Assessment and Grading Benchmarking Form

[Unit Code and Title]

 [Course Name/s]

UNE undertakes assessment and grading benchmarking to ensure quality in its teaching and learning delivery, and continuous improvement and enhancement for unit and assessment design, and the student experience. To realise this, UNE undertakes the assessment and grading benchmarking with a focus on:

1. assessment in a sample final year unit delivered in the course or across the cognate courses being reviewed;
2. benchmarking to compare grades awarded in similar units across universities; and
3. ensuring assessment and grading benchmarking forms part of a suite of scaffolded monitoring, review, and improvement quality assurance mechanisms.

The benchmarking process is conversational, and intended to be a collaborative dialogue between professionals to promote learning. The learning that is gained from using the conversational approach is based on the idea of reciprocity, an opportunity for learning when both parties of the benchmarking process (the person/institution requesting and the person providing feedback) accept the benchmarking process as an opportunity for mutual learning.

The role of the external reviewer in the assessment and grading benchmarking is to provide conversational feedback that:

* reviews the appropriateness and comparative quality of the specified learning outcomes, assessment tasks, assessment criteria and assessment processes set for a final year unit; and
* reports on the appropriateness of the grades awarded to stratified random samples of student work in this unit.

The assessment and grading benchmarking has been designed to align with the best practice principles as outlined in the Council of Australasian University Leaders in Learning and Teaching (CAULLT) project publication “External Peer Review of Assessment: A Guide to Supporting the External Referencing of Academic Standards.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

# collation of information

To undertake assessment and grading benchmarking as part of a course review, a peer should be identified and an agreement reached for peer review. It is anticipated that peer review is a reciprocal exercise with both institutions benefiting from the process.

The following information should be collated and provided to the peer reviewer:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item** | **URL or attachment number** |
| Course Learning Outcomes |  |
| Unit information and assessment overview from Moodle |  |
| For each assessment task in the unit, the description of the Assessment Task and grading guidelines or rubric |  |
| Up to five de-identified pieces of student work for each assessment task, one for each grade (HD, D, C, P, N).  |  |

# PEER Reviewer questions

1. To what extent are the Unit Learning Outcomes aligned with the relevant Course Learning Outcomes?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Completely | [ ]  Very Well  | [ ] Adequately | [ ]  Somewhat  | [ ]  Not at all |

Provide any further feedback that explains your answer (max 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. To what extent are the Unit Learning Outcomes and curriculum appropriate for the level of the unit at this AQF Qualification Level?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Completely | [ ]  Very Well  | [ ] Adequately | [ ]  Somewhat  | [ ]  Not at all |

Provide any further feedback that explains your answer (max 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Does the assessment enable students to demonstrate attainment of both the Unit Learning Outcomes and relevant Course Learning Outcomes?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Completely | [ ]  Very Well  | [ ] Adequately | [ ]  Somewhat  | [ ]  Not at all |

Provide any further feedback that explains your answer (max 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

1. Are the grading guidelines or rubric appropriate for the specified Unit Learning Outcomes and Course Learning Outcomes?

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [ ]  Completely | [ ]  Very Well  | [ ] Adequately | [ ]  Somewhat  | [ ]  Not at all |

Provide any further feedback that explains your answer (max 200 words):

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Assessment Tasks

Do the grades awarded to the five pieces of de-identified student work provided,

 accurately reflect the level of student attainment?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessment Task** | **Commentary** |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| … | [Add or delete rows as necessary] |

Do you have any other feedback about the assessment, including opportunities for improvement?

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Appendix 1: UNE Assessment and Grading information.**

Key information on assessment and grading is available in the UNE [Assessment Guidelines](https://policies.une.edu.au/view.current.php?id=00290).

Information about the grading scheme used at UNE is available [here](https://policies.une.edu.au/download.php?id=513&version=1&associated)

Clause 10 of the guideline outlines the volume of assessment for units:

*(10)The following applies to the volume of assessment:*

1. *The maximum word limits for a six credit point unit where the assessment tasks are predominately written are:*
	1. *100 level units – 5000 words;*
	2. *200, 300 or 400 level units – 6000 words; and*
	3. *500 level and higher units – 7500 words.*
2. *A two-hour examination is equivalent to 2000 words.*
3. *A different limit may be approved through the unit approval process in the Course and Unit Design and Approval Guidelines.*
4. *These limits do not apply to assessment tasks for discipline-specific tasks (e.g. language proficiency, music notation or mathematics).*

Guiding information on peer review of assessment and what is intended by each of the questions is available from Wilson, G., Bedford, S. B., & Readman, K. (2019). External Peer Review of Assessment: A Guide to Supporting the External Referencing of Academic Standards; accessed from [https://hdl.handle.net/1959.7/uws:53024](https://hdl.handle.net/1959.7/uws%3A53024)

1. Wilson, G., Bedford, S. B., & Readman, K. (2019). External Peer Review of Assessment: A Guide to Supporting the External Referencing of Academic Standards; accessed from [https://hdl.handle.net/1959.7/uws:53024](https://hdl.handle.net/1959.7/uws%3A53024) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)