Pre-Delivery Peer Review - Course Description

(PDPR – CD)

## Purpose:

The purpose of this peer review process involving Course Descriptions is to:

1. Peer review every Course Description prior to semester use and student distribution
2. Ensure the Course Description aligns with university expectations regarding student workload, types of assessment, timing of assessment, volume of learning, scaffolding of learning and provides clarity and instructions for students regarding the sequence of learning and expectations of the learning environment.

## Instructions for this review process:

1. As part of FedUni’s approach to improving quality assurance of learning and teaching, all Course Descriptions must be peer reviewed by a moderator prior to the commencement of delivery. For the purpose of this exercise, a moderator is a staff member completely independent of the delivery or assessment of this course.
2. A particular focus during this peer review is to assess the Course Description from the perspective of a future student. This peer review process should also focus on the appropriate use of assessment (timing, weighting, type, descriptions) and appropriate use of scaffolding strategies within the learning environment.
3. This peer review process will be coordinated by the faculty ADLT and the program coordinators.
4. The peer review process should begin 4 weeks prior to the commencement of semester (Refer to Table 1.0)

## Table 1.0: Logistic Planning for Peer Review Course Description (Pre-Delivery)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Activity Summary  Semester 1 Delivery – Feb Year………………  Semester 2 Delivery – July Year…………….. | Dates |
| 1 | The Program Coordinator (PC) nominates moderators for courses and communicates this to the Deputy Head of School. PC complete the details in Table 2 of the Pre-Delivery Peer Review - Course Description (PDPR-CD) template for each course in their program. | 4 weeks before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 3 | CC must provide the most recent Course Outlines, Course Description and any other key relevant documents to the PC in preparation for the peer review process. | 4 weeks before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 4 | The PC determines who will moderate the course and appropriate information is distributed to the moderator. | 3 weeks before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 5 | The moderator assesses the documents and completes Table 3. Please see Table 5.0 for support criteria regarding assessment and a copy of the Guide to Good Assessment (UTAS 2011). The moderator has 1 week (5 days) to complete this moderation task. Once this is complete, the moderator sends the completed PDPR – CD information directly to the CC. The time allocation should be a maximum of 1 hour for the moderator. | 3 weeks before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 6 | The CC receives the moderator’s feedback as detailed in Table 3. The CC completes the final section (Table 4) demonstrating reflection and responds to moderators comments within 1 week of receiving the feedback | 2 week before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 8 | The CC returns the PDPR-CD to the PC for final sign off | 1 week before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 8 | The PC signs off on the process of the course | 1 week before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 9 | Where there is discrepancy, the PC will approach the CC and moderator for a meeting or ask for assistance from the ADLT, Head of School, Deputy Head of School or services available through CLIPP | 1 week before commencement of semester: Date……………………. |
| 10 | All processes need to be completed to ensure the correct information is ready for students at the commencement of the teaching semester. Final versions of this document will be stored in faculty shared drives. | Week 1 of Semester commencement – Course Description made available to students day 1 of semester commencement |

There are a series of question asked as part of this pre-delivery peer review process.

* If any of the questions elicit a “no” response the moderator should detail their concerns in the “*Additional Comments”* section. and the course coordinator/VET Teacher at a mutually acceptable time to discuss potential clarification.
* If no agreement can be reached, or the moderator does not respond within **one week**, then the Program Coordinator should be contacted for advice.
* If all the answers to the questions is “yes”, then the moderator should sign-off on the review, make any final comments and return this form to the course coordinator.

## Table 2: Course Coordinator and Moderator Details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program: | Location: |
| Course Code: | Course Name: |
| Course Coordinator Name: | Semester/Year: |
| Moderator Name: |  |

## Table 3: Peer Reviewing the Course Description

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Key question | Yes (tick) | No (tick) |
| 1. | Does the Course Description align with the most recent Course Outline approved by Curriculum Committee? |  |  |
| 2. | Do all assessment tasks clearly align with the learning outcomes? |  |  |
| 3. | Are the student expectations appropriately described for each assessment task? |  |  |
| 4. | Are the assessment criteria clearly defined for each assessment tasks? |  |  |
| 5. | Is their sufficient scaffolding of learning tasks embedded within the sequence/organisation of this Course? |  |  |
| 6. | Is the weighting of assessments appropriate for the type and timing of the assessment? |  |  |
| 7. | Is there an appropriate balance of formative and summative assessment? |  |  |
| 8. | Are the assessment submission processes and assessor details clearly defined for each assessment task? |  |  |
| 9. | Does the volume of learning for the total assessment tasks align with acceptable university student workload guidelines? |  |  |
| 10. | Are the student feedback mechanisms appropriate, timely (within 1 day and 10 working days) and provide students with opportunities to take feedback and improve future associated assessment tasks? |  |  |
| 11. | Will the current assessment tasks demonstrate sufficient evidence of student learning as compared to the intended learning outcomes? |  |  |
|  | Additional Comments/Suggestions: |  | |
|  | Moderator completion date: | | |

When completed please send upload into an agreed location for the Course Coordinator to access or send via email

Table 4: Course Coordinator response to the moderator comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Course Coordinator Comments/Responses (Date…………..) | Futures Directions/Strategies for improvement (Tick) |
|  | Make minor amendments as per feedback & suggestions (Yr………..) |
| Make major amendments & discuss these with Program Coordinator |
| Seek 1-on-1 Peer review with ADLT and/or CLIPP support |
| Use this process as part of reflective practice in my teaching & PRDP  (Compulsory) |
| Explore action research opportunities based on my teaching practice;  Explore scholarship of learning and teaching opportunities; contact CLIPP |
| Course Coordinator completion date: | Program Coordinator receipt date and closing remarks: |

Table 5: Principles of Assessment: Support material for the moderator

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Principle 1  **Assessment should be seen as an integral part of the learning and teaching cycle**. | This principle is achieved when:   * there is a clear alignment between stated learning outcomes (or objectives), the learning experiences provided for students, and the assessment tasks * student understanding of the assessment process is facilitated by clear explanations of the assessment tasks, how the assessment tasks relate to the learning outcomes, and the criteria and standards against which students will be assessed * assessment tasks are designed to assess relevant UB graduate attributes as well as discipline-specific criteria * there is a clear progression in the assessment requirements within a course and through the progress of a program and * assessment tasks assess the capacity to analyze and synthesize information and concepts, not just recall the information previously presented |
| Principle 2  **Assessment has four key purposes and these should be considered when developing assessment tasks and learning experiences for students in a course of study.** | These purposes are to:   * guide students’ development of meaningful learning * inform the students of their progress * inform staff on the progress of students, and the effectiveness of their teaching * provide data for Schools and Faculties to: * arrive at final grades for students in a course of study & make decisions on the awarding of a qualification and rank students for awards or progress to another level of study * ensure academic quality and standards are upheld and maintained at UB   This principle is achieved when:   * assessment supports student learning and tests their achievement by providing clear opportunities to demonstrate their learning and skill development * assessment provides students with descriptions of their progress against stated learning outcomes, criteria and achievement * assessment feedback provided to students is both detailed and constructive, returned in a timely manner, and allows students to benefit in the preparation of future assessment tasks * feedback from assessment tasks (and other sources) provides clear information for staff to make judgments about students’ progress against the criteria and standards, and enables them to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching * assessment tasks are weighted to balance the developmental (‘formative’) and judgmental (‘summative’) roles of assessment. That is, early low-stakes, low-weight assessment should be used to provide students with constructive feedback to improve their achievement – later assessment tasks of higher weight could be used for summative assessment * plagiarism in various forms is minimized through careful task design, clear explanations and education about academic integrity, and monitoring of academic honesty by academic staff. |
| Principle 3  **Assessment practices and processes must be transparent and fair.** | This principle is achieved when:   * clear criteria and achievement standards for the assessment of student work are made available to students, with the task descriptions at the beginning of the semester * assessment tasks are designed to ensure there are no inherent biases that may disadvantage any student groups * the anonymity of students’ work is maintained in the assessment process where this is possible and practical * at a year level within a School, scheduling and design of assessment tasks take into considerations student workloads * penalties and adjustments, such as late penalties and moderation of grades, are made consistently, and according to clearly articulated policy readily available to students and * at a School and University level, there are clear and published processes available to students who request their results be reviewed. |

Reference: Guidelines for Good Assessment Practice; Three Principles of Assessment. UTAS Publication (2011)

The end