External Benchmarking Procedures

Version 1.0

Learning resource	Owner	Version:	Summary/Overview of changes
External Benchmarking Procedures	Deborah Murdoch	1.0 June 2018	Version 1

Contents

Purpose, Scope and Responsibility

Title:	External Benchmarking Procedure
Purpose:	This procedure describes how to undertake external benchmarking of subjects or courses.
Scope:	This procedure covers all steps involved from first draft of the procedure to Approval.
Responsibility:	Designated staff such as the Faculty Lead for Benchmarking and nominated subject coordinators should be involved in all or some steps of benchmarking, depending on their level of responsibility and the purpose and scope of the procedure.

Procedure Steps

1	**Planning**	**Institutional Manager:** Identifies courses to be reviewed in the **following** year Notify benchmarking lead of requirements for numbers of subjects Records projects for benchmarking in master sheet	**Faculty Lead Benchmarking:** Identify subjects to be benchmarked for courses under review in the **following** year. Inform Institutional Manager for the Peer Review Portal site setup OR sets up sites. Identify type of measure (subject, course, accreditation review) Identification of questionnaire (preferred CSU measure)
2	**Setup**	**Institutional Manager:** Set up site(s) – if multiples, then create one with appropriate questionnaire and clone. Enter: Course name and code Subject name and code Country Education and discipline fields Classification of degree (Bachelor, Masters etc.) Uploads MOU Add subject coordinator	**Subject coordinator:** Uploads: Context statement outlining where the subject fits in the course, consideration of course design Subject Outline Any particular information regarding: • Course Learning Outcomes • Grading Guidelines Rubric • Other Supporting Material Assessment Tasks to be reviewed(file or link as suitable) Sets timeline for review and communicates to the reviewer through the broadcast or other
3	**Review**	**Institutional Manager:** Invites reviewers either by broadcast or invitation to known reviewers (this may occur in Stage 2 prior to subject convenor uploading information provided sufficient information about the reviewer is known at the time)	

4	Report	Institutional Manager: Checks review has been completed	Subject convenor: Retrieves subject report and feeds back to course team, course director for implementation in course review. Course director uploads report to Coursespace.
5	Institutional Report	Institutional Manager: Collate Annual Institutional Report to meet HES Standard	

Supporting Notes:

Relating Operating Procedures	None
Communication requirements; How, Where, Who, When	Notify Deborah Murdoch dmurdoch@csu.edu.au of any proposed changes
Policy this document relates to	Moderation Policy Course Review, Design and Development Policy

Preferred CSU measure:

This questionnaire is the preferred CSU measure but can be edited to suit individual requirements on request.

In reviewing the subject outline/learning guide: To what extent does the curriculum for this subject cover all that a first year undergraduate subject on this topic should cover? If the subject's curriculum could be improved, indicate any refinements/improvements.	*Likert scale and comment box*
To what extent does the subject outline/learning guide clearly explain how performance will be assessed as being at various grade levels (e.g. what is required to achieve a credit, distinction etc.)? What refinements or improvements to grading would you recommend?	*Likert scale and comment box*
What, briefly, are the best aspects of the subject outline/learning guide?	*Comment box*
Do you have any suggestions for further enhancing the subject outline/learning guide?	*Comment box*

To what extent are the assessment tasks aligned to the specified learning outcomes? Please list up to three reasons for making this rating if alignment is not strong.	*Likert scale and comment box*
How well does the "Rationale" in the subject outline/learning guide explain how the assessment tasks relate to the subject learning outcomes? If appropriate, indicate any suggestions for improvement.	*Likert scale and comment box*
To what extent does the subject outline/learning guide explain how the assessment tasks relate to the overall Graduate Outcomes of the degree program? If appropriate, please indicate any improvements.	*Likert scale and comment box*
In reflecting on the assessment grading guidelines provided for the samples of student work that you are reviewing: To what extent is it clear how student work will be awarded grades at different levels? Please indicate any issues or concerns you see with the grading guidelines.	*Likert scale and comment box*
To what extent are the grading criteria at an appropriate level for a first year undergraduate subject of study in this field of education? Please give specific suggestions for improvement where appropriate.	*Likert scale and comment box*
Which aspects of this peer review process do you think we could improve and how might this be achieved?	*Comment box*
Please provide brief feedback on this peer review process as a collegial way to monitor and assure standards in common units of study between different institutions. What, briefly, are the best aspects?	*Comment box*
Areas of Good Practice	*Comment box*
Areas of Improvements	*Comment box*
Areas of Further Development	*Comment box*