Coursework Committee);
- f. Discipline Moderation (Discipline Coordinators Committee);
- g. Institutional Academic Moderation (Coursework Committee Committee); and, with regard to research degrees:
- h. thesis supervision and examination arrangements (Research Committee).

## **3. Accreditation of Teachers**

As previously reported, this process has been centralized for very many years, conducted until the 2015 implementation of the 2014 external academic governance review by Professor Anne Cusick through the Academic Standards Committee of Academic Board, since then through its Coursework Committee, in both cases chaired by an external academic.

For current policy and procedure see <http://scd.edu.au/policies-staff/faculty-accreditation/>. For the Coursework Committee see Att. B2.2f.ix AB Committees. For comment in relation to disciplinary expertise and PCAS 4.2, see also Att. B3.2a.i Culture of Scholarship Overview.

This process enables SCD stakeholders, including students, to have confidence that all teachers meet the Higher Education Standards and may reasonably be expected to carry out their teaching duties effectively, and that all are assessed by the same approval criteria. Teacher accreditation is recorded in the Faculty Register, which is openly available and regularly updated:

<http://scd.edu.au/about/policy-procedures/6-0-faculty-matters/faculty-register-7-december2015/> .

Subsequent updates will have the same address to 'register', followed by the latest date.

#### **4. Academic Classification and Promotion**

Academic classification according to the five normal levels used in universities is expected of permanent/continuing faculty and is available optionally for sessional/casual faculty, where the teaching body concerned wishes to support an application from a (semi-)regular person. In practice, sessional faculty rarely seek academic classification, though many will have an academic rank within their base university or other provider and would not regard the SCD teaching body as their main place of employment. Academic classification refers to SCD recognition: an employing teaching body is expected to, but may not, oblige its employee to seek this recognition, as distinct from the compulsory implementation of SCD teacher accreditation, for which the MI necessarily applies. The classification and promotion application is made by the faculty member, whereas the teacher accreditation application (not relevant for research degrees) is made by the teaching body. Both processes are centralized, but academic classification and promotion are regarded as a management tool for SCD academic quality assurance.

The Classification and Promotions Committee had been treated as a governance committee before the implementation in 2015 of the 2014 external academic governance review by Professor Anne Cusick. In line with her recommendation, this is now a Committee of the Dean for the purpose of reporting its decisions about individual faculty to Academic Board and from time to time, through the Dean in the Dean's governance role, providing policy advice to Academic Board for decision.

A call for applications in either category is sent out by the Dean to all faculty across SCD in the middle of each semester and a committee meeting considers applications at the end of each semester. The Dean informs Academic Board of new classifications and promotions to ensure the Board's awareness of SCD's academic capacity for strategic purposes. All five of the current Committee members are Level E themselves (with two at level D) and three of the seven are external academics: see Att. B2.2f.x Dean's Committees-Panel; Att. A10 Committee Members. The Academic Classification and Promotion processes are essentially the same as those included with the 2012 application for Renewal of Registration, section 4: see Att. B3.2a.ii Academic Classification Policy; Att. B3.2a.iii New Classification Template; Att. B3.2a.iv Promotions Policy Documents; Att. B3.2a.v Application Guidelines B-D; Att. B3.2a.vi Application Guidelines E. For further comment see also Att. B3.2a.i Culture of Scholarship Overview.

#### **5. Course Unit Outlines (CUOs)**

Since the renewal of accreditation across 2007-2008, SCD has had a single shared curriculum as the basis for all delivery of SCD awards. Subject to the requirements of the course structures, the individual teaching bodies select which units they wish to deliver and when. Preparation of teaching and the course outline provided to the specific cohort of students as the Course Unit Booklet (below) are based on the Course Unit Outline (CUO) recommended by the Discipline Coordinators Committee for acceptance by Academic

Board: see Att. B2.2g.i Course Unit Outline Template. By far the majority of current CUOs are those recently approved by TEQSA; a small number of additional units have been created using the same template with requisite details: Att. B2.2g.vii Course Variations 2013-2015. The use of the template and the approval of new CUOs through the Discipline Coordinators Committee and Academic Board provide a fundamental form of academic quality assurance.

## **6. Course Unit Booklets (CUBs)**

Across all coursework teaching bodies of SCD the SCD CUB template must be used for the delivery of all units. The CUB template itself embeds quality assurance and equivalence across SCD in respect of necessary adherence to the common curriculum CUOs and relevant course regulations. It also functions to reinforce awareness and understanding on the part of faculty members as they develop skills under its guidance. The Academic Dean of each teaching body is obliged to sign off that the CUBs for the coming semester meet requirements, and several CUBs from each teaching body, in each discipline, are selected for checking by the Discipline Coordinators each semester: see Att. B2.2g.iii Course Unit Booklet Policy; Att. B2.2g.iv Course Unit Booklet Verification Policy; Att. B2.2g.v Course Unit Booklet Template; Att. B2.2g.vi Course Unit Booklet example. For refinement of assessment details required see Att. B2.2e.iv AcadBd minutes 2015 Feb-July (draft), 4 May A1505-16.

## **7. Student Assessment and Outcomes**

Coursework assessment is conducted by the individual teaching bodies, in line with the framing requirements for the particular unit, as set out in the CUO and specified in the CUB at the beginning of the unit. SCD has adopted standards based assessment: see <http://scd.edu.au/about/policyprocedures/2-0-academic-regulations/>, documents at 2.4. Adherence to the demands of the CUO in the setting of assessment tasks is centrally checked in several ways: by the Discipline Coordinators (see (iv) above); in the monitoring process described immediately below; and through Discipline Moderation (see (vi) below).

All student results were for many years monitored each semester by the ASC and reported to Academic Board. This duty has now passed to the Coursework Committee: see Att. B2.2f.ix AB Committees. The monitoring process enables SCD stakeholders, including students, to have confidence that results and progress are subject to the same standards across SCD: see <http://scd.edu.au/about/policyprocedures/2-0-academic-regulations/>, documents at 2.8.

## **8. Discipline Moderation**

A different Discipline undergoes Discipline Moderation in second semester each year. Previously, the cycle has been five years, allowing the fifth year to be left fallow during preparation of the application for renewal of accreditation; a four-year cycle will pertain from now on. The cycle since 2013 has been:

2013 Biblical Studies

2014 Christian Life and Ministry

2015 Theology

2016 Humanities in the Christian Tradition

The cycle will then be repeated.

The current practice is that a panel of five external academics whose expertise spans the sub-disciplines under moderation is appointed to examine course unit information and assessment in each of the subdisciplines. The materials provided include policy information, sample copies of CUBs and assessment items collected during the previous two semesters, staff information, and reports on library holdings, as these relate to the discipline. The moderation includes all coursework teaching bodies including the SCD KST. At least one moderator is bilingual in English and Korean and able to read the Korean materials. Procedural information is sent in advance. The actual reading of the sample materials takes place through a long single day, when the panel gathers in one place (normally the SCD Office) and has the opportunity for discussion following the reading. The event is facilitated by the Academic Director.

The panel's written report, referring to the performance of both the individual teaching bodies and SCD as a whole, is received by the Discipline Coordinators Committee. Initial responses are sought from the teaching bodies (the academic deans), and a report by the Discipline Coordinator concerned is provided to Academic Board for information. A formal response is then sought from the teaching bodies, and when that has been received the Discipline Coordinator submits a final report to Academic Board, with indications of areas to be addressed. Appropriate follow-up actions are undertaken by the Discipline Coordinator and the Academic Director.

This exercise is directed to quality assurance of delivery of the curriculum, including the maintenance of standards in scholarly approach across the teaching bodies. With appropriate developments in procedure from time to time, external Discipline Moderation has been in place for many years, since at least 1999. It typically provides SCD with useful feedback that is taken seriously in the interests of continuous improvement.

See Att. B4.2b.ii Policy for Moderation of Disciplines; Att. B4.2b.iii Discipline Moderation Forms and Process; Att. B4.2b.iv Discipline Moderation Library Component; Att. B4.2b.v Assembling Discipline Moderation Materials; Att. B4.2b.vi Discipline Moderation Flowchart.

While these documents are still in use and there has, thus far, been some suggestion of improving procedure only with regard to handling the library component (a streamlining suggestion from the Library Committee), it is intended to review the Policy and associated procedural documents early in 2016. This will include updating of details.

The example of the 2014 Moderation of Christian Life and Ministry is provided in Att. B4.2b.vii.a-f CLM Moderation 2014. Of the four SCD disciplines, CLM typically involves some amount of practical as well as more theoretical work, and some of the accredited teachers are normally in professional practice rather than academe, as compared with the other three disciplines, whose subject matter typically calls for more conventional book-learning. This discipline moderation thus reveals more significant criticisms and recommendations than usual for the others, but this means it also shows that SCD proactively chooses to receive criticism and identification of areas for improvement, as well as working towards such improvement. While the system itself will always be open to review

and improvement, SCD believes it is a transparent and robust system. It is, of course, fully overseen by Academic Board. This is evidenced in Att. B2.2e.iv AcadBd minutes 2015Feb-July(draft), 4 May, where the 2015 panel for Theology is also identified.

## **9. Institutional Academic Moderation**

Each teaching body undergoes Institutional Moderation once in every five years. Each Moderation Panel consists of two external academics nominated by the teaching body and two nominated by SCD, one external and one who may be the Dean, the Academic Director, or the Chair of the Coursework Committee (exact provision under review). In a rigorous self-assessment process, the teaching body completes the Institutional Academic Moderation Proforma and provides a Performance Portfolio. The panel reviews these and supporting documents in advance of the site visit, when additional materials may be provided as requested, to measure performance against SCD standards across academic areas, including implementation of SCD policy. Following the site visit, the panel completes its report and directs it to the Coursework Committee, which seeks a response from the teaching body. Upon receipt of this, Coursework sends its report, including the response, to Academic Board, which will oversee any necessary follow-up.

See Att. B4.2b.viii InstAcadMod Policy; Att. B4.2b.ix InstAcadMod Procedure; Att. B4.2b.x InstAcadMod Flowchart.

While these documents are still in use, it is intended to review them early in 2016. This will include updating of details.

With appropriate developments in procedure from time to time, external Institutional Moderation has been in place for many years, since at least 1997. The name was changed to Institutional Academic Moderation in 2014 to make it clear that this process does not directly address membership or financial matters or membership, which are addressed annually by Council.

The teaching bodies moderated in 2013-2015 have been:

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2013 | Australian College of Ministries; Booth College   |
| 2014 | Nazarene Theological College; St Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College  |
| 2015 | Broken Bay Institute (required by Council as a new/returning MI); Catholic Institute of Sydney; NSW College of Clinical Pastoral Education. The 2015 moderations are still in progress. |

Documents from the 2014 Moderation of the Nazarene Theological College are provided in Att. B4.2b. xi NTC Moderation 2014. NTC has seen several improvements to its operation during 2015 as it has become a more significant entity for its international church.

For the 2015 panels for the Catholic Institute of Sydney and the NSW College of Clinical Pastoral Education see Att. B2.2e.iv AcadBd minutes 2015Feb-July(draft), 4 May, A1505-14-15. The panel for Broken Bay Institute was approved by Academic Board at its meeting on 1 June 2015 but the names were, inadvertently, not transferred to the Minutes from the

Academic Director's Report: Dr Chris Monaghan, President (Yarra Theological Union/UD), Associate Professor David Pascoe (Archdiocese of Brisbane, previously Head of School of Theology and Philosophy, ACU), Dr John Davies (retired Principal of Christ College/ACT), Dr Evelyn Hibbert (Academic Director).

With regard to the SCD Graduate Research School, a virtual moderation of the existing Research Degrees Program was conducted for the 2012 Renewal of Accreditation application, including the external consultant's report (Prof. Mark Lindsay, Research Director at UD). Following advice in the Cusick report, however, SCD has now resolved that the people and activities involved will be termed the SCD Graduate Research School. With this clear entity established and being more fully developed from late 2015, the question of a regular external moderation process of an appropriate kind will be considered.

## **10. Research Thesis Supervision and Examination**

In respect of the research degrees, two key points for quality assurance are the appointment of thesis supervisors and examiners, duties carried out by the Research Committee with the assistance of the Research Director. Both processes are governed by strict controls to ensure the highest standards: see Att. B3.2a.i Culture of Scholarship, section 7, and the documents gathered at Att. B4.2h (supervision) and Att. B4.2j (examination).

### **Quality Assurance through the Office**

In 2014 Council initiated a review of the Office to ensure 'appropriate and responsive leadership structures': see Att. A35 Leadership at SCD 2014. As noted in this report by the two independent members of the SCD Council tasked with conducting the review, Prof Anne Cummins (Deputy ViceChancellor, Students, Learning and Teaching, ACU) and Dr Tim O'Hearn (Consultant), there had also been previous reviews of the office in 2008 and 2011. As a result of the 2014 review, two senior positions were disestablished and replaced by positions in similar areas but requiring a higher level of capacity to address future developments.

As well as their respective roles in SCD academic governance (see section 1 above), the Dean and the other four senior Office staff collectively referred to as 'Directors') have responsibility for particular areas of the overall SCD operation, the Dean with oversight of the whole enterprise, together with high-level institutional duties, and the four Directors with responsibility the matters indicated by their titles: Academic Director, Research Director, Academic Registrar, and Chief Operating Officer. Together with support staff, whose number and duties may change from time to time, the Dean and Directors, in the very nature of their operational roles, exercise ongoing quality control in the centralized management of SCD both as a single entity and as a consortium.

The roles of the Dean and Directors in respect of both management and governance are set out in Att. B2.2b Delegations Manual.

The management duties of the Dean and the four Directors involve regular communication with individual teaching bodies in respect of SCD requirements and the two-way provision of information, and also connect them with particular categories of employee within the MIs overall. The Dean has a particular duty of contact with the Principals and attends the

Principals' Fellowship. The Academic Director has a particular duty of contact with the Academic Deans and the Dean of Studies (Korean Program), the Academic Registrar with the Registrars, and the Research Director with those having oversight of research matters in the teaching bodies. In addition, the Dean and Directors commonly lead professional development in a range of SCD community situations.

For some years, the Dean and Directors have met at least once a month for the specific purpose of exchanging information about current concerns in a group setting, facilitating understanding of individual matters in the larger context, and providing for collegial feedback and advice. One of the regular duties of the meeting is to review the Register of Significant Risk for the current year and decide on any recommendations for change. These are subsequently presented for consideration at the next Academic Board and Audit Committee, which in turn make recommendations to Council on Academic and Institutional/Financial matters, respectively. The Directors' Meeting itself constitutes a form of risk management by providing a formal way of ensuring that the senior staff as a whole, not just one person, are reasonably familiar with key operational matters. An additional person at the meeting is the Dean of Studies (Korean Program), who is regarded as a Director for this purpose.

## **Benchmarking**

Benchmarking is a constant factor in SCD's academic quality assurance, with SCD's academic performance being measured against the HES, AQF, and other Government expectations, on the one hand, and sector practice, on the other. Practices set out in the 2012 applications continue, but external sector benchmarking has been heightened and further systematized since then, especially through the Theology Higher Education Consortium Benchmarking Network, which is the 2015 formulation of the 2013 benchmarking agreement between SCD, ACT and UD (Att. A7 Benchmarking Agreement, with Minutes of 2 October meeting appended).

This arrangement means that the three major private theological consortia, which have enough in common to make detailed distinctions or parallels significant, call on each other for information or quality checks (e.g. on policies) as the need arises and also schedule benchmarking meetings to address a program of exchanges regarding issues of mutual concern. These meetings have been established amongst three key groups addressing particular areas, with at least one meeting a year for each group: (a) Vice-Chancellor and Deans; (b) Learning and Teaching Directors; and (c) Research Directors. Due to variations in the configurations of officers in the three institutions, student outcome matters are included under the third heading. The most recent meetings have been as follows:

- (a) Vice-Chancellor and Deans 2 October 2015
- (b) Learning and Teaching Directors 17 September 2015
- (c) Research Directors 5 November 2015

A program of matters to be addressed systematically in 2016 has already been drawn up.

SCD also has a specific benchmarking agreement with Moore Theological College, initiated 2010 but dormant in recent years; it could be reactivated if both parties thought it useful, given the difference in structures.

Other external benchmarking occurs in various ways:

- a. SCD membership of the HEPP-QN initiated by Avondale College, reviewing the shared materials and participating actively on occasion, including participation in the conference in Melbourne on 3 November 2015
- b. SCD participation in the broad benchmarking exercises of the Council of Deans of Theology, the Council of Private Higher Education, and Deans and Directors of Graduate Schools
- c. Use of external experts as consultants for major reviews, such as the 2014 External Academic Governance Review and the comprehensive course reviews described in the 2012 applications for Accreditation and Renewal of Accreditation
- d. Occasional use of external experts as consultants for occasional reviews of major policies, such as Student Grievance
- e. Frequent use of external experts as presenters at SCD Strategic Planning Days and professional development events
- f. Regular Discipline Moderation, panels with external experts: see above, 2 (vi)
- g. Regular Institutional Academic Moderation, panels with external experts: see above 2 (vii)
- h. Ongoing input from external academic members of Council, Academic Board, and committees, including the Dean's External Advisory Panel: see Att. A9 Council Membership; Att. B2.2d Academic Board Members; Att. A10 Committee Members
- i. Opportunities through the participation of SCD personnel on committees or in Departments/Schools of other HEPs and universities: see Section A2.2, A.9 'Participation'
- j. Ongoing consultation of other HEP and university websites for comparative information regarding policies and possible academic developments, such as possible academic partnerships and joint doctorates: see Att. A8 Policy on Joint Doctorates
- k. Regular participation in research conferences and other forums, including some mounted by SCD or its MIs
- l. A sound and increasing level of peer-reviewed publications in the field implicitly benchmarked by external academics for journals or academic book publishers with regard to the discipline

In addition, the fact that SCD is structured as a consortium means that the application of SCD policy and procedure across its teaching bodies provides a kind of internal

benchmarking, as set out, for example, in the various subheadings under 2 above, 'Instruments of Academic Governance'.

### **Specific Areas for Quality Assurance**

The application for Self-Accrediting Authority calls for explicit comment on academic quality assurance in respect of three special factors that are relevant for SCD:

A2.3 Offshore delivery

A2.4 Delivery in a language other than English

A2.5 Third-party involvement

Comment on all three factors is embedded across the application, in that all three factors are contained within the centralized SCD academic operation, thus:

### **Offshore Delivery**

Offshore delivery of SCD awards may occur online or in person. Online delivery to students residing offshore is governed identically with all online delivery, with such students visible in the student database through their residential addresses.

Face-to-face offshore delivery is likewise governed identically with all face-to-face delivery which is deemed to occur through a campus of a Member Institution. Good Shepherd College (GSC), Auckland, is an independent registered provider under New Zealand government regulation, delivering its own accredited Graduate Diploma of Theology as well as the SCD BTh (with nested DipChSt and AssocDegChThPr) as a campus of the Catholic Institute of Sydney (CIS). For the purpose of delivering SCD awards, its academic operation is incorporated into that of CIS as an MI of SCD, so that it is subject to all relevant SCD policy and procedure and SCD academic governance as part of CIS itself. GSC is the official provider of academic training for the Roman Catholic dioceses of New Zealand (and also for the Marist Fathers in New Zealand), as CIS is for the Catholic dioceses of Sydney and Parramatta (as well as some religious orders and overseas dioceses). This natural closeness between the two colleges is reinforced by the fact that they are regulated by Higher Education authorities with similar expectations and standards. GSC is obliged to seek the approval of NZQA for all the work it does with SCD through CIS as well approval from TEQSA through SCD-CIS.

In practical terms the following arrangements pertain:

- GSC-based students are processed in SCD amongst CIS-based students (re admission, progression, and completion), and graduate as SCD-CIS students.
- Course Unit Booklets used at GSC are included in the regular semester verification by SCD's Discipline Coordinators and the students' results undergo SCD monitoring each semester within the CIS cohort.
- GSC-based teachers are accredited as CIS-based teachers through normal SCD procedure.

- GSC faculty visit CIS regularly to participate in professional development and committee work with their CIS colleagues, and ongoing relevant contact is held through electronic media.
- Coordination of the SCD-CIS academic operation in Auckland is provided in the immediate context by GSC's Academic Dean and Registrar, in their respective roles, functioning under the oversight of the CIS Academic Dean and Registrar, who receive information from CIS but are the people responsible to SCD for all academic matters concerning either students or faculty based at GSC.
- The CIS President or his representative and the SCD Dean visit GSC at least annually, when informal discussions are held with GSC faculty and students and the current state of the overall facility is viewed.
- Some GSC faculty have periodically been members of the SCD Academic Board's committees in amongst other CIS faculty; at present the GSC Librarian is SCD's Principal librarian, a member of Academic Board, and Chair of the Library Committee, which is a committee of the Dean (as well as serving on Council's Institutional Membership Committee).
- SCD professional development events are often attended by GSC faculty electronically.
- SCD Institutional Academic Moderation and Discipline Moderation comprehend GSC as part of CIS.

#### **A2.4**

Delivery in a language other than English occurs only through the SCD Korean School of Theology (KST), which is an enterprise of SCD itself, entirely overseen by the Office of the Dean, with the day-to-day running of the School delegated to the Dean of Studies (Korean Program). The units taught in Korean medium are translations of the English units, and the course regulations for the awards with the indicator '(Korean)' – e.g. BTh (Korean) – are identical with those of the English awards. The Korean Program is entirely integrated into SCD academic governance alongside the programs of the MIs and is subject to the same policies and procedures. The SCD KST offices and classrooms are located alongside the Office of the Dean, facilitating ongoing communication, and the Korean staff must demonstrate reasonable fluency in English at the time of appointment.

For further information about the LOTE delivery of SCD courses through SCD KST, see the application itself at A2.4; Att. A38 Korean Plan Interim Review; and periodic reference to the Korean Program in Att. B2.2e Academic Board Minutes 2012-2015.

#### **A2.5**

Third-party involvement refers to the very nature of SCD as a consortium of Member Institutions, each of which is a third party under TEQSA definition but, at the same time, organizationally an owner of SCD (a not-for-profit company), with a vested interest in promoting SCD quality. In all cases, the third party delivers SCD coursework awards based on the common coursework curriculum in respect of the admission, teaching, resourcing, assessment, progress, and welfare of students, under SCD oversight and according to SCD

policy, as stipulated in the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) and enacted through SCD's academic and corporate governance.

The MoU sets out the MI's obligations to adhere to SCD policy and standards in all aspects of the educational enterprise and summarizes SCD's checks and vigilance, which are exercised through SCD's Officers and its academic and corporate governance bodies. The MoU is reviewed periodically and was last updated by Council 150218, to make explicit one further point of obligation for the MI that has till now been only implicit:

26. The Member Institution undertakes, in the event that it announces its intention to cease to deliver any awards of the SCD, to provide teach-out for students currently enrolled in those SCD awards, by providing teaching at SCD standards of sufficient SCD units to enable those students to complete their SCD awards within a reasonable time as determined by SCD.

This addition was set out in an amendment sheet signed and attached to each individual signed MoU. Other amendment sheets attached to the signed MoUs refer to new delivery locations and/or the delivery of new awards. The current MoUs are provided as Att. A5.2a-h.

Note especially that point 5 in the undertakings of the MI requires annual reporting on a wide range of academic matters. This is actually enacted through reporting by MI Academic Deans each semester, as well as the SCD KST Academic Dean, using the Register of Teachers, SCD Committee Members and Other Academic Leaders: see Att. B4.2g.ii Register of Teachers. The reports are received by the Academic Director, who discusses any anomaly with the Academic Dean concerned. Following this, the reports are collated into reports to the Coursework Committee, which may request follow-up from MIs on any matters raised. If a matter is not resolved, the Dean will be informed and will discuss it with the MI Principal/Dean of Studies (Korean Program) and, if appropriate, the Chair of Academic Board, for remedial action. Potential problems will thus be brought to the attention of the Office, which will respond with an appropriate management strategy or communication to the appropriate governance body if necessary.

The MoU ends (ahead of Appendices and signature pages) with a Schedule of Courses and Locations, setting out the SCD courses the MI is permitted to deliver and the locations at which the MI is permitted to offer them. For SCD, implementation of these permissions is overseen by Academic Board, while Council holds the ultimate responsibility for risk management in connection with the institutional implications of course delivery. Documentary amendments to the original list of courses and locations are thus overseen by Council acting on advice from Academic Board about the academic viability and appropriateness of such amendments (see above for handling of amendments).

The Schedule of Courses and Locations sets out clearly whether SCD course delivery on the part of the MI takes place in more than one campus. The CIS situation is explained above: apart from the home base at Strathfield in Sydney, CIS delivers SCD awards in only one other location, through GSC in Auckland.

The only other MI delivering SCD awards at additional, remote campuses is Emmaus Bible College (EBC), which delivers SCD postgraduate awards in three locations additional to its home base in Macquarie Park, Sydney:

- at Perth Bible College (PBC) in Karrinyup in Perth, WA; and

- at the Australian College of Christian Studies (ACCS) in (i) Miranda, Sydney, and (ii) Rothwell, Queensland.

Both PBC and ACCS are themselves HEPs registered through TEQSA.

SCD undergraduate courses are also listed in the MoU and its amendment sheets, but across 2015-2016 these, together with the BTh (Hons), are delivered by EBC for teach-out purposes only; they will not be offered by EBC at all after that. The change arises because ACCS now uses the Macquarie Park base of EBC as well as the Miranda and Rothwell sites for delivery of its own undergraduate awards.

For all remote EBC campuses (all in Australia) – Karrinyup, Miranda, and Rothwell – SCD academic governance and quality assurance is enacted according to the same principles as those enacted at the CIS additional campus:

- All remote-based EBC students are processed in SCD in amongst home-based EBC students (re admission, progression, and completion), and graduate as SCD-EBC students.
- Course unit booklets used at the remote campuses are included in the regular semester verification by SCD's Discipline Coordinators and the students' results undergo SCD monitoring each semester within the EBC cohort.
- All remote-based EBC teachers are accredited as EBC-based teachers through normal SCD procedure.
- EBC faculty from Miranda are part of the regular EBC teaching team at Macquarie Park, and vice-versa, for practical academic purposes undifferentiated from their Macquarie Park colleagues. The very small number of Rothwell students (three) are effectively Macquarie Park students: they attend Macquarie Park classes synchronously and access other EBC services electronically, while using Rothwell's general facilities. PBC-based faculty accredited by SCD through EBC are the teachers of students based at Karrinyup.
- Coordination of the SCD-EBC academic operation at the Miranda and Rothwell campuses is provided directly by the EBC Academic Dean and Registrar in their respective roles; all academic matters concerning either students or faculty for these two remote campuses are handled within the day-to-day operation of EBC itself.
- Coordination of the SCD-EBC academic operation at the Karrinyup campus is provided in the immediate context by PBC's Academic Dean and Registrar, functioning under the oversight of the EBC Academic Dean and Registrar in their respective roles, who receive information from PBC but are the people responsible to SCD for all academic matters concerning either students or faculty based at PBC. The PBC Academic Dean is also a member of the EBC Academic Board.
- The EBC Principal and the SCD Dean visit PBC at least annually, when informal discussions are held with EBC-PBC faculty and students.
- The PBC Principal visits EBC at least annually for institutional discussions and occasionally meets also with the SCD Dean at that time.
- Some remote-based EBC faculty have periodically been members of the SCD Academic Board's committees in amongst other EBC faculty; at present the SCD's Discipline Coordinator for Biblical Studies, a member of Academic Board itself, is based in EBC-PBC (mostly travelling to attend Academic Board and the Discipline Coordinators Committee in person, occasionally using electronic means). The

Karrinyup and Miranda Librarians are members of the Library Committee, a committee of the Dean.

- SCD professional development events are often attended by remote-based EBC faculty in person or electronically.
- SCD Institutional Academic Moderation and Discipline Moderation comprehend the remote campuses as part of EBC.