

Date
ACP Coordinator
Preferred Contact
Email

IRU Academic Calibration Process

External Reviewer Report

While the information provided by reviewers may be collated and published by the University, individual review reports and the names of reviewers will not be publically available.

Reviewer Details

Name:	
Home Institution:	
Discipline Area:	
Area of Expertise:	

Unit/Subject Review Coversheet¹

Prepare one of these reports for each unit/subject or capstone project reviewed.

IRU University:	
Field of education:	
Unit/subject reviewed (unit/subject code):	
Sample size (# assessment items):	

Statement of potential conflicts of interest

For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the unit/subject being reviewed.

¹ Adapted from the University of Cambridge's Report Coversheet for External Examiners (2009), retrieved 10 May, 2011, from www.admin.cam.ac.uk/offices/education/examiners/eecoversheet.pdf

Review of grades awarded

Number of assessments	Pass	Credit	Distinction	High Distinction
Reviewed in total				
Agree with grade awarded				
Believe grade awarded to be unduly high				
Believe grade awarded to be unduly low				

Please provide reasons for disagreeing with any of the grades awarded.

Summary Judgement

Please tick one of the following three options for your overall summary judgment of the unit/subject you have reviewed.

<p>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the unit/subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</p> <p>Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the unit/subject and its assessment.</p>	
<p>The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the unit/subject I have reviewed were appropriate.</p> <p>HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the unit/subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.</p>	
<p>There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning, outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the unit/subject I have reviewed.</p> <p>These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.</p>	

Comments

Additional points to consider whilst providing your summary judgment and comments:

- How do the specific learning outcomes and student achievements compare with those in similar universities?
- Are the key issues which should be brought to the attention of supervising committees in the faculty/department/school division or wider university?
- Are there examples of good practice that might be noted and disseminated more widely as appropriate?

Review of specified learning objectives

1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

Not at all	Somewhat	Adequately	Very Well	Completely
------------	----------	------------	-----------	------------

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for the unit/subject in its delivery year?

Not at all	Somewhat	Adequately	Very Well	Completely
------------	----------	------------	-----------	------------

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of units/subjects from similar universities in the same delivery year?

Additional points to consider whilst reviewing the learning objectives:

- To what extent are the learning objectives “precise, challenging and complete”, (Laurillard 2002:183)?
- How do the capstone unit/subject learning outcomes match the course learning outcomes?

Review of assessment task

1. To what extent is the assessment task suitable for the specified learning objectives? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

Not at all	Somewhat	Adequately	Very Well	Completely
------------	----------	------------	-----------	------------

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

2. To what extent is the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

Not at all	Somewhat	Adequately	Very Well	Completely
------------	----------	------------	-----------	------------

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

3. To what extent is the assessment task and the marking criteria appropriate for a unit/subject in its delivery year? Please mark the box that best represents your view.

Not at all	Somewhat	Adequately	Very Well	Completely
------------	----------	------------	-----------	------------

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

Review of assessment task (cont)

4. How does the assessment task and the marking criteria compare with unit/subjects from similar universities in the same delivery year?

Additional points to consider whilst reviewing the assessment task:

- To what extent is the assessment task timed appropriately?
- Based on the material provided for the review, to what extent have the assessment items provided been graded in a rigorous, equitable and fair manner?

Additional Comments

Please provide any additional comments you may consider useful or use this space to elaborate on any of the sections above.

Notes for ACP External Reviewers²

Submitting ACP reports to the University

1. Within two weeks of receiving the relevant materials, you are required to submit a written report to the ACP coordinator of the university being reviewed.
2. Reports should be addressed and sent to the ACP coordinator of the university for which you conducted the review (see below a list of ACP coordinators for all the IRU universities).
3. You will be paid an honorarium of \$600 after your reports have been submitted.

Report structure and content

1. Your report is expected to address the following key questions for each subject you review:
 - Are the learning outcomes appropriate?
 - Are the learning outcomes comparable to those of final year subjects in similar universities?
 - Are assessment processes and the determination of grades sound and fairly conducted based on the materials that have been provided for the review?
2. Avoid discussing individual staff by name as your report will be considered by the committees of the relevant Faculties/Departments/Schools which are likely to include student representatives.
3. In general, you will draw upon your academic experience and judgment to review the materials provided to you. The following is a list of issues which are suggested for inclusion in your ACP report³.

Suggestions for review of specified learning objectives

- To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient?
- To what extent are the learning objectives “precise, challenging and complete” (Laurillard 2002: 183)?
- How do the learning objectives specified for the unit/subject compare with those of final year units/subjects in similar universities?

Suggestions for review of the assessment task and assessment processes

- To what extent is the assessment task suitable for the

specified learning objectives?

- To what extent is the assessment task timed appropriately?
- Is the language used in the assessment task unambiguous, appropriate and inclusive of all students?
- Are the marking criteria sufficiently clear?
- How does the assessment task and marking criteria compare with those of final year units/subjects in similar universities?
- Based on the materials provided for the review, to what extent have the assessment items provided been graded in a rigorous, equitable and fair manner?

Suggestions for overall summary comments

- How do the specified learning outcomes and student achievements compare with those of final year units/subjects in similar universities?
- Are there key issues which should be brought to the attention of supervising committees in the faculty/department/school, or wider university?
- Are there examples of good practice that might be noted and disseminated more widely as appropriate?

General points

1. Submitted reports will only be used in accordance with IRU member university policy (for the monitoring of academic standards within the institution).
2. The university being reviewed will own the copyright of all the materials produced in relation to the ACP review.
3. You will assign all present and future rights relating to the reports and any other materials created in relation to your appointment as a ACP External Reviewer to the university being reviewed. You will also waive any rights including moral rights in connection with those materials.
4. The university being reviewed will make reasonable endeavors to ensure the accurate reproduction of material and information provided by you; all other warranties and undertakings are excluded, including liability for direct or indirect loss to you.
5. You give consent to the university being reviewed to publish any part of your report, electronically or in hard-copy, in internal or publicly accessible websites, reports and/or brochures

Please return your completed report coversheet and materials to the ACP coordinator in the university which you have undertaken the review for:

University

Charles Darwin University
Flinders University
Griffith University
James Cook University
La Trobe University
Murdoch University

ACP coordinator

Abbey Murray
Chris Reid
Cecilia Arrigoni
Mariana Van Niekerk
Regan Martin
Alison Black

Email

abbey.murray@cdu.edu.au
chris.reid@flinders.edu.au
c.arrigoni@griffith.edu.au
mariana.vanniekerk@jcu.edu.au
R.Marten@latrobe.edu.au
A.Black@murdoch.edu.au

² Adapted from the University of Cambridge's coversheet for external examination

³ Adapted from the QAA code of practice on external examination (2004)

