

**Peer Review: Course Design Practice
Report Template for Academic Promotion Applications**

Peer Reviewer details:

Reviewer's name	
Reviewer's school/faculty/division	Faculty of Arts and Education
Reviewer from same Faculty <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> or Reviewer not from same Faculty <input type="checkbox"/>	Discipline expert <input type="checkbox"/> or Learning and teaching expert <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

To be completed with the Peer Reviewee during the pre-observation meeting:

Reviewee's name	
Faculty and School	Faculty of Arts and Education
Brief description of role in faculty (brief overview of your work and responsibilities, committees, etc.)	Course Director
Subject Design Element Reviewed	
Dimensions chosen for peer review (Comment on any of the dimensions that you would like the peer reviewer to highlight)	Course Review - Process and Procedures Course Review - Leadership
Other Dimension (optional)	Course Director - Leadership & Engagement
List of courses, etc.	

Peer Review Report: Course Design Practice

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>1. Lead to ensure course design quality and engaged student experience:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated capacity for leadership in course design and evaluation, teaching and learning, leadership in the use of e-learning technologies and proficiency in application of course data for implementation, and quality assurance.</p> <p>b) Demonstrated application of CSU policies and model for developing learning and teaching, including course design, implementation, performance evaluation and improvement, student advisory processes and administrative functions.</p>	<p>The course design process means an extended period of time in pre, during and post implementation. For the benefit of this document, The review refers to the Design and Implementation of the xxx which as Course director I managed the data analysis and transition from 2 courses with 13 specialisations, to one course with 5 specialisations (and simultaneously growing student options).</p> <p>My role in the design and evaluation has been described as 'setting the benchmark' for expectations across the faculty and is now used by Executive Dean and Associate Dean Academic as an exemplar of how to approach review in the faculty.</p> <p>As part of the implementation process I have championed the university trialling several E-Learning tools which will ensure greater parity between internal and online students. These specifically include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PeePSO (which will allow staff to have cohorts return to previous years' content - and to speak across cohort years in subjects). This will be a university first for this kind of cohort conversation. It will also integrate in future with industry mentorship capacities to enable pre-during and post university mentorship. 2. Slack (which allows us to set up projects, have internal students work in real time, then deliver 'deliverables' to online students in alternate time zones to complete overnight - so our internals can wake up and pick up projects. We will be using industry leading internationalisation software that allows us to manage peer interactions and projects in real time). 3. DIT VDI - Working in collaboration with the FOAE technical team we have worked with DIT to agree to a pilot Virtual Desktop Interface... This creates complete parity of experience between internal and distance students (and in the future eliminates unsightly lab based class rooms and pushes BYOD to its logical limits). <p>CSU policies followed throughout. Where necessary clarification sought and applied from governance.</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>xxx led the course design process for the xxxx. I have been involved at various points throughout the process as a participant at Faculty level and as a member of various committees that include course related discussions. Throughout the review xxx met institutional deadlines and ensured that the work completed aligned with governance requirements. Course data available via SPI and other institutional sources was presented by xxx at the Faculty stage process meetings and internal/external stakeholder meetings to inform decisions made.</p>	

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>2. Lead and nurture course teams:</p> <p>a) Demonstrate leadership and collaborative practice with internal and external stakeholders to achieve goals and objectives.</p> <p>b) Demonstrated knowledge and skill in the educational design of courses and/or subjects, including experience in problem solving in all aspects of the course review, design and implementation process.</p> <p>c) Demonstrated ability to apply collaborative processes in a timely manner to ensure finalisation and delivery of course design and implementation, and to meet University governance, academic and administrative requirements.</p> <p>d) Demonstrate collaboration with other Course Directors, and the Division of Student Learning in building a community of practice for professional learning and sharing of good practice in course design.</p>	<p>a) The xxxx course review process required academic leadership in managing an enormous number of internal and external stakeholders across a sustained period of engagement. This included;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Direct School and Faculty based Academic Staff. ii) Academic staff across faculties through support teaching-arrangements. iii) Administrative and Support staff within the Faculty. iv) Divisional staff including DFM, DSA, DIT, DSL, Library, DivMark&Com, SPI, Finance and more. v) Executive Deans of all faculties. vi) Indigenous Board of Studies. vii) External National and International Tertiary Advisors. viii) Industry Advisory Panels. <p>These engagements remain as ongoing collaborations as the course now rolls-out.</p> <p>b) The course review required an incredibly complex series of problems that demanded creative solutions. These included, but were not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Progression rate differentials between specialisations fluctuating between 96% and 71% meaning proposed solutions needed to work for a very broad progression data set. <p>Solution 1 being trialled is to allow numerous progression pathways rather than a single fixed progression pathway - allowing different students to progress in different ways - and at different rates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii) Attrition statistics varying widely between 5% and 42% meaning proposed solutions needed to work for a broad range of attrition statistics. <p>Solution 1 being trialled is to provide more exit-points including Diploma (allowing for more flexible exit).</p> <p>Solution 2 being trialled is to allow numerous progression pathways meaning students no longer get 'stuck' at pinch points that caused attrition.</p> <p>Solution 3 was to more clearly delineate out AQF levels and match content to AQF expectations so that subject content and expectations are more clearly delineated across years.</p> <p>Solution 4 was to recode all subjects so that level 1xx, 2xx and 3xx actually aligned properly and provided students clear knowledge of the level of subject</p>

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
	<p>expectations.</p> <p>Solution 5 was to take GLO statements and map them in to the course (with Bloom's Taxonomy) which resulted in the redesign of over 60 subjects - measuring much clearer pathways between subjects.</p> <p>iii) Cohort Mix Differentials between percentage School Leaver/Non-School Leaver, demographics, psychographics and modes of study (Campus/Online/FT/PT etc).</p> <p>Solution 1 - Work with DSA to determine new standard criteria statements for admissions allowing for greater access to school leaver market. Institute xxx pathway that meets government transparency regulations and removes ATAR criterion.</p> <p>Solution 2 - Re-work course pathways to allow more flexible delivery between on campus and online cohorts - and increase cross cohort collaboration. Introduce single cross cohort project management tools - allowing cross cohort discussion, and, cross year discussion and access.</p> <p>Solution 3 - Take demographic data, apply to forward projections of school leaver numbers with a view to measure likely impact on campus of future capacity and initiate plan for scaleable degree offering (subject availability is massively scaleable between 22 and 90 offerings).</p> <p>c) All stages of course review delivered on time and on budget. Final stage course review to Faculty Course Committee delivered early.</p> <p>d) The process I undertook in review now has me on several panels informing the course review process across the university. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Appointment on xxx ii) Appointment by xxx. iii) Appointment to xxx iv) Membership on Course Directors Leadership Forum to lead best practice across faculties. v) Asked to deliver two training sessions to all FOAE Course Directors

Reviewer Comments

The complexity of the course review that xxx led cannot be stated enough. Not only did xxx work with two existing courses and develop a single, innovative course, xxx had to contend with multiple specialisations and monitor connections and potential implications of changes made for other courses. The range of stakeholders included in the consultation and feedback processes was extensive as indicated in part (a) of this response. xxx course documentation also clearly demonstrates the respectful manner in which xxx responded to all feedback through the provision of a rationale for all decisions made.

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>3. Facilitate the giving and receiving of feedback:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated high level written and oral communication skills, including influencing, facilitating, presenting, active listening, providing constructive feedback and capacity to work effectively with others and build strong partnerships with colleagues, academic and administrative units, and the profession</p>	<p>1. At the most recent FOAE Course Directors Forum I delivered two sessions to all Faculty Course Directors, Sub Dean (Academic), Sub Dean (Learning and Teaching), Associate Dean (Academic) and Deputy Dean.</p> <p>This include a 40+ page booklet to follow up with more information for attendees. I have extended the opportunity to staff to have me facilitate other sessions as necessary to help with processes.</p> <p>2. My relationship with other areas within and outside the faculty have meant that I can lead the university with DSA in alternate admissions methods in response to the admissions transparency governmental requirement</p> <p>Working with Course Team, Course Administration Officer, and Technical Manager - Dev Ops FOAE to create a complete matrix to graduation for all Phase out students - a first for the university that accurately reflects exact timelines to subject phase outs.</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>xxxx asked me to observe the sessions presented at the FoAE Course Director forum. I wrote a reflection on this for xxx and noted that <i>“strengths of the workshops included the way in which xxx engaged with Course Directors prior to xxx design of the session in order to determine issues pertinent to them, xxx development of a comprehensive workbook and ability to adjust xxx instruction to cater for the needs and understanding of the participants.”</i> It would be fair to say that xxx engaged participants in quite complex concepts and was able to keep everyone on track. xxx was able to present to xxx peers in an engaging way and constructed activities that were relevant to the role of a Course Director.</p>	

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>4. Monitor, analyse, interpret and report course data:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated analysis and provision of advice to the Faculty Leaders and Head of School in relation to key metrics of progression, attrition, enrolment, EFTSL and course growth/viability.</p> <p>b) Demonstrated provision on the, performance outcomes, development and review.</p> <p>c) Demonstrate monitoring of pathway and partnership arrangements.</p>	<p>Throughout the Review Process I needed to access, analyse and act on a great number of data sets. In response to some of my requests SPI set up the Course Directors Dashboard (of which my courses were the trial). I delivered all documents on time to a standard to the faculty executive that was described throughout the process as exemplary. Other Course Directors described it with frequency to me as 'providing an exemplar from which they can work'.</p> <p>Performance will require continuous measurement. The HoS/CD relationship remains and in seeing through the review a process of prioritisation has been developed to ensure the review Academics (xxx) and Learning Designer xxx have been attached to specific course and School KPI targets linked directly to School/Faculty I&I plans.</p> <p>Pathway and Partnership arrangements have been strengthened through this relationship - with clearer job-pathways created. Partnerships with industry have been expanded - and further review is necessary to ensure we can truly capitalise on industry interest pursuant to the new degrees.</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Data centrally informed the course review process. xxx was very clear at each meeting about what elements needed to be followed up and the implications of this on the progress of the review. xxx has an extremely close working relationship with his Head of School (HoS) and fellow Course Director (CD). As a School-based course leadership team they managed content across both courses that were being reviewed in a strategic way. The volume of work that was progressing through the School, and the impact this had on staff, and the need to effectively manage this was significant. Over 100 subject profiles were produced and reviewed by the School Board sub-committee. The pro-active working relationship of xxx, his HoS and fellow CD has been referenced as an exemplar to other teams in the Faculty.</p>	
<p>5. Ensure inclusive communication and practice with students:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated commitment to applying culturally respectful and inclusive practices, and demonstrating respect and inclusiveness of culturally diverse people in all work practices and communications with staff and students.</p>	<p>The review saw the inclusion of greater than the mandated Indigenous Cultural Competence requirements. We continue to work with IBS to expand this even further to ensure we lead, rather than just meet a minimum standard.</p> <p>The review also integrated two subjects specifically in global transculturalism for which was described by xxx as 'exemplary'</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>During the course review process, xxx worked closely with the xxx to ensure compliance with institutional requirements and the University Strategy, as well as authentic integration of content. The Faculty is strongly committed to working with the Indigenous Board of Studies (IBS) to ensure that the work of the Board is done in a timely fashion so that each Course Director can consider and incorporate feedback, resubmit their course work to IBS (if required) and still meet deadlines. xxx has provided useful feedback on this element of the course design process as the Faculty moves into 2019 course reviews.</p>	

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>6. Apply and communicate CSU academic regulations and policies, as appropriate:</p> <p>a) Demonstrated experience in managing student matters including providing course advice and pastoral care, and responding to feedback and complaints.</p> <p>b) Demonstrate the application of appropriate delegation of special consideration, exclusion and appeals, and admission related processes such as credit.</p>	<p>I am involved in a number of higher level Course related committees dealing specifically in policy.</p> <p>I maintain an active role in the pastoral care of students - responding where and when necessary to their concerns. I do so working with HoS, my Course Admin Officer and other support staff on a necessary escalation basis. This ensure that there are clear lines of enquiry and clear delegation of tasks as necessary.</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>xxx effectively manages all student matters relevant to the role of a Course Director. What is particularly evident is the close relationship xxx has maintained throughout the course review process with his Head of School. This has been essential to the success of the review as well as the continuation of the significant other element of xxx portfolio focused on students. As xxx, I see all xxx documentation and have always found xxx deliberations fair and clearly articulated in a way that greatly assists my determination process.</p>	
<p>7. Represent the University in a positive and professional manner:</p> <p>a) Demonstrate professional engagement with relevant internal and external stakeholders such as industry and professional partners to gauge current needs and trends, and/or accreditation bodies/external advisory processes.</p>	<p>Throughout the course review process, I engaged extensively with internal and external stakeholders. recorded in excess of 30 interviews which were recorded (transcribed) and attached in full to the course documentation.</p> <p>To ensure clarity of process I ensured that members of the previous external course review were contacted and involved in the current process - this provided a clearer continuity of purpose.</p>
<p>Reviewer Comments</p> <p>Reading through the documentation xxx refers to in xxx response, the extent of the consultation undertaken is clear. xxx was able to effectively articulate xxx vision for the course to internal and external stakeholders and utilise industry contacts xxx has to provide targeted feedback. xxx own industry engaged research was central to this and allowed for xxx to explore elements of entrepreneurship and innovation in xxx field. The depth of xxx expertise is further evident through xxx ability to maintain Tier 2 research-active status while undertaking such significant work in the leadership of teaching and learning.</p> <p>xxx is on all three Faculty xxx. xxx indicated that xxx was happy to do this because of the significant professional benefit. The FoAE has already seen the benefits of xx oversight across these committees as xxx is able to report what is being done in other Faculties to resolve particular problems or highlight that something different needs to be tried.</p>	
<p>8. In collaboration with relevant University and Faculty leaders, lead the course team in applying CSU learning and teaching frameworks, standards, methodologies, processes, technologies and tools:</p> <p>a) Demonstrate leadership in the application of CSU learning and teaching policies and processes, in particular the synergy with AQF, HES and other relevant higher education accreditation requirements</p>	<p>Through the review the AQF and HES where consulted constantly. This ensured we can manage a clear articulated set that met all necessary exit standards.</p> <p>By understanding the AQF - and aligning AQF statements to the GLOs made for an easier time in understanding how content specifically across the GLOS could be engaged and measured meaningfully.</p> <p>The resulting outcome is a clearly delineated articulated set (appreciating that we are due for version 3 of the AQF in 2019).</p>

Criteria for course design:	Reviewee Reflection
<p>xxx is a strong advocate for the promotion of learning and is an active GLO advocate. Throughout the course review process xxx was constantly engaging with different frameworks and policies to ensure a cohesive course. At the last xxx committee where various subject profiles were tabled, xxx profiles were particularly striking to as a committee member due to the detail provided. xxx was the only Course Director who provided specific detail on the profile cover page beyond simply stating the cell number that had been updated in the CASIMS document. This allowed committee members to understand the rationale for the changes made and, more importantly, the exact nature of each of the changes without having to flick through multiple pages of text. This attention to detail was invaluable when reading a 1000+ page agenda.</p>	

Signature:

X

Peer Reviewer

Reviewer's Title: