

Notes for reviewers

Preparing reports

Within 3 weeks of receiving the relevant information and materials, you are required to submit the attached completed report to the project administrator of the university requesting the external referencing report.

Report structure and content

Please complete all of Part A: Sections 1 to 3 of the report. If there are additional comments or recommendations you wish to make, document these in Section 4 of the report.

Language of the report

In writing the report you should be aware that it may be discussed widely within departments and schools, and in forums that have a range of participants including students.

The language used in the report should reflect:

- sensitivity to the peer review nature of the process
- cognisance of a potentially wide audience for the report

General points

1. The university being reviewed will own the copyright of all the materials produced in relation to the review.
2. You will assign all present and future rights relating to the reports and any other materials created in relation to your appointment as an External Reviewer to the university being reviewed. You will also waive any rights including moral rights in connection with those materials.
3. The university being reviewed will make reasonable endeavours 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.
4. 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.

Notes for requesting university

Selection of units

The unit selected as part of the EROS Project should be from the final year or stage of the program and the assessment tasks put up for review should NOT be multi-stage ones – eg. those that contain several integrated assessment tasks.

Checklist for the university requesting the external referencing

The requesting university will provide the reviewer with the following information:

General points

- Program structure for the unit being reviewed
- List of Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)
- Specific PLOs relevant to the Unit being reviewed.

Unit

- Unit outline
- Unit Learning Outcomes (ULOs)
- Other unit learning guides that may be provided to students.

Assessment task

- Information provided to students setting out the assessment task and questions specific to the samples of student work
- Weighting of the assessment
- Assessment Guide (see Glossary of Terms. Also referred to as Assessment Rubrics, Grading Guides/Criteria).

Grading

- Grading scheme of the university as it applies to the samples of student work and explanations of nomenclature.

Samples of student work

Please read the guide *How to select samples of student work* in the **EROS Project Supporting Documentation and Information**.

- Samples of de-identified student work provided.

The Questionnaire is divided into Part A and B:

PART A: For Reviewers to complete

- Section 1: Program (PLOs) and Unit (ULO) Learning Outcomes
- Section 2: Assessment
- Section 3: Student Achievement Standards
- Section 4: Other matters you wish to raise

PART B: Response of the requesting University to the external referencing report

PART A: Section 1 | Program (PLOs) and Unit (ULO) Learning Outcomes

1. Are the Unit Learning Outcomes aligned with the relevant Program Learning Outcomes?

Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No

Comments / suggested changes.

Note: responses should pertain to the program selected for external referencing and not other programs the unit may be taught in.

2. Are the Unit Learning Outcomes appropriate for a final stage Unit at this AQF qualification level?

Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No

Comments / suggested changes.

PART A: Section 2 | Assessment

1. Does the assessment task enable students to demonstrate attainment of the relevant ULOs and PLOs?

Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No

Comments / suggested changes.

2. Is the description of the performance standards (eg. the marking guide/marketing criteria/assessment rubric/ annotated work samples) appropriate to the specified ULOs and PLOs?)

Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No

Comments / suggested changes.

PART A: Section 3 | Student Achievement Standards

1. Do you agree that the grades awarded reflect the level of student attainment?

Yes	Yes, but	No, but	No

Comments / suggested changes.

Note: please refer to the grading scheme and descriptors provided for this University and respond to each sample assessment.

2. Based on your review, do you consider the methods of assessment are capable of confirming that all relevant specified PLOs and ULOs are achieved?

Yes	No

Comments / suggested changes.

PART A: Section 4 | Other matters you wish to raise

1. Are there other matters not covered in Parts 1, 2 and 3 above that you wish to draw to the attention of the program team?

Yes	No

Please provide brief details.

PART B: Section 1 | Response of the requesting University to the external referencing report on the program *(to be completed by the Program Coordinator/Manager)*

Priorities for implementation from the review	What are the anticipated enhancements to the quality of the program and learning experience of students?	Date for completion	Responsibility