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Discussion paper (2016)
Options for a sixth cycle of academic audit for New Zealand/South Pacific universities

- 2015 External Review of AQA recommended AQA, consider, in consultation with universities and other stakeholders, how cycle 6 might be more focussed

- Methodological shift in Cycle 5 was that evidence played a significant role in self reviews and ... the willingness [opportunity] to be truly self critical could have been more fully developed

- Develop strategies for more specific benchmarking of actual practices and conduct workshops for universities in self evaluation

- AQA is not a regulator, places high levels of emphasis on peer review

- Role of Ako Aotearoa in quality enhancement projects

- Quality improvement and more importantly quality enhancement
**Booth model [2016] [based on ACED Model]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit preparation</th>
<th>Self-review by each institution</th>
<th>Identification of areas for improvement institutionally as well as sector challenges</th>
<th>External referencing and benchmarking with national/international comparators on these identified areas</th>
<th>Peer review and calibration workshop</th>
<th>Final Report with recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Composite/Both assurance and enhancement activities may require different methods/timelines and could run on different timelines
National University of Samoa: Proposed Benchmarking Project, actions and responsibilities 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider a Vice-Chancellors Consortium to identify strategic priorities in improving the quality of HE in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish an international Pacific HE Quality Network for benchmarking and peer review of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish database of network participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop Framework for benchmarking best practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop online database/clearinghouse of good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secretariat support on a rolling process. e.g. National University of Samoa to be first secretariat for Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identification of strategic priorities for the Network e.g. benchmarking literacy and numeracy in primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a collaborative agreement between all participating benchmarking institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with funding agencies to fund this proof-of-concept project for the Pacific and New Zealand HE institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE institutions consider ways of building institutional capacity and awareness in benchmarking and peer review of assessment to support programme review and accreditation, for e.g. a workshop on benchmarking and peer review of assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• 179 higher education providers

43 universities

Implementation January 1st, 2017

Massive change implications in terms of benchmarking, peer review of assessment and external referencing
### Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Domains</th>
<th>Relevant Standards</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domain 1: Student Participation and Attainment</td>
<td>1.4.1</td>
<td>The expected learning outcomes for each course of study are specified, consistent with the level and field of education of the qualification awarded, and informed by national and international comparators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domain 5: Institutional Quality Assurance</td>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.2</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                | 5.3.4              | Review and improvement activities include regular external referencing of the success of student cohorts against comparable courses of study, including:  
  a) analyses 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. |
Definitions of benchmarking
Definitions

Benchmarking

… a structured, collaborative, learning process for comparing practices, processes or performance outcomes. Its purpose is to identify comparative strengths and weaknesses, as a basis for developing improvements in academic quality. Benchmarking can also be defined as a quality process used to evaluate performance by comparing institutional practices to sector good practice. (TEQSA, 2014)
Benchmarking (Booth, 2013)

### Direction of Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Formative</th>
<th>External Summative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Information</td>
<td>2. Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Benchmarking of Data only</td>
<td>- Sector Benchmarking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Standards Benchmarking - Projects informed by research</td>
<td>- Standards Benchmarking - Projects informed by research and validated by external reference groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisational Roles

- **Administrative Staff/Managers**
  - 1. Information - Benchmarking of Data only
  - 2. Presentation - Sector Benchmarking - Ranking

- **Faculty**
  - 3. Research for Improvement - Standards Benchmarking - Projects informed by research
  - 4. Educational Research - Standards Benchmarking - Projects informed by research and validated by external reference groups

- **Senior Executives**

---

Calibration (2015)
Case study: University of Tasmania
Institutional Context: University of Tasmania

- Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 AUQA Audits
- Academic Quality and Standards Committee approved three benchmarking priorities for 2016:
  - Governance of third party arrangements;
  - Course Approval, Accreditation and Review Processes; and
  - Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching.
- Benchmarking Policy and Procedure
- Benchmarking Projects and Reports
- Online benchmarking tool
- Contract Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2009 | Academic transition support | Side of my desk 
Cycle 1 AUQA audit 
No evidence 
Data collection over email 
No policy 
No procedure 
No follow up on actions in Final Report 
Event not a process 
2 universities |
| 2010 | Assessment Policies and Processes | Whole of institution 
6 PhD Students to analyse the data 
Evidence patchy 
Graduate attributes missing in Science 
Bottom up approach 
Final Report commended by Quality Committee 
Rec 1: L&T Dashboard was implemented $750K 
Actions followed up by faculties 
3 universities |
Exemplar by HEA Report 
Teaching Resources 
Benchmarking Resources 
Teaching Performance Expectations 4 unis 
Higher Degree Program 
Final Report 
Informed significant review of Graduate Research Office 
Only 2 PhD students had been evaluated 
South American partnership with UOW/Deakin 3 unis |
| 2012 | Maritime Engineering Capstone Units | International partnership for benchmarking courses 
Evaluation activities patchy 
UTAS Online benchmarking tool 5 unis 
Faculty of Education 
Aligned to accreditation 
13 units literacy, numeracy early childhood 
Practicums, professional studies 5 unis |
<p>| 2013 | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project/Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>University Department of Rural Health Final Report Over 20 recommendations including research outcomes Based on partnership agreement and accreditation process 2 unis HDR Course Outcomes and Employability Benchmarked PREQ survey Used DDOGS Framework as guide OLT project 5 unis Pathway Partnerships Pathway processes and partnerships Partnership framework for UTAS 5 unis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Clinical Simulation, Alzheimer's, clinical placement, health literacy Actions followed up by faculties Clinical Simulation Strategy Informed accreditation for nursing 2 unis International Student Experience and Student Employability Student employability survey ISB Informed restructure of DVC and Global Engagement 2 unis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>International student employability and mobility Global Think Tank Summit Final Report Increased emphasis on employers/links to local government Recommendations to Department of Education and Universities Australia Research consultancy, HERDC points 10 unis, 4 countries Ako Aotearoa Benchmarking Project on Teaching Quality, Student Success, Curriculum Quality, assessment, support for academic staff Ako Aotearoa commissioned project Final Report and institutional outcomes Informed audit reports for New Zealand Universities Research consultancy, HERDC points Submitted to the Productivity Commission 7 unis, 3 countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Quality-Curriculum Review and Third Party Arrangements In progress Strategy and Schedule for Institutional Benchmarking Consultancy 5 unis Council of Private Higher Education (COPHE) Student support Attrition, retention, Completion Student support processes QILT/Department of Education Sector Report/Workshop Consultancy 31 private providers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UTAS: Benchmarking and peer review

Problems that have arisen:

- Finding partners to benchmark with, aligning to other HE strategic initiatives
- Finding peer reviewers/reviewees
- Time it takes to sign MOU/Collaborative agreements
- Lack of evidence
- Screaming academics—How dare you do this to me? Don’t you know that I am the best in Australia! Issues in change management
- Difficulty in benchmarking against comparators and finding similarities and differences
- Security of data over email
- Sheer enormity of data over email
- Language and definitions in peer review and benchmarking
- Scheduling reviews
- Monitoring reviews, following up with academics that haven’t completed their reviews
- Manually reporting on benchmarking and reviews
- Follow up actions and responsibilities
- Resourcing—one person
- Costs for organising a benchmarking project
- Seen as an administrative quality exercise, not recognised as research
Benchmarking Process

- Who is preparing the institutional context statements?
- What data and self review information will be shared?
- Where and when will the peer review take place?
- How long will the peer review workshop take?
- Who will coordinate the peer review?
- How will the benchmark partners contribute to the workshop?
- What evaluation strategies will be used?
5 snapshots: Benchmarking projects
Snapshot 1: HEA Benchmarking Project

1. University of Wollongong, Aust
2. University of Tasmania, Aust
3. University of Leicester, UK
4. Newcastle University, UK
Snapshot 2: Ako Aotearoa Benchmarking Project

1. Auckland University of Technology
2. Lincoln University
3. Birmingham City University
4. The Arts University Bournemouth
5. Swinburne University
6. University of Tasmania
7. Victoria University

- Repeated recommendation in Academic Audit reports conducted by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand’s Universities (Cameron, 2015)
Snapshot 3: International Student Employability & Mobility Benchmarking Project 2015-2016

1. Edith Cowan University (ECU), Australia
2. Massey University, New Zealand
3. Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada
4. Plymouth University, United Kingdom
5. Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
6. Ulster University, Ireland
7. University of Otago, New Zealand
8. University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom
9. University of Tasmania, Australia
10. University of Wollongong, Australia

Australia China Business Council (ACBC)
Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN)
Australian Government Department of Education and Training
CPA Australia
Federal Group, Tasmania
Hobart City
High Commission of Canada
Higher Education Academy (HEA)
Higher Education Services (HES)
Navitas
Stornaway, Tasmania
St Ann’s Homes, Tasmania
Tasmanian Government and Department of Education
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)
The Australian Industry Group (Ai Group)
The International Education Association of Australia (IEAA)
University of Auckland
Universities Australia (UA)
Universities New Zealand (UNZ)
Snapshot 4: Council of Higher Education Private Providers (COPHE)

The aims of this national benchmarking project are to:

1. Compare first year transition support practices and pathways with HE institutions;
2. Compare student cohort data [retention, completion, attrition] in first year courses/programs/papers;
3. Compare student experience data in first year [for e.g. item student support in Student Experience Survey (SES) or other comparative survey data]

Four key outcomes for this benchmarking project include:

1. National workshop [16 & 17 June, 2016]. Day 1 is the AIR SIG Forum which ACER has kindly invited COPHE members to presentations from TEQSA, QILT, a session on private providers and universities; and a SIG Group for Private Providers. Day 2 will be hosted by Tabor Adelaide and will focus on presentations from the Department of Education on HEIMS data and student cohort analysis data and introduction to benchmarking project.
2. Peer review workshop: Areas of good practice, areas for improvement and areas for sharing [late October, 2016];
3. Final Report with individual recommendations for each institution [November, 2016];
4. Report to the COPHE Board and TEQSA.
Performance Measure 1.1: Aligned policies and organisational structures in course approval [1.1a and 1.1i]

Discussion: Areas of good practice, areas for improvement or further development and areas for sharing

Recording: Change ratings if necessary; add institutional and national recommendations

---

Step 1
Self review process
Self Review Report

Step 2
Calibration and validation process
Peer Review Workshop

Step 3
Record changes and recommendations
Peer Review Workshop

Step 4
Identify actions and accountabilities
Final Report

SAMPLE

Sector Gaps
Sector Strengths
### 1.1a Aligned plans, policies and organisational structures

What institutional plans and policies are in place to ensure support for students transitioning in the first year of study?

#### Ratings for Performance Measure 1.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, but</th>
<th>Yes, but</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Academies Australia</td>
<td>1. Australasian College of Health and Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Adelaide College of Ministries</td>
<td>2. Australian College of Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Alphacrucis College</td>
<td>3. Engineering Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Australian Institute of Business</td>
<td>4. Excelsia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Australian Institute of Management</td>
<td>5. International College of Management Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Eastern College</td>
<td>7. Macleay College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. John Paul II Institute</td>
<td>8. Marcus Oldham College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Sydney College of Divinity</td>
<td>10. Moore Theological College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11. Perth Bible College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Photography Studies College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Universal Business School Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14. UOW College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of good practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defined plans and policies</th>
<th>Institutional Plans outlining the UOW College planning framework: UOWC Strategic Plan; UOWC Business Plan; UOWC Annual Operating Plan; and UOWC Education Strategy. Institutional Policies in Place: Admissions Policy; Academic Consideration Policy; Assessment Policy; Attendance Policy; Course Progress Policy; Credit for Prior Learning Policy; Deferment Suspension and Cancellation Policy; Feedback Policy; Fees and refund Policy; Graduate Qualities Policy; Homestay Fees and Refund; International Student Transfer; Between Providers Policy; Student Academic Integrity Policy; Student Conduct Policy; Student Disability Policy; and Student Grievance Policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We have a significant number of plans and policies related to students transitioning. We also have particular staff roles that are dedicated to supporting students and first year students in particular - it is part of their job.</td>
<td><strong>Areas for improvement/further development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for students transitioning in their first year of the degree is integral to achieving student retention, progression and success. The overarching rationale is derived from the Student Engagement Strategy, the PSC Student Consultation and Support Policy, the Teaching and Learning Plans,</td>
<td>• Institutional programs in place to support all students during the course of their studies. The programs are not necessarily documented in formal policies or plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Plans outlining the UOW College planning framework:</strong> UOWC Strategic Plan; UOWC Business Plan; UOWC Annual Operating Plan; and UOWC Education Strategy. <strong>Institutional Plans in Place:</strong> Admissions Policy; Academic Consideration Policy; Assessment Policy; Attendance Policy; Course Progress Policy; Credit for Prior Learning Policy; Deferment Suspension and Cancellation Policy; Feedback Policy; Fees and refund Policy; Graduate Qualities Policy; Homestay Fees and Refund; International Student Transfer; Between Providers Policy; Student Academic Integrity Policy; Student Conduct Policy; Student Disability Policy; and Student Grievance Policy.</td>
<td>• Has no specific policies exist for students transitioning in their first year of study, only generic policies that apply to all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic plan, has a focus on 'student experience' but this is overarching to all students and not focused on first-year students and their support</td>
<td>• Has good intentions and multiple initiatives to help ensure support for students transition into the MBA (but no written document or plan articulating how the various initiatives together provide evidence of appropriate support for students transitioning into study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Areas for improvement/further development</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Development of policy outlining required components of an orientation program is an action item on the Thresholds Standards 2015 Work Plan. ACT’s e-Learning Panel has begun work on this.
Snapshot 5 : Quality Benchmarking Project: OBJECTIVES

1. To compare institutional course approval and accreditation, review and third party arrangement processes across 5 universities; and
2. Identify areas of good practice, areas for improvement/development and areas for sharing.

OUTCOMES
- Agreed benchmarking template on processes for course accreditation, approval and review and third party arrangements;
- Ethics proposal and approval through the University of Tasmania to undertake this national project;
- Self-Review Report and institutional recommendations submitted on the UTAS online benchmarking tool;
- Training for institutional coordinators in coordinating a benchmarking session at the peer review workshop;
- Peer review workshop: Areas of good practice, areas for improvement/development and areas for sharing [14-15 November, 2016]
- Final Report with institutional recommendations for the academic governing bodies of each institution and case studies [January, 2017];
1.3f Professional accreditation process

Is there an online process for accreditation? If so, how does this work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No, but</th>
<th>Yes, but</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Curtin</td>
<td>2. UTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratings for Performance Measure 1.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3 Ratings</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3b</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3c</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3d</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3e</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3f</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of good practice

- **QUT**: The CTRP (Course Transformation and Reaccreditation Plan) is an online tool which is used to capture professional accreditation information. It is not yet integrated with other systems however a range of current activities occurring in the university may better support this online into the future, e.g. PIMMS, Compass. In the past QUT Business School Teaching and Learning team have implemented an ‘Electronic Base Room’ to assist with onsite accreditation. The ‘Electronic Base Room’ includes electronic course information which pertains to the design, implementation and experience of delivering all QUT Business School courses. Other faculties through documents and site visits.

- **Curtin**: No. Some accreditation bodies have an online submission process (e.g. Nursing). AKARI supports the approval process of curriculum changes arising from Accreditation activities. **COMMENTARY**: The university has clearly outlined policies and procedures that cover Course Approval (CAP) processes. CAP is well supported by centrally developed templates and a dedicated team that work with Schools. A new curriculum management system that provides online support for course approval and workflow was launched 14 November 2016. Subsequent releases focus on curriculum mapping and accreditation modules, and unit outline builder and repository functions. The university has clearly outlined policies and procedures that cover Comprehensive Course Review (CCR) and Annual Course Review (ACR) processes. The CCR is well supported by centrally developed templates and a dedicated team that work with Faculties to establish the schedule or reviews, and negotiate around school priorities, staffing and accreditation activities.

### Areas for improvement/further development

- Recommend continued improvement in this space. The ACR process is about to be supported by a BI Dashboard tool. The ACR template will also include section on monitoring of Action plans subsequent to accreditation of CCR. There will be online reporting of the ACR. Review of Course Approval and Quality Manual planned for 2017.

- Addition of policy on Course accreditation

- Clarification of reporting of CCR so that it is visible at ULTC and Courses Committee.

- Formal introduction of Action plans to monitoring reports from CCR and Accreditation at University Courses Committee (introduced 2016)

- Finalisation of priority course approval process

### ACTIONS UNDERWAY 2016

- Need to establish clear link between Accreditation / Comprehensive Course Review and Annual Course Review processes (in train 2016)

- Improved implementation and support of ACR (in train 2016)

- Better monitoring of CCR and ACR at Faculty and Centrally (in train 2017)

- Priority Course Approval process — initiated, consultation to implement in 2017
Having two days to talk about excellence in teaching in such depth with such openness was an inspiration. For me, when I think of the last few days: all the hallmarks that OLT aspires to. I did have a deep belief that collaboration, particularly across institutions and internationally, is what builds innovation and leadership for innovation and I saw all that here today.

[Ako Aotearoa Benchmarking Project, 2015]
Peer Review of Assessment
An Agenda for Australian HE 2013-2016: A smarter Australia

• Theme 1: Increase Australians’ university participation
• Theme 2: Develop a globally engaged university sector
• Theme 3: A powerful research and innovation system that drives economic and social progress
• Theme 4: Efficiency, investment and regulation

University actions

• Introduce external peer moderation of assessment standards
• Integrate technologies to support teaching and enhance the student experience
Definition of peer review of assessment

‘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’ (Booth et al, 2015).
## Comparing Peer Review Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verification (e.g. QVS, IRU)</th>
<th>Moderation (eg. LaTS)</th>
<th>Calibration &amp; Double Blind (eg. AMA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary intent</strong></td>
<td>QA (&amp; QE)</td>
<td>QA (&amp; QE)</td>
<td>QA &amp; QE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Selected final UoS</td>
<td>Selected final UoS</td>
<td>Selected degree standards/TLOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplines</strong></td>
<td>Multiple (11)</td>
<td>Multiple (12)</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>Bachelor + Master</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviewers</strong></td>
<td>1 academic</td>
<td>1 academic per partner</td>
<td>2 anonymous academics +/- professionals (3rd potentially)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards</strong></td>
<td>Implicit in reviewers</td>
<td>Implicit in reviewers</td>
<td>Explicit (agreed nationally 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calibrated</strong></td>
<td>Not explicitly</td>
<td>Not explicitly</td>
<td>Yes by workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Products viewed</strong></td>
<td>Tasks (inputs) &amp; outputs in final unit of study</td>
<td>Tasks (inputs) &amp; outputs in final unit of study</td>
<td>Tasks (inputs) &amp; outputs in degree evidencing standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data selection</strong></td>
<td>Stratified</td>
<td>Stratified &amp; de-identified</td>
<td>Random &amp; de-identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample outputs</strong></td>
<td>12=3 per grade</td>
<td>4=1 per passing grade</td>
<td>Minimum 5 per agreed standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reviews</strong></td>
<td>Manual submission files &amp; aggregation</td>
<td>Manual submission files &amp; aggregation</td>
<td>Online submission &amp; auto aggregation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Disciplinary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Context setting: Peer review of assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building capacity for peer review and evaluation of practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Scholar Networks and Threshold Learning Outcomes projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Verification System (QVS), Innovative Research Universities (IRU), Academic Calibration Process; Achievement Matters (Watty et al., 2014); Inter-University Moderation Project (Krause et al., 2014); External Examiner System (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness of purpose and fitness for purpose of assessment: Emeritus Prof Geoff Scott: Peer review of program level outcomes (2015). Also builds on Scott’s (2014) work on networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review of Assessment Network (Booth, et al., 2015): national support mechanism for peer review of assessment; feedback also pointed to other forms of peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewan, C. &amp; Freeman, M. (2015) Found evidence of improved assessment practices with the development of threshold learning outcomes (TLOs); the establishment of networks; and the important role Deans Councils play in leading efforts on academic standards. Yet, they also found three noticeable gaps: 1) the absence of non-self-accrediting and private providers in these academic quality projects; 2) the lack of an evidence base for quality assurance; and 3) the lack of external referencing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National support mechanism for peer review of assessment
# National Support Mechanism for Peer Review of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>✔ University Networks ✔ UTAS/collaboration</td>
<td>Strong, deft leadership of networks External reference group</td>
<td>Good practice principles in peer review</td>
<td>✔ Online Peer Review Portal ✔ National clearinghouse of good practice in assessment (Flip Curric website) ✔ Training for the Peer Review Portal ✔ National workshops/Forum[Higher Ed Services/UTAS]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE institution</td>
<td>Institutional networks, mission groups such as IRU</td>
<td>Clear roles for different players, AD L&amp;T, Quality Managers, Course/Program/Discipline Coordinators</td>
<td>✔ Academic governance, ✔ accreditation, course review, assessment, reward &amp; recognition</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


## National Support Mechanism for Peer Review of Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Dimensions</th>
<th>Networks</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Deans Councils (AD L&amp;T Networks) and accreditation bodies</td>
<td>Leadership of network&lt;br&gt;✓ 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>Individual</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>
Aligning Accreditation to Peer Review of Assessment

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>
Feedback from Higher Ed Services Workshops on Peer Review of Assessment May-July, 2016

- Sector readiness for online peer review portal and numerous templates
- Regional series of workshops
- Sector readiness for professional development workshops on peer review and accreditation
- Sector support for certificates of participation
- More details on costs of collaboration for HE institutions undertaking peer review
- Ability to contact numerous reviewers
- Consolidated access point for peer review resources
- Online network like Linked in-if looking for collaborative networks
- Online discussion forums, video or SMS contact-for quick chat to verify any questions
Feedback from Higher Ed Services Workshops on Peer Review of Assessment May-July, 2016

PEER REVIEW PORTAL

- Webinars and online training for peer review and calibration
- Industry representatives provide feedback
- Ability to monitor both admin and academic hours
- Monitor number of reviews status
- Scheduling of reviews
- Ability to upload multiple mode documents
- Intuitive and user friendly
- Reporting of outcomes of the process of peer review, accreditation and calibration
- Downloadable at course, faculty and institutional level
Collaboration with Higher Ed Services, Professions Australia and the University of Tasmania 2017

Universities Australia and Professions Australia: Joint Statement of Principles for Professional Accreditation (2016)

• Universities Australia Conference (February, 2017)
On Tuesday February 28, HES, the University of Tasmania and Professions Australia will host an afternoon probing professional accreditation and peer review of assessment in the lead up to the 2017 Universities Australia annual conference.

• 2017 Peer Review of Assessment Workshops (March-April, 2017)
The full day workshops in Melbourne, Brisbane, Fremantle and Sydney are designed to:
  • Support the sector as it implements the new Higher Education Standards Framework (2015)
  • Promote innovation in different models of peer review in learning and teaching
  • Demonstrate a peer review of assessment portal
  • Provide opportunities for networking and connecting with colleagues
  • Provide access to resources to support peer review and assessment.

• National Assessment and Review Summit (19-20th September, 2017)

• TEQSA Conference and Higher Education Compliance and Quality Forum [29th November- 1 December, 2017]
Peer Review Portal
Peer Review Portal
Please select a project type.

- **PEER REVIEW OF ASSESSMENT: INPUTS/OUTPUTS**
  As part of the University of Tasmania, you are currently able to create unlimited peer reviews.

- **CURRICULUM REVIEW**
  Aenean eu leo quam. Pellentesque ornare sem lacinia quam venenatis vestibulum. Aenean lacinia bibendum nulla sed consectetur.

- **BENCHMARKING**
  Donec ullamcorper nulla non metus auctor fringilla. Cras mattis consectetur purus sit amet fermentum.

**CONTINUE**
Online Peer Review Portal

Phase 1: Peer review of assessment inputs/outputs [Feb, 2017]
Phase 2: Curriculum review [May, 2017]
Phase 3: Benchmarking [later in 2017]

Proof of Concept
http://nagnqs.axshare.com/#c=2

Register your expression of interest to know more:
Peerreviewportal.com
This Month Total Projects:

- **95** in progress
- **80** pending
- **12** closed

Total submitted: **286**
Total users: **126**

Overview for University of Tasmania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>INSTITUTIONS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>VIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project name</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2 SEP 2016</td>
<td>VIEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total new: 215 projects

VIEW ALL
Faculty of Education : Proposed Draft Plan: Master of Teaching

The units suggested for external review in 2017 and 2019 reflect a focus of accrediting bodies on literacy and numeracy in teacher education and involve both our primary and secondary specialisations, representing all four semesters of the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Planning Plan peer review of assessment activity and consider potential benchmarking partners</td>
<td>Calibration A college of peers is engaged in the first round of external referencing and peer review of assessment</td>
<td>Adjustment Feedback is analysed and generates ideas for revision where appropriate</td>
<td>Moderation A college of peers is engaged in the second round of external referencing and peer review of assessment</td>
<td>Consolidation Feedback informs actions to fine-tune the course ahead of the next accreditation cycle as part of ongoing improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Faculty leadership and University in consultation with the MTeach team</td>
<td>EMT511 Foundations of English EMT611 English Curriculum and Pedagogy</td>
<td>All MTeach unit coordinators</td>
<td>EMT521 Teaching Primary Mathematics 1 EMT620 Teaching Primary Mathematics 2</td>
<td>EMT520 Personal and Professional Numeracy EMT525 Teaching the 7-12 Mathematics Curriculum EMT625 Grade 7-12 Students as Mathematics Learners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• What are the next steps for Irish HE institutions on benchmarking, peer review of assessment and external referencing to assure the quality of provision?