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Aims of the workshop
* Seek feedback on ways to support the sector in peer review of assessment
* Provide a snapshot of examples of good practice across the sector
* Initiate opportunities for networking and ongoing discussion

Collaboration between Higher Ed Services and the University of Tasmania for establishing a national support mechanism for peer review of assessment

Jacqui Elson-Green, Higher Ed Services
Higher Ed Services

- Working for the benefit of Australian universities
- Strengthening the higher education sector
- Not-for-profit company wholly owned by Universities Australia
• Collaborating for success
• Digital Student Data Project
• All 39 UA member universities
• All Universities New Zealand Universities
• Creating a secure student academic record digital database
• International links to the Groningen Declaration
Peer Review of Assessment Workshop

• Collaborating with TEQSA
• First TEQSA conference lead in to annual Higher Education
• Compliance and Quality Forum

Sharing Excellence: Assuring Quality
Sharing Excellence through Collaboration

9, 10, 11 November – Melbourne
Peer Review of Assessment Workshop

Call for papers

• Academic Integrity
• Learning and Teaching
• Compliance and Standards

Deadline 29 July 2016
Thank You

Jacqui Elson-Green
Convenor Higher Education Compliance and Quality Network
Background context for establishing a national support mechanism in peer review
Dr Sara Booth

- **International trends in measuring learning outcomes**
  - Tuning Project
  - Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) US
  - New tool for assessment of learning outcomes for Bachelor’s degrees: National Centre for Public Accreditation (NCPA), Russia (2016)
- **HE quality assurance agencies and peer review**
  - Academic Quality Agency, New Zealand (Cycle 5 Audit)
  - Accreditation and external referencing across international borders and inter-agency cooperation

1.4.1 Expected learning outcomes are informed by national and international comparators
5.3.1 Accredited courses [at least every 7 yrs.] are subject to comprehensive reviews including external referencing or other benchmarking activities
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, and also takes account of emerging developments in the field of education, modes of delivery, the changing needs of students and the identified risks to the quality of the course of study.
5.3.4 Review and improvement activities includes regular external referencing against comparable courses of study [progression, attrition, completion] and assessment methods & grading of learning outcomes for selected units of study within courses

Scope is undergraduate courses and postgraduate coursework
Establishing a national support mechanism builds on the following research initiatives/projects:

- OLT Discipline Scholars Network and establishment of TLOs
- Quality Verification System (Go8), IRU Academic Calibration Process, Interuniversity Moderation Project (Krause et al., 2014), Achievement Matters Project (Accounting);
- Assuring learning and teaching standards [Emeritus Prof Geoff Scott, 2014; Prof Romy Lawson, 2015);
- Networks (Scott, 2014)
- Ewan & Freeman (2015) Found evidence of improved assessment practices with the development of TLOs; important role of Deans Councils in leading project on academic standards; identified gaps absence of private providers in academic projects; lack of evidence base for quality assurance and lack of external referencing
- OLT Peer Review of Assessment Network (Booth et al, 2015): national support mechanism
Definition of peer review of assessment [Booth et al, 2015]

‘the practice of colleagues providing and receiving feedback on one another’s unit/subject outlines, assessment tasks and marking criteria to ensure that assessment is aligned to intended learning outcomes and includes a calibration process to ensure comparability of achievement standards and an opportunity for professional learning’.
# National Support Mechanism in Peer Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Dimension</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Sector            | - University Networks  
                   - UTAS/ESA/HE collaboration                                              | Strong, deft leadership of networks  
                   External reference group                                              | Good practice principles in peer review                                 | - National online peer review tool: ESA (OPRT)  
                   - National clearinghouse of good practice in assessment (Curric Flip website)  
                   - Training for OPRT  
                   - National workshops/Forum[Higher Ed Services/UTAS/ESA]                 |
| HE institution    | Institutional networks                                                  | Clear roles for different players, AD L&T, Quality Managers, Course/Program/Discipline Coordinators | ✓ Academic governance,  
                   ✓ accreditation,  
                   ✓ course review,  
                   ✓ assessment,  
                   ✓ reward & recognition                                                  | Institutional register of trained peer reviewers  
                   Integrate with other forms of peer review  
                   Internal grant process  
                   Consideration of paying an honorarium  
                   ✓ PD workshops/including sessional staff                                 |
## National Support Mechanism in Peer Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Dimensions</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discipline</strong></td>
<td>Deans Councils (AD L&amp;T Networks) and accreditation bodies</td>
<td>Leadership of network ✓ Discipline coordinators, Chairs and Executives of Australian Deans Councils and other Academic Committees and Societies</td>
<td>Accreditation and industry requirements</td>
<td>✓ College of Peers process, e.g., Annual Forum on calibration, alignment to TLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td>University networks and peer support networks</td>
<td>Course/Program/Disciplinary Coordinators and peers</td>
<td>✓ Alignment to TLOs, course mapping, assessment, grading, calibration and learning resources; workload allocations; reward and recognition</td>
<td>Feedback from other disciplinary/cross-disciplinary peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assuring learning and teaching standards: *How do we assure learning and teaching standards?*

**Emeritus Prof Geoff Scott**, Western Sydney University  
Prof Romy Lawson, Edith Cowan University  

Presented by **Dr Sara Booth**
Workshop session: Discuss in your groups what process you would use to ensure your assessment tasks meet the key tests for powerful assessment.

Some key tests:

- Attracts high levels of student satisfaction,
- Addresses key capabilities set down for program/unit especially work ready plus graduates
- Has different perspectives; Is integrated
- Not just problem based but solutions oriented
- Whole program focus
- Directly relates to what has been learnt
- Can be digitally enabled
- Where possible, dilemma based, real world focus
- Can be use for learning (formative) as well as for assessment (summative)
- Is scalable (Scott, 2016)
Different models of peer review of assessment: *What models of peer review of assessment are available?*

**Different Models of Peer Review**

*A/Prof Mark Freeman*, University of Sydney

[EROSS Project Peter Czech](#), RMIT; Dr *Simon Bedford*, UOW; *Judith Smith*, QUT;

*A/Prof Jon Yorke*, Curtin

Presented by *Dr Sara Booth*
Workshop session: Discuss in your groups what process and model/s of assessment would you consider implementing in your institution. What are some of the opportunities/challenges that you may face?
Morning Tea & Networking
College of Peers process with Deans Councils and alignment to accreditation: How do we align peer review of assessment with accreditation and threshold learning outcomes?

A/Prof Siegbert Schmid, University of Sydney; A/Prof Gwen Lawrie, University of Queensland; Dr Daniel Southam, Curtin; Prof Simon Pyke, The University of Adelaide; A/Prof Kieran Lim, Deakin University; Dr Madeleine Schultz, QUT; Samuel Priest, Adelaide; Prof Adam Bridgeman, Sydney; Dr Simon Bedford, UOW; Dr Ian Jamie, Macquarie

Presented by Sara Booth
Australian Council of Engineering Deans (ACED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>Peer review Calibration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Peer review Calibration</td>
<td>Reaccreditation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Organisational Support and Resources for External Assessors
- Report to accreditation body and HE institution
- Training for External Assessors
  - Calibration Workshop
  - Peer Review
Workshop session: Discuss in your groups what processes/policies need to be in place to align accreditation and peer review of assessment.
Institutional implementation and reporting processes for peer review of assessment: *How do you operationalise peer review of assessment across your institution?*

Prof John Jenkins, A/Prof Gail Wilson, Southern Cross University; Royson Valore, Western Sydney University; A/Prof Byeong-ho Kang, University of Tasmania; Elisa Cassin, Swinburne University of Technology
Testing national online peer review tool: *How do you establish an efficient, online process for peer review?*

**Victoria Johnson**, Education Services Australia
Feedback and Evaluation

Dr Sara Booth, University of Tasmania