

Course Review Report

Bachelor of Ministry (AQF Level 7)

Executive Summary:

This report covers the review of the Bachelor of Ministry which took place between October 2024 and September 2025.

Aim:

The aims of the review were to ensure that the course continues to:

1. comply with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF), the Tertiary Education Standards Agency (TEQSA) standards and requirements policies and procedures;
2. compare favourably with similar courses in Australia and overseas;
3. be ‘fit for purpose’; and
4. benefit students, the affiliated colleges and other stakeholders.

Method:

The Bachelor of Ministry has been reviewed according to the ‘AUT Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure’, accessible at:

[AUT Course Development, Approval, Review and Accreditation Policy](#)

[AUT Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure.](#)

In line with the requirements of the ‘Policy’ and the ‘Procedure’, the Academic Board appointed a Course Review Panel (CRP). In turn, the CRP appointed a Course Review Working Group (CRWG).

The CRWG met (either in full or sub-groups) on 14/11/24, 4/12/24, 8/4/25, 15 & 16/4/25, 14/5/25, 11 & 25/8/25 and 1/9/25. The CRWG now reports to the CRP.

The review entailed evaluation of the course on the basis of:

1. the records of the AUT boards and committees;
2. annual course evaluations;
3. consultation with the principals, academic deans and registrars of the AUT affiliated colleges;

4. Unit of Study Experience Survey (USES), Student Experience Survey (SES) and Graduate Outcomes (GOS) feedback from current students and recent graduates; and
5. analysis of course data and structures.

The CRWG also confirmed that the Bachelor of Ministry:

1. operates within, and complies with, the framework of AUT policies and procedures, especially those in the ‘Teaching and Learning’ Repository and particularly the:

[Courses Policy](#)

[Course Resources Policy](#)

[Course Development, Approval, Review and Reaccreditation Policy](#)

[Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure](#)

[Annual Course Evaluation Policy](#)

[Faculty Qualification Policy](#)

[Units Policy](#)

[Field Education Policy](#)

[Assessment Policy](#)

[Moderation Policy](#)

2. operates under the continuous monitoring of Teaching and Learning Committee (formerly the Coursework Committee), the Academic Quality Committee and the Academic Board.

Key Findings:

1. The course complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) 2021, and the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) requirements.
2. The course aligns with the AUT’s [Identity, Purpose, Mission](#), Purpose and Objects of the [Constitution](#), Graduate Attributes, [Strategic Plan](#), and [Courses Policy](#).
3. The Course Rationale continues to be relevant.
4. The Admissions Criteria continue to be appropriate.
5. In general, the design, content, delivery and assessment, bibliographies and resources, and samples of common and elective units which comprise it:
 - a. demonstrate that they are informed and shaped by recent scholarship, research and pedagogical practices, including outputs from the AUT’s

Research and Scholarship Networks and academic staff of Affiliated Colleges;

- b. ensure the Graduate Attributes are fostered;
- c. facilitate achievement of the Course Learning Outcomes; and
- d. is 'fit for purpose' and is of ongoing benefit to students, affiliated colleges and stakeholders.

6. Adoption of new Course Learning Outcomes will provide further clarification, alignment and benefits to students and stakeholders.

7. The Bachelor of Ministry remains viable, benefits students, the affiliated colleges and other stakeholders, and warrants reaccreditation.

Recommendations:

1. that a succinct statement of the course purpose, potential students for whom the course would be suitable and its relation to other courses be added to the course rationale
2. that the course description replace unit codes with English language descriptors
3. that the proposed course learning outcomes be endorsed
4. should revisions subsequently be made to the AUT strategic plan, and Graduate Attributes (particularly in relation to Generative AI), consideration be given to alignment with recommended updated course learning outcomes for the Bachelor of Ministry
5. there be a substantial review of the alignment of the course unit learning outcomes with the new course learning outcomes
6. that the Bachelor of Ministry be reaccredited for the period 1 January 2026 to 31 December 2032.

Affirmation:

In conducting this review and writing this report, members of the CRWG-CW affirm they adhered to the relevant privacy requirements.

Review of the Bachelor of Ministry

Introduction

The description of the Bachelor of Ministry is available at [Bachelor of Ministry - https://aut.edu.au/course/BMIN20/](https://aut.edu.au/course/BMIN20/).

The review builds on the latest available annual course evaluation report (2023) and functions as the annual evaluation for 2024. It responds to the recommendations arising from the 2023 annual course review. See:

Annual Course Evaluation Reports for [2023](#) and [2024](#)

[Recommendations from Annual Course Review 2023](#)

[Recommendations from Annual Course Review 2024](#)

Course Data - Bachelor of Ministry - (BMIN20)

Enrolments

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025
Headcount	236	200	196	180	158	155
EFTSL	114.3	96.3	86.3	75.1	72.0	64.8

Progression, retention, attrition, completion

	S2 2020	S1 2021	S2 2021	S1 2022	S2 2022	S1 2023	S2 2023	S1 2024	S2 2024	S1 2025
Progression										
Completed	90.3 %	91.8 %	91.3 %	85.9 %	87.2 %	90.7 %	94.3 %	93.5 %	93.9 %	92.9 %
Failed	8.2 %	7.3 %	1.5 %	11.2 %	11.3 %	7.1 %	5.6 %	6.5 %	6.1 %	6.7 %
Withdrawn	1.5 %	0.8 %	7.3 %	2.9 %	1.5 %	2.1 %	0.2 %	0% %	0% %	0.4 %
Completion	48.4 %	61.3%		No data		No data		No data		No data
Attrition	17.7 %	9.7%		23.7%		21.4%		No data		No data

Grade Array

	S2 2020	S1 2021	S2 2021	S1 2022	S2 2022	S1 2023	S2 2023	S1 2024	S2 2024	S1 2025
HD	6.2%	6.7%	7.4%	3.6%	7.2%	6.4%	9.1%	2.9%	4.3%	4.5%

D	21.1 %	23.3 %	21.3 %	20.1 %	20.7 %	25.3 %	28.4 %	23.5 %	26.6 %	26.1 %
C	35.6 %	33.3 %	35.2 %	32.1 %	33.3 %	33.7 %	32.2 %	41.5 %	39.6 %	38.1 %
P+	16.2 %	18.3 %	17.1 %	19.8 %	17.5 %	15.8 %	14.9 %	19.0 %	16.1 %	14.2 %
P&CP	10.9 %	10.0 %	10.2 %	10.3 %	8.3%	10.1 %	9.4%	6.5%	7.4%	10.4 %
F&F W	8.4%	7.5%	1.5%	10.6 %	11.5 %	6.7%	5.6%	6.5%	5.9%	6.3%
W&C W	1.6%	0.8%	7.2%	3.4%	1.4%	2.0%	0.6%			0.4%

GOS

	Employment	Overall Employment	Full time Study	Median Salary
2016	64.3%	83.3%	31.6%	\$48,600
2017	64.3%	86.4%	4.5%	\$42,500
2018	58.8%	76.7%	14.8%	\$45,600
2019	100.0%	66.7%	0.0%	\$51,100
2020	75.0%	64.35	7.7%	\$58,300
2021	84.2%	96.0%	8.7%	\$57,000
2022	70.0%	86.4%	17.4%	\$83,700
2023	76.9%	88.2%	0.0%	\$50,900
2024	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	\$75,000
2025	100.0%	100.0%	0.0%	\$78,300

SES

Modes of Delivery	Overall Experience – Positive Response				
	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024
AUT					
Internal	89.5%	91.8%	93.6%	95.7%	100.0%
External	100.0%	96.4%	100.0%	91.3%	73.7%

The Report

The review of the course has been carried out with particular reference to HESF 5.3. This seven components of this Standard furnish the structure of this report. The review was also informed by the TEQSA Guidance Note, *Academic Monitoring, Review and Improvement*.

1. HESF 5.3.1

All accredited courses of study are subject to periodic (at least every seven years) comprehensive reviews that are overseen by peak academic governance processes and include external referencing or other benchmarking activities.

1. Initial accreditation and previous course review

In relation to the Bachelor of Ministry the CRWG noted that:

The course was first accredited by the NSW Higher Education Board in 1991-1992.

The last comprehensive review of the course in 2019 resulted in a reaccreditation for the period 1 January 2020 to 31 December 2026.

2. Policy and procedure framework for this review

This review of the course was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the 'AUT Course Review and Accreditation Policy' and 'Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure'.

Evidence:

[AUT Course Development, Approval, Review and Accreditation Policy](#)

[AUT Course Review and Reaccreditation Procedure](#)

3. Establishment of the schedule for course reviews by the Board of Directors

The Academic Board recommended a Course Review Schedule at its October 2022 meeting ([AB2210-12.4](#)).

The Board of Directors established the schedule at its 14 November 2023 meeting (DIR2211-10.3-4)

The review of the course took place as part of Cluster 2 of the courses encompassed in this schedule for the period.

4. Appointment of the Course Review Panel (CRP)

The Academic Board appointed the following as members of the Course Review Panel (CRP):

Rev. Assoc. Professor John Capper (Chair)

Dr Cameron Clausing (Christ College)

Gayle Kent (Morling College)

Professor John McDowell (University of Divinity)

It was noted that the CRP included external representation.

5. Appointment of Course Review Working Groups (CRWG)

The CRP appointed the following as members of the Course Review Working Group:

Rev. Dr Ian O’Harae, AUT Director of Teaching and Learning (until June 2025)
/ Dr Geoff Treloar (from July 2025)

Simon Davies, AUT Chief Operating Officer

Rev. Dr Andrew Bain, AUT Coursework Committee Chair (until July 2025)

Dr Lyn Kidson, senior AUT academic and AUT New Testament moderator

Dr Ben Nelson (Presbyterian Theological College, Victoria), senior AUT academic

Rev Ian Packer (until July 2025), senior AUT academic

Dr Angela Sawyer (ACOM), senior external academic

Dr Andre van Rheede van Outshoorn (Perth Bible College), senior external academic

Rev Travis Mundy (Narrabeen Baptist Church), industry representative

Jen Rangiawha (Baptist Association of NSW/ACT), industry representative (until July 2025)

It was noted that the CRWG also included external representation and ‘industry’ stakeholders.

6. Course Review Process

The Course Review Working Group (CRWG) met for the first time on 14 November 2024. The meeting established the aims of the review, outlined the process to be followed and identified the data to be used which was supplied in the form of a Shared Point folder and a Tableau Workbook. The orientation to the review was continued when the CRWG met again on 4 December 2024.

The CRWG in turn divided into two sub-groups – one to review the undergraduate courses; the other, the graduate courses.

The graduate courses sub-group met on 8 April 2025. It considered a range of issues and determined to further divide into a ‘Student Data Team’ and a ‘Structure Team’.

The graduate ‘Student Data Team’ met on 15 April 2025. As required the team considered the relevant data and proposed several recommendations. The work of this team was completed.

The undergraduate courses sub-group met on 16 April 2025. The meeting canvassed the work that needed to be done, noted the results of the graduate ‘Student Data Team’ and followed the example of the graduate courses sub-group by dividing into two streams.

The ‘Student Data Team’ for the undergraduate courses met on 14 May 2025 and carried out a comprehensive review of the relevant data. The work of this Team was completed.

The review was disrupted in May by the illness of the Director of Teaching and Learning who had been directing the process. On July 1 Dr Geoff Treloar was appointed to resume the leadership of the review.

The combined structures teams met on Monday August 11 and 25 and September 1. These meetings discussed proposed course learning outcomes for the 14 courses, this being the principal recommendation of the 2023 Course Review; assessed course rationales, structures, and content; and evaluated the various alignments of the courses. The work of this team was completed.

The results of these meetings are encapsulated in this report.

7. Review data and reference points

Course packs were supplied to the CRWG that included the following data:

USES Unit of Study Experience Survey (USES); Student Experience Survey (SES); Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS); Completion and Attrition; Grade Array; Enrolments

The review also entailed evaluation of the course on the basis of: annual course evaluations; consultation with the principals, academic deans and registrars of the AUT affiliated colleges; Australian and international comparators; and basic course data.

It was confirmed as a general consideration that the course operates within, and complies with, the framework of AUT policies and procedures, especially those in the ‘Teaching and Learning’ Repository and particularly the:

[Courses Policy](#); [Course Resources Policy](#); [Annual Course Evaluation Procedure](#); [Faculty Qualification Policy](#); [Units Policy](#); [Field Education Policy](#); [Assessment Policy](#); and [Moderation Policy](#)

Finding:

The course is 'subject to periodic (at least every seven years) comprehensive reviews that are overseen by peak academic governance processes and include external referencing or other benchmarking activities'.

2. HESF 5.3.2

A comprehensive review includes the design and content of each course of study, the expected learning outcomes, the methods for assessment of those outcomes, the extent of students' achievement of learning outcomes, and also takes account of emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and identified risks to the quality of the course of study.

The CRWG considered:

1. Design and content of the course

1.a. The course rationale

Discussion:

It was agreed that the course rationale is appropriate, relevant and 'fit for purpose' for an AQF Level 7 in Ministry.

While sufficient it was suggested that the course rationale could be improved by provision of a succinct statement of the course purpose, potential students for whom it would be suitable and its relation to other courses

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, item 1: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The rationale for the course is appropriate, 'fit for purpose' and of ongoing relevance.

1.b. Course admission requirements

Discussion:

It was agreed that these are clearly presented, comparable with other Australian and international providers and appropriate to an AQF Level 7 course.

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, item 2: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The admission requirements for the course are appropriate.

1.c. Design and content of the course

It was agreed that the design and content is clearly presented and comparable with other Australian and international providers and appropriate to an AQF Level 7 course.

It was suggested that, in the interest of clearer communication with prospective students, the course description replace unit codes with English language descriptors.

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, item 3: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding: the design and content of the course is appropriate.

1.d. Course learning outcomes

Discussion:

It was noted that there has been over several years a strong push from stakeholders for a revision of the course learning outcomes and that the Academic Board had requested that they be more clearly expressed in terms of the AQF requirements for a Level 7 award.

The CRWG responded to the need by proposing (after extensive discussion) a new set of course learning outcomes:

	Graduates of the Bachelor of Ministry will be able to:
Knowledge [on the basis of what they have learned]	1. demonstrate understanding of a broad range of the concepts and practices of 'Ministry', including spiritual and ethical implications, with particular attention to <i>at least</i> one field of 'Ministry and Practice' 2. use Ministry knowledge and understanding as the basis of life-long personal and professional development
Skills [using the skills they have developed]	1. collect, analyse and synthesise Ministry scholarship and information 2. think critically and independently in identifying and solving problems in Ministry contexts 3. engage with specialist and non-specialist audiences using a variety of formats to present clear, coherent and independent perspectives on ministry concepts and applications

Application [and be in a position to]	1. conduct Christian ministry and/or scholarship individually and in collaboration with others 2. be responsible and accountable for their own learning and professional practice
---	--

It was noted that the proposed course learning outcomes:

- i. Reflect the AQF generic descriptors
- ii. Comparable with Australian and international providers

They also align with:

- i. The AUT Graduate Attributes
- ii. The AUT's identity, purpose and mission
- iii. The AUT's strategic plan

It was noted that the AUT's current strategic plan is undergoing review by the Council in late 2025. It was therefore suggested that the alignment of the course learning outcomes of the course be reconsidered when a new strategic plan is promulgated.

Evidence:

[Recommendations from Annual Course Review 2023](#)

[Recommendations from Annual Course Review 2024](#)

CRWG Course Papers for August 11 and 25, items 4-9: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 11 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 11 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The current course learning outcomes are no longer regarded as satisfactory and 'fit for purpose', so that a new set of course learning outcomes such as those proposed herein is required.

1.e. Alignment of the course learning outcomes and unit learning outcomes

Discussion:

The CRWG noted the constructive alignment of the unit learning outcomes of the numerous AUT course units with the current course learning outcomes. Given the substantial influence of the AQF requirements on the current course learning outcomes, the Group believes that the constructive alignment will be maintained with the adoption of the new course learning outcomes. Nevertheless, the Group suggests that there be a substantial review of the

alignment of the course unit learning outcomes with the new course learning outcomes.

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 1 September 2025: [25.09.01 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 1 September 2025: [Meeting notes, 1 September 2025](#)

Finding:

The alignment of the proposed course learning outcomes and the current unit learning outcomes is viable but a review of this alignment is warranted.

Recommendations:

1. that a succinct statement of the course purpose, potential students for whom it would be suitable and its relation to other courses be added to the course rationale
2. that the course description replace unit codes with English language descriptors
3. that the proposed course learning outcomes be endorsed
4. that the alignment of the course learning outcomes of the Bachelor of Ministry be reconsidered when the new AUT strategic plan is promulgated
5. there be a substantial review of the alignment of the course unit learning outcomes with the new course learning outcomes

2. Compliance with the Australian Qualifications Framework

[Australian Qualifications Framework](#), with particular reference to the Bachelor Degree qualification type

Discussion:

The Group considered that the course is compliant with the AQF and notes that the new Course Learning Outcomes strengthens this alignment.

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, item 5: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The course is compliant with the AQF requirements.

3. Compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (2021)

The CRWG noted that the review process itself and the course report demonstrate compliance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (2021), particularly Standard 5.

Evidence:

This report.

Finding:

The course is compliant with the Higher Education Standards Framework.

4. Compliance with TEQSA requirements

Discussion:

The CRWG observed that the review process is an expression of TEQSA requirements and notes reference to Guidance Notes

Evidence:

Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021,
<https://www.legislation.gov.au/F2021L00488/latest/text>

TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Monitoring, Review and Improvement,
<https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/guidance-notes/guidance-note-academic-monitoring-review-and-improvement>

This report

Finding:

The course is compliant with TEQSA requirements.

5. Alignment with the AUT's Identity, Purpose, Mission, Graduate Attributes and Strategic Plan

Discussion:

The CRWG agreed that, assuming the proposed course learning outcomes are accepted, mapping demonstrated these alignments.

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, items 7-9: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The course aligns with the AUT's Identity, Purpose, Mission, Graduate Attributes and Strategic Plan.

6. Graduate Attributes are fostered

Discussion:

The CRWG recognised the strong alignment of the current course learning outcomes with the Graduate Attributes and accepted that mapping showed the

new course learning outcomes will foster ongoing attainment of the Graduate Attributes.

Evidence:

CRWG Course Papers 25 August 2025, item 7: [25.08.25 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 25 August 2025: [Meeting notes, 25 August 2025](#)

Finding:

The Bachelor of Ministry ensures that the Graduate Attributes are fostered.

7. Course Learning Outcomes are achieved.

Discussion:

The CRWG noted the evidence that current course learning outcomes are being achieved and accepted that mapping shows this will continue if/when the new course learning outcomes are adopted.

Evidence:

[Sample moderation reports](#)

CRWG Course Papers 1 September 2025: [25.09.01 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 1 September 2025: [Meeting notes, 1 September 2025](#)

USES Evaluation Survey, [AQC2302-10.2](#), [AQC2402-11.2](#), [AQC2502-11.2](#)

Finding:

The current course learning outcomes are being achieved.

8. Progression, retention, attrition and completion rates

Discussion:

The CRWG noted that these matters are attentively monitored and clearly reported.

Evidence:

Course data above

[Meeting notes – CRWG, student data review group, Undergraduate coursework awards. Meeting 14 May 2025](#)

Annual reports on attrition and completion rates: [AQC2304-1.0](#), [AQC2402-11.4](#), [AQC25.02-11.4](#)

Finding: progression, retention, attrition and completion rates are properly scrutinised.

9. The extent of students' achievement of learning outcomes

Discussion:

The CRWG observed that the achievement of course and unit learning outcomes is closely followed and maintained.

Evidence:

Sample moderation reports

CRWG Course Papers 1 September 2025: [25.09.01 C.3. Bachelor of Ministry](#)

CRWG Meeting Notes 1 September 2025: [Meeting notes, 1 September 2025](#)

USES Evaluation Survey, [AQC2302-10.2](#), [AQC2402-11.2](#), [AQC2502-11.2](#)

Finding:

Student achievement of learning outcomes was satisfactory and appropriate. The review of the units data also showed consistency of learning across the consortium.

3. HESF 5.3.3

Comprehensive reviews of courses of study are informed and supported by regular interim monitoring, of the quality of teaching and supervision of research students, student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course of study.

Discussion:

The CRWG noted that

1. All AUT courses, including the Bachelor of Ministry are regularly monitored through a variety of means, including analysis of:

Unit of Study Experience Survey (USES), Student Experience Survey (SES) and Graduate Outcomes Survey (GOS) data

Enrolment, progression, attrition and completion rates

Assessment methods and grade arrays

Student feedback

The affiliated colleges are provided with an individualised annual report on each of these domains and a comparison of its results with the aggregated AUT data. These reports form the basis of on-going monitoring, reporting and feedback processes through the AUT's tickit risk management system.

2. Monitoring of the quality of teaching and the overall delivery of units within each courses of study is effected primarily through the Moderation Policy.

Moderation is governed by the [Moderation Policy](#).

The affiliated colleges are provided with individualised Moderation Reports for selected units each semester.

The Assessment and Moderation Committee is provided with moderation reports for each unit of study. The Academic Quality Committee (AQC) is provided with summary tables, with any concerns noted, to which colleges respond. The Academic Board monitors the process, receiving the general moderation reports each semester, as well as a report from the Academic Quality Committee.

3. The CRWG was provided with access to unit outlines delivered at each college in 2025. These outlines typically include content outlines, teaching schedules, learning aids, assessment activities and available resources (with recent scholarship and pedagogical practice). The CRWG noted that there is ample evidence that units are implemented effectively across the consortium.

4. Student feedback is provided to staff and colleges via anonymous surveys distributed by colleges at the end of each semester.

Evidence:

Course Data, pp.4-5 above.

[Meeting notes – CRWG, student data review group, Undergraduate coursework awards. Meeting 14 May 2025](#)

USES Evaluation Survey – Student Feedback Support, [AQC2302-10.2](#), [AQC2402-11.2](#), [AQC2502-11.2](#)

Annual Reports of the AQC to the Academic Board 2021-2024: [AQC2202-9.2](#); [AQC2302-06.2](#); [AQC2402-7.2](#); [AQC2502-07.2](#).

[Sample moderation reports](#)

Sample unit outlines: [Old Testament units at Christ College](#), [Pastoral and Church-Focussed Ministry units at Ridley College](#), and [Theology units at Trinity Theological College](#)

Finding:

The CRWG is satisfied that the course is informed and supported by the AUT system of regular interim monitoring of the quality of teaching, student progress and the overall delivery of units within each course of study.

4. HESF 5.3.4

Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study, including:

- a. Analysis of progression rates, attrition rates, completion times and rates and, where applicable, comparing different locations of delivery, and**
- b. The assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses of study.**

Discussion a:

The CRWG noted that progression, attrition, completion times and rates are monitored centrally and by the affiliated colleges being provided with an individualised annual report of these domains as well as a comparison of its results with other colleges by comparing them with aggregated AUT data.

This report forms part of the ongoing monitoring, reporting and feedback processes through the AUT's use of the Tickit risk management system.

On the basis of the course data, the CRWG concluded that performance in each of these domains is satisfactory. No serious cause for concern requiring significant remedial action was identified.

The CRWG also noted that the AUT has benchmarking agreements with the University of Divinity, the Australian University College of Divinity and Tabor College.

Evidence:

Course data, pp.4-5 above.

[Meeting notes – CRWG, student data review group, Undergraduate coursework awards. Meeting 14 May 2025](#)

Annual reports on attrition and completion rates: [AQC2304-1.0](#), [AQC2402-11.4](#), [AQC25.02-11.4](#)

Benchmarking agreements with [UD](#), [AUCD](#) and [Tabor College](#).

Discussion b:

The CRWG noted that assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes for units of study within courses is monitored through the AUT's comprehensive UQAF and moderation processes.

It noted further that:

1. Colleges are provided with individualised Moderation Reports for units each semester.
2. The Academic Quality Committee (AQC) is provided with summary tables, with any concerns noted, to which Colleges respond.
3. Student feedback is provided to staff and colleges via anonymous surveys distributed by the affiliated colleges at the end of each semester.

On the basis of the evidence presented, the CRWG was satisfied that management of assessment methods and grading of students' achievement of learning outcomes in the Bachelor of Ministry is appropriate and effective.

Evidence:

[Assessment Policy](#)

[Moderation Policy](#)

[Sample UQAFs](#)

[Sample moderation reports](#)

Finding:

The CRWG is satisfied that the course has rigorous review and improvement activities that include external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study.

5. HESF 5.3.5

All students have opportunities to provide feedback on their educational experiences and student feedback informs institutional monitoring, review and improvement activities.

Discussion:

The CRWG noted that all students are provided with opportunities for providing feedback on their educational experiences.

This is because: each affiliated college has a Dean of Students (or designated officer) who is available to discuss any matters of concern to students; each affiliated college has a range of support people and structures available if needed; and the 'AUT Grievance Resolution Policy – Students' provides the framework for resolving grievances, both academic and non-academic.

The CRWG noted that students of this course contributed to the SES and Student Well Being Survey which evince high levels of student satisfaction with the quality of education and student support provided by the AUT.

Evidence:

[AUT Grievance Resolution Policy – Students](#)

[AUT Wellbeing and Safety Policy](#)

[AUT Support for Students Policy](#)

‘How AUT Is Responding to Student Feedback,’

<https://aut.edu.au/studentfeedback/>

Students at Risk Report: [AQC2302-10.5](#), [AQC2402-11.5](#)

[AUT SES and Student Wellbeing](#)

[Meeting notes – CRWG, student data review group, Undergraduate coursework awards. Meeting 14 May 2025](#)

Finding:

The CRWG is satisfied that ‘all students have opportunities to provide feedback on their educational experiences and student feedback informs institutional monitoring, review and improvement activities’.

6. HESF 5.3.6

All teachers and supervisors have opportunities to review feedback on their teaching and research supervision in enhancing these activities.

Discussion:

The CRWG noted the opportunities staff have to review feedback on their teaching such as feedback to staff and colleges via anonymous surveys distributed at the end of each semester.

The feedback from these surveys are provided to the Academic Dean (or another designated colleague) and areas for commendation and improvement are identified. Where required, plans for action are developed for implementation. The reports and relevant action plans form part of the Affiliated College annual review process.

Staff are supported to develop their teaching by professional development activities such as the AUT's annual Professional Development conference, participation in AUT discipline support groups, engagement with AUT's governance bodies, the establishment and offer of the [Graduate Certificate of Theological Education](#), provision of study leave and conference attendance (typically the conferences of the Evangelical Theological Society, Society of Biblical Literature, ANZATS and the 'Learning and Teaching Theology' conferences run by the AUCD). Affiliated College compliance with the [AUT's Research and Scholarship Policy](#) is reviewed on an annual basis.

Evidence:

Professional Development Conference programs for [2023](#) and [2024](#).

[Sample moderation reports](#)

Research and Scholarship Reports for [2021](#), [2022](#) and [2023](#)

Finding:

The CRWG is satisfied that all teachers have opportunities to review feedback on their teaching and are supported in enhancing these activities.

7. HESF 5.3.7

The results of regular interim monitoring, comprehensive reviews, external referencing and student feedback are used to mitigate future risks to the quality of the education provided and to evaluate improvements, including the use of data on student progress and success to inform admission criteria and approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support.

Discussion:

The CRWG noted that risks are identified through the rigorous processes stipulated in the Risk Management Policy and the Risk Management Procedure according to which academic risks are recorded in the AUT Risk Register which is overseen by the AQC and the Finance, Risk, Audit and Compliance Committee.

The CRWG noted that, in addition to continuous consideration of risk issues by the AQC, 'New and Emerging Risks' is a recurring component in the agendas of the Teaching and Learning Committee (formerly the Coursework Committee)

with the motion ‘that the Teaching & Learning Committee note the risks identified in this meeting and ask that the EO reports these to the Quality Manager.

The CRWG noted that a continuous feedback loop in AUT risk management procedures ensures that continuous improvements are guided by data and feedback.

The CRWG observed that the most pressing risk with which the AUT is grappling in relation to ‘approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support’ is the impact of Artificial Intelligence (AI) on assessment.

Evidence:

[Risk Management Policy](#)

[Risk Management Procedure](#)

Monitoring evident in the Course Data, pp.4-5 above.

AQC Circular Resolution Reported to the Coursework Committee: [CC2304-14](#).

Annual Reports of the AQC to the Academic Board 2021-2024: [AQC2202-9.2](#); [AQC2302-06.2](#); [AQC2402-7.2](#); [AQC2502-07.2](#).

ACT response to TEQSA’s Request For Information – Action Plan for Generative Artificial Intelligence (GAI): [CC2407-16.2](#)

Finding:

The CRWG is satisfied that regular interim monitoring, comprehensive reviews, external referencing and student feedback are used to mitigate future risks to the quality of the education provided and to evaluate improvements, including the use of data on student progress and success to inform admission criteria and approaches to course design, teaching, supervision, learning and academic support.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In submitting this report, the CRWG has completed its work in relation to the Bachelor of Ministry.

Key Findings:

The CRWG has found that:

1. The course complies with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) 2021, and the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) requirements.
2. The course aligns with the AUT's [Identity, Purpose, Mission](#), Purpose and Objects of the [Constitution](#), Graduate Attributes, [Strategic Plan](#), and [Courses Policy](#).
3. The Course Rationale continues to be relevant.
4. The Admissions Criteria continue to be appropriate.
5. In general, the design, content, delivery and assessment, bibliographies and resources, and samples of common and elective units which comprise it:
 - a. demonstrate that they are informed and shaped by recent scholarship, research and pedagogical practices, including outputs from the AUT's Research and Scholarship Networks and academic staff of Affiliated Colleges;
 - b. ensure the Graduate Attributes are fostered;
 - c. facilitate achievement of the Course Learning Outcomes; and
 - d. is 'fit for purpose' and is of ongoing benefit to students, affiliated colleges and stakeholders.
6. Adoption of new Course Learning Outcomes will provide further clarification, alignment and benefits to students and stakeholders.
7. The Bachelor of Ministry remains viable, benefits students, the affiliated colleges and other stakeholders, and warrants reaccreditation.

Recommendations:

The CRWG recommends that:

1. A succinct statement of the course purpose, potential students for whom the course would be suitable and its relation to other courses be added to the course rationale
2. The course description replace unit codes with English language descriptors
3. The proposed course learning outcomes be endorsed
4. The alignment of the course learning outcomes of the Bachelor of Ministry be reconsidered when the new AUT strategic plan is promulgated
5. There be a substantial review of the alignment of the course unit learning outcomes with the new course learning outcomes

6. The Bachelor of Ministry be reaccredited for the period 1 January 2026 to 31 December 2032.

Affirmation:

In conducting this review and writing this report, members of the CRWG affirm that they adhered to the relevant privacy requirements.