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Promoting peer review processes at JCU
Peer review: Policy and practice

Learning, Teaching and Assessment Policy 5.17

The Subject Co-ordinator must seek a biennial peer review of the subject’s assessment plans and grading practices.

JCU Peer Review of Teaching documentation
Academic staff rubric to evaluate quality of assessment design

**Criterion 1.** Assessment tasks and criteria are aligned with subject learning outcomes (and relevant course learning outcomes), and across campuses, modes and/or study periods, of high cognitive order and weighted appropriately.

**Criterion 2.** Assessment tasks are authentic (see JCU assessment list), aligned with core learning activities and, where appropriate, stimulate a wide range of active responses.

**Criterion 3.** Assessment tasks take into consideration student workload expectations, are distributed across the study period and allow opportunities for early, timely, consequential and multi-source feedback.

**Criterion 4.** Assessment task specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources are available, clearly articulated and aligned.

---

### Academic staff rubric to evaluate quality of design of assessment methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Good practice</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment tasks and criteria are aligned with subject learning outcomes (and relevant course learning outcomes), and across campuses, modes and/or study periods, of high cognitive order and weighted appropriately</td>
<td>Assessment tasks and criteria are valid, evincing student achievement of knowledge, skills and dispositions targeted in subject learning outcomes (and relevant course learning outcomes). Assessment tasks are of high cognitive order, as aligned with the Australian Qualifications Framework. Assessment task weightings reflect relative importance of learning outcomes and anticipated student workload. Assessment task types and weightings are aligned across campuses, modes and/or study periods.</td>
<td>Assessment tasks are not conducive to assessing the learning outcomes; or tasks and criteria are consistently aligned with subject learning outcomes, however, these may be knowledge, skills and/or dispositions targeted in subject learning outcomes that are not assessed and/or unnecessary duplications. Assessment tasks are of low cognitive order, lacking alignment with the Australian Qualifications framework. Assessment task weightings do not fact reflect relative importance of learning outcomes (i.e. demonstration of lower order outcomes weighted too highly or higher order outcomes are not assessed). Adequate weightings and/or anticipated student workload. Assessment task types and weightings do not align across campuses, modes and/or study periods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLE: VALIDITY</strong></td>
<td>Assessment tasks are authentic (see JCU assessment list), aligned with core learning activities and, where appropriate, stimulate a wide range of active responses.</td>
<td>Assessment tasks: Are authentic (i.e. similar to the real work done in professional or further learning research contexts. Are aligned with core learning activities and stimulate a wide range of active responses (i.e. allow students to make connections with their own experiences, areas of choice and/or work in collaboration with others), where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLE: AUTHENTICITY, INCLUSIVITY</strong></td>
<td>Assessment tasks take into consideration student workload expectations, are distributed across the study period and allow opportunities for early, timely, consequential and multi-source feedback.</td>
<td>Assessments tasks: Take into consideration student workload expectations. Are distributed across the duration of the study period (in addition to summative purposes) Fulfil formative assessments for learning purposes, and build on each other where appropriate, to maximise opportunities for students to receive early, timely and consequential feedback. Incorporate exit, peer and/or industry/client assessment, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPLE: INCLUSIVITY, TRANSPARENCY</strong></td>
<td>Assessment task specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources are available, clearly articulated and aligned</td>
<td>Assessment task descriptions specifications, criteria, standards and supporting resources (e.g. annotated exemplars) are available, clearly articulated and aligned, to support student understanding and make judgement of assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Idea of one-page staff rubric: Prompted by resource developed by Graham Hendry in collaboration with the University of Sydney Assessment Scholars Network (presented at 2017 HERDSA conference)
Staff professional resources

4-Quadrant Model of evaluating teaching

Internal learning and teaching grants of up to $3000

Peer review by external academics or industry partners
Internal dissemination via ePoster (and conference presentation and publication)

**Undergraduate**

1. Sector/industry relevance of 1\textsuperscript{st} year professional practices in education subject
2. Competency assessment in 1\textsuperscript{st} year physiotherapy subject
3. Blended learning approach in anatomy component of 1\textsuperscript{st} year veterinary science subject
4. Pedagogical strategies in endocrinology component in 1\textsuperscript{st} year medicine subject
5. Computer programming components of a 2\textsuperscript{nd} year engineering subject
6. Constructive alignment and emphases on higher order outcomes in a 2\textsuperscript{nd} year evolutionary biology subject
7. Clinical simulation across the undergraduate nursing program at JCU

**Postgraduate**

8. Best practice learning, teaching and assessment principles for large, external cohort in Master public health subject
Engaging in the IRU Academic Calibration Process
Documentation for Unit Coordinator to compile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Grading nomenclature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Information about the course structure(s) of which the unit is a part of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Course level learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Unit outline provided to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Unit Learning Outcomes, and how the relate to course learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Grade distribution for the particular semester being evaluated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Context statement – optional documentation you can use to comment on additional factors not present in standard documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Details of assessment task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Grading criteria/markng rubric for the assessment task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection of deidentifed student samples (grades and comments are still included):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Med</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
External review: Learning outcomes

Likhert-scale responses and open-ended rationale

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning outcomes clear and sufficient? Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

2. To what extent are the specified learning outcomes appropriate for the unit in its delivery year? Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

Open-ended question

3. How do the specified learning outcomes compare with those of units from similar universities in the same delivery year?
External review: Assessment task

Likhert-scale responses and open-ended rationale

1. To what extent is the assessment task suitable for the specified learning outcomes? Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

3. To what extent are the assessment task and the marking criteria appropriate for a ________ year unit?

Open-ended question

4. How does the assessment task and marking criteria compare with those of ________ year units from similar universities?
### External review: Grades awarded

#### Student Samples - Review of grades awarded

To make your assessment of the grade, please click into the blank cell in 'Grade assessment', and select the value you think is most appropriate.

Where you disagree with a grade, you must provide reasoning in the comments box below.

#### 3 options for assessment of grades awarded (note not marks)

- Agree with grade awarded
- Believe grade awarded to be unduly high
- Believe grade awarded to be unduly low

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Samples Name</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Total Marks</th>
<th>Grade Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S01</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S02</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S03</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S04</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S05</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S06</td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S07</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S08</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S09</td>
<td>Distinction</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10</td>
<td>High Distinction</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S11</td>
<td>High Distinction</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S12</td>
<td>High Distinction</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Agree with Grade Awarded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide reasons for any grades you have disagreed with.
External review: Summary judgement

When the reviewers’ report is received, it is typically sent to the Unit Coordinator, Course Coordinator and Head of School/Academic Group.

3 options for summary judgement

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes were **appropriate**.

Any **recommendations** made are for the **purposes of enhancement** to the unit and its assessment.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes were **appropriate**.

However, there are **some risks to the future quality assurance** of the unit and its assessment, as outlined in recommendations.

There are **immediate concerns or risks** relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes.

These require **immediate action** on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.
Range of options depending on how disparate the judgment is between the reviewer and original marker

• University’s Calibration Coordinator, Unit Coordinator, Course Coordinator, and Head of School/Academic Group review disparity against other available data;

• Engage External Reviewer in discussion regarding reasons for grades;

• Involve third party in calibration exercise to determine appropriate academic standards;

• Repeat calibration exercise in following year to ensure measures put in place result in level of confidence required;

• Participate in a more extensive peer review exercise.
**IRU Calibration Project milestones**

**2013-14**
Initial trial 20 units, 6 IRU universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>HD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Fail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessments reviewed</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Believe grade to be unduly high</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Believe grade to be unduly low</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**2015**
- Evaluation of IRU Calibration Project: Valuable process
- Recommendations: Create a central coordinator role and a dedicated calibration system (Abbey Murray, Charles Darwin University)

**2016-17**
Accelerated calibration volume
Dedicated calibration system

Central Coordinator Dashboard

JCU units

Other units seeking review

Other institutions’ units
Dear IRU Calibration Coordinators,

A new Calibration Job is available in Calibrate. Please make your calibration nominations via the calibration register or distribute this information to relevant academics at your institutions.

**Calibration Job _S1_2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Charles Darwin University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Structure</td>
<td>Faculty of Engineering, Health, Science, and the Environment, School of Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Related Courses</td>
<td>Bachelor of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calibration Period</td>
<td>Semester 1, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment selection - Brief</td>
<td>Assig 2 – 2500 word case study essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment selection - Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Add calibrator nomination

Confirmation email

Central Coordinator notifications

Dear {NOMINATING CALIBRATION COORDINATORS},

JOE BLOG has been selected as the calibrator for TEST123_S1_2017.

You will be notified when the calibration package is available.
Dear Joe Blog,

The Calibration Package is available for TEST SUBJECT 2017.

Instructions

To access the information package for your review please use the following link: https://cloudstor.aarnet.edu.au/plus/index.php/apps/files/?dir=TEST

Please review the full package prior to completing the report. Please also ensure you have read either the IRU Calibrator Guide or your local Calibrator Guide prior to your evaluation.

To access the report and make your evaluation please use the following link: Academic Calibration Report

Your authentication code to access the report is: TEST_S1_2017.

If you have any questions regarding the information provided, please submit these to your calibration coordinator. Please do not continue you review until you have feedback from your coordinator on the requested information.
# JCU subjects calibrated in 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathways Diploma – Foundation subjects</th>
<th>Bachelor capstones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CS1022 Learning in a Digital Environment</td>
<td>BA3000 Arts Edge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC1022 Essential Science</td>
<td>SP3014 Independent Research Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor 1st year units</th>
<th>Postgraduate units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS1111 Science Communication for Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td>RH5200 Rehabilitation Research and Evidence-Based Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NS5922 Masters Nursing Pharmacotherapeutics for Nurse Practitioners 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A JCU reviewer’s experience

• Reviewer: Academic who is passionate about the development of the HR professional
• Engages in accrediting body’s professional network and accesses university websites for desktop benchmarking, however, has not had the opportunity to be exposed to counterparts’ assessment methods
• Ample artefacts to conduct a comprehensive review; may have been good to have access to the subject site in the LMS
• “What was amazing is that we were pretty much consistent!” – only difference was the 2 HD samples (lacked deep analyses of issues and clear alignment with concrete and viable HR recommendations)
• Nonetheless, agreed with grades awarded – limitations may have been due to task design (privileging breadth over depth) and students not having been directed in that way (in terms of feedback on Part 1)
• Implications for practice: Saw merit in aspects of task design, wherein group work processes were supported and all members had designated roles and responsibilities
• Estimated that the review took 3 days; was not motivated by the $600 honorarium
A JCU reviewee’s experience

- Context: 9 deliveries of a Pathways Diploma unit, with 600-800 students across 4 campuses per year
- Video presentation task (most heavily weighted in schedule)
- Deidentification of student samples was time consuming: edited any audio or on-screen reference to student names; uploaded MP4 files on google drive with link provided to reviewer
- Already considerable investment in calibrating student and markers’ understanding of specifications and standards: student assessment guidelines, graders’ handbook, pre marking moderation consensus meetings
- Reviewer deemed that grades awarded for 2 submissions (1D, 1C) were unduly high
- Impact on practice: Prompted exchange marking (no sessional staff member assessing own students); more explicit rubric
- Benefits: “Focused my energies to tighten up the subject”
- Appreciated that the reviewer had “the expertise and distance to provide a constructive review”
- Straightforward process, however, clearer instructions needed regarding management of assessment tasks other than written tasks
Working towards utilising the Peer Review Portal to support program review
2017: Academic Expert Working Group developed new academic program/course review procedure

Academic Course Review Procedure

Intent

JCU has a three-fold obligation to undertake routine course quality review for all academic programs:

1. Ensures the academic quality of its programs are of the highest calibre possible;
2. Assures the university’s sustainability as a tertiary education provider; and

These Procedures provide the structure and process for the review of all academic programs delivered at JCU.
Academic course review

Level 1. Annual Course Performance Report (supported by Course Coordinator workshop and provision of data report), with following foci:

• Entry Standards
• Assessment and moderation
• Learning and teaching methodologies
• Graduate employability
• Course accreditation

Level 2. Internal Course Review, every 5-7 years

Themes synthesised in Divisional Academic Program Reports
Level 2: Initial first pass
(evidenced based undertaken by Quality, Planning and Analytics)

Performance on 7 of 9 indicators:
1. Course accreditation profile
2. Course learning outcomes
3. Course assessment
4. Student experience
5. Industry linkage
6. Scale: overall size
7. Student enrolment trend
8. Student retention
9. Financial performance

Academic Course Review Committee (Chair Academic Board, DVCA & Directors Academic Quality and Strategy) verify review type:
### Who reviews and what evidence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Desktop</th>
<th>Panel Interview</th>
<th>Panel Visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Application provided directly to:**
- Academic Course Review Committee

**Undertaken by a team/panel consisting of:**
- Academic from another Division
- ADLT from Division but not College
- Member of Academic Board
- ADLT from Division but not College
- Director of Quality and Strategy from Division
- Member of Academic Board
- External expert: Alumni, industry or another institution

**Final report from the external accrediting agency**

**Simple Portfolio of Evidence**

**Comprehensive Portfolio of Evidence**
Academic Course Review Committee provides recommendation to Academic Board

Renew the course of study
- without conditions
- with recommended (formative) improvements
- with required (summative) improvements (including a plan)

OR

Suspend the course for a period of time (timeframe identified)
Disestablish the course
2017 pilot courses

Division of Academic and Student Life
**Desktop:** AQF 5 Diploma program

Division of Tropical Health and Medicine
**Simple:** accredited AQF 7 Bachelor program
**Panel Interview:** AQF 9 Masters coursework program

Division of Tropical Environments and Societies
**Simple:** accredited AQF 7 Bachelor program
**Panel Visit:** AQF 9 Master coursework program
Working to utilise the Peer Review Portal to support course review processes

Outgoing Projects

Diploma of Higher Education Developing Academic Skills

First pilot course Desktop review
Step 1

Project information

Key detail pertaining to the program/course
Step 2

Uploads

Evidence base for panel members to review

Role of the Applicant
Step 3

Questionnaire

Questions for panel members to respond to

• 5 point scale
• 4 point scale
• Customised scale
Step 4

Payment

Billing Information

Biller name

Biller email

Biller phone number

Biller address

Contact person

Purchase order

Card Information

Card name

Please type exactly the same name as in your card

Card number

Expiry date

Month Year

CVC

Delegate Payment Authority

You can delegate Payment Authority to any other registered user. Nominated Payee's will receive an email notification and see the project within their Outgoing screen.

Add new

Role of the Payment Authority

Summary

Project Name
PRP Course

Field of Education

Classification
Postgraduate Degree Level,
Calibration

This facility differentiates a program review from a unit review in the Portal.

Once all panel members’ reviews are submitted, the Panel Chair is able to broadly calibrate panel members’ assessments through a manual or auto-stacking function.

The Chair is also able to include comments.
Contacts

A/Prof Michelle Lasen, Head, Teaching Quality and Student Success: Michelle.Lasen@jcu.edu.au

Mariana van Niekerk, JCU Coordinator, IRU Calibration Project: Mariana.vanniekerk@jcu.edu.au

Glenn McMahon, Manager Quality, Standards and Policy: Glenn.McMahon@jcu.edu.au

Prof Stephen Naylor, Chair, Academic Board: Stephen.Naylor@jcu.edu.au
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