Moderation of Grades and Peer Review of Assessments Procedure

Approved by the Vice-Chancellor:	25 November 2025
Revised by the Vice-Chancellor:	
Procedure Steward:	Dean of Academic Programs

Related documents

Moderation and Peer Review Policy

Assessment Policy and Procedure

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Unit Development and Review Policy and Procedure

Related Legislation and Regulatory Standards

Australian Qualifications Framework

Higher Education Standards Framework 2021

Privacy Act 1988 – relating to collection and handling of student and industry partner data

1.   Rationale and Objectives

1.1   This Procedure sets out the practical implementation of the policy related to moderation and peer review activities in courses delivered at the University of Divinity.

2.   Scope

2.1   This Procedure applies to all units of study used as part of a University of Divinity undergraduate or postgraduate award. This policy also applies to all staff involved in the teaching of these units at the university and colleges.

3.   Purposes of Moderation

3.1   Research has identified four purposes of moderation. At the University of Divinity, all four purposes should be taken into consideration when moderation and peer-review activities are planned and implemented.

3.2.1   The first purpose is **Equity**. The goal of moderation is consistency and fairness for students in how their achievements of the learning outcomes are measured across locations and cohorts. This is best achieved by benchmarking assessment practices across colleges, locations, cohorts and modalities of delivery.

3.2.2   The second purpose is **Justification**. This is building the academics' confidence to make judgments about submitted assessments and objectively defend the decisions made about student's work. This is best achieved by having a mechanism to ensure that assessment tasks are constructively aligned and are measured by clearly designed marking rubrics, and the judgments are made in line with the rubrics.

3.2.3   The third purpose is **Accountability**. This is meeting the requirements and standards in terms of the processes taken to achieve the assessment outcomes through statistical analysis and grade distribution.

3.2.4   The fourth purpose is **Community Building**. This emphasises the value of collaboration in a community of practice of the teaching and marking staff through open discussions and arriving at a common understanding of standards in relation to assessment tasks, marking criteria, alignment with the learning outcomes and teaching activities. This is best achieved through exchanging samples of marked assessments from various units across the colleges and with external institutions in a benchmarking exercise where peers review each other's work in a collegiate manner to learn and improve assessment practices.

4.   Categories of Moderation

4.1   Researchers and learning and teaching practitioners have identified four categories of moderation that may be used to achieve the four purposes of moderation.

4.2   The first category is **Pre-Study Period Moderation**. This moderation strategy focuses on validating the assessment design; alignment with learning outcomes; the weighting, number of, and complexity of the assessment tasks; rubrics' fitness for purpose; and how the tasks fit with the course-level outcomes.

- In instances where postgraduate and undergraduate units are co-streamed, this type of moderation should ensure the differentiation of complexity of the assessment tasks between the levels. Somethings to consider could be differentiation in the depth of discussion, complexity of issues or analysis, and word count.

- Colleges should aim to ensure this moderation category is performed internally before the start of semester and before students have had access to their unit guides and assessment information.

4.3   The second category is **Pre-Assessment Moderation**. This moderation strategy is achieved through either blind marking of three de-identified assessment pieces, or analysis of the rubric (marking criteria) across all the grade descriptors, or both.

4.4   The third category is **Mid-Assessment Moderation**. This moderation strategy focuses on the marking process and practice of the assessment tasks.

- This is an important calibration activity of marks especially when there are more than one marker and a larger student cohort number.

- Specific triggers may also call for this moderation strategy. Such triggers may include a new unit being delivered, first time lecturers / markers, when the unit guides have been modified, or assessments have been changed.

- When such triggers occur, Colleges are encouraged to implement this category of moderation internally, or some cases, engage an external marker (from another College).

4.5   The fourth category is **Post-Assessment Moderation**. This moderation strategy consists of various practices including, second or third marking, sampling of submissions at different grades, grade distributions, and external peer review / benchmarking.

- Colleges are encouraged to engage internal and external (from other colleges) markers either for specific student assessment pieces, or for a sample of assessment tasks. The second or third markers will use the same marking rubric and need to understand the content covered in the delivery at the College, as the various college perspectives may influence how students understand and interpret the material and the questions asked.

- Moderation of grades and grade distribution to be performed at the College level where there is an anomaly (e.g. high fail rate).

5.   Moderation Activities

5.1   *Pre-Study Period Moderation*

5.1.1   The Pre-Study Period moderation is a validation activity and is the responsibility of the College.

5.1.2   This activity is usually triggered when the unit(s) are delivered by new lecturers / markers, when the unit guides have been modified, or assessments have been changed.

5.1.3   This activity is coordinated and facilitated by the College or School Academic Dean.

5.1.4   The outcome of this moderation is reported to the Dean of Academic Programs using the Form in Appendix A.

5.1.5   Roles and Responsibilities

Table 1. Pre-Study Period Moderation Roles and Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Lecturer / unit coordinator	- Reviews the Unit Learning Outcomes (ULOs) to ensure alignment with the relevant AQF level descriptors of knowledge, skills and application. - Ensures alignment of assessment tasks, rubrics, assessment criteria to the learning outcomes of the unit.

	• Ensures that the assessment tasks have been created to mitigate the irresponsible use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools. • If alignment issues were identified, this is escalated to the Academic Dean. • Creates rubrics and assessment criteria that align with the ULOs taking into consideration whether GenAI is to be used.
Academic Dean	• Coordinates and facilitates this moderation activity with the College lecturers for all the units to be taught in the teaching period. • Ensures that all first-time lecturers participate in this activity for assurance of learning. • Ensures that for co-streamed units, the learning activities, assessments and rubrics align with the relevant AQF level descriptors in relation to knowledge, skills and application. • This activity may also involve the College Academic Committee (CAC). • Provides a moderation report to the Dean of Academic Programs.
Dean of Academic Programs	• Receives moderation reports, analyses the data and presents a summary report to the Academic Board annually.

5.2 *Mid-Assessment Moderation*

5.2.1 The Mid-Assessment moderation activity is the responsibility of the College(s) delivering the unit(s).

5.2.2 This activity is usually triggered when the unit(s) are delivered and assessed by multiple lecturers / markers.

5.2.3 The aim of this Mid-Assessment moderation is to achieve consistency in how the various markers of the unit are judging the students' submitted work.

5.2.4 This activity is coordinated and facilitated by the College or School Academic Dean.

5.2.5 This activity is performed before the release of results to students.

5.2.6 The outcome of this moderation is reported to the Dean of Academic Programs using the Form in Appendix B.

5.2.7 Roles and Responsibilities

Table 2. Mid-Assessment Moderation Roles and Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Academic Dean	• Coordinates and facilitates this moderation activity with all the lecturers and markers of the unit(s) being marked by multiple markers. • Ensures that all first-time lecturers participate in this activity for assurance of learning. • Ensures that for co-streamed units, the learning activities, assessment tasks and rubrics align with the relevant AQF level descriptors in relation to knowledge, skills and application. • Facilitates the discussion between markers regarding the markers they gave and how they came to their judgments as well as their feedback, leading to a consensus on how to mark students work. • Provides a moderation report to the Dean of Academic Programs.
Lecturers / markers	• Ensure their marking is according to the rubrics and assessment criteria in alignment with the learning outcomes of the unit. • Ensure that their marking considers the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools. • Share the basis of their marks and judgment of the students' work with other markers. • Give feedback to other markers on the marking in relation to the rubrics, and on their feedback to students. • Receive feedback on their marking and discuss with other markers how to achieve consistent marking for the unit(s).
Dean of Academic Programs	• Receives moderation reports, analyses the data and presents a summary report to the Academic Board annually.

5.3   *Post-Assessment Moderation*

5.3.1   The Post-Assessment moderation activities are performed after the marking of the assessment tasks.

5.3.2   There are two types of Post-Assessment moderation activities. The first is Grade Moderation and the second is Peer Review of Assessment.

5.3.3   Conducting the Grade Moderation is the responsibility of the Colleges delivering the units.

5.3.4   Coordinating and conducting the Peer Review of Assessment moderation activity is the responsibility of the Dean of Academic Programs.

5.3.5 *Grade Moderation*

5.3.5.1 Roles and Responsibilities - At the University of Divinity there are several roles and responsibilities in the grade moderation process as outlined in Table 3.

Table 3. Grade Moderation Roles and Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Lecturer / unit coordinator	• Ensures alignment of assessment tasks, rubrics, assessment criteria to the learning outcomes of the unit. • Ensures that the assessments tasks have been created to mitigate the irresponsible use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools. • Ensures that the above are communicated clearly and in a timely manner to the students before assessments are due. • In collaboration with the relevant Academic Dean, ensure all relevant assessments and gradings are made available to the moderator.
Marker / Assessor	• Mark student work according to the marking rubric for each assessment task, ensuring that clear and constructive feedback is given to the student. • When asked, provide rationale for the grading decisions made.
Moderator(s)	• Review marks and grades awarded in line with the rubrics and the learning outcomes. • Assess that grade distribution of specific units, cohort of students, and the whole college / school data to determine any outliers that may need attention or change. • Provide a report to the Academic Dean including constructive feedback to the markers / assessors and lecturers.
Academic Dean	• Provide a summary of the moderation of grades to the Academic Committee. • Act on any recommendation or adopt any changes that needs to be implemented before the next time the units are delivered at the college / school. • Provide a moderation report to the Dean of Academic Programs.
Dean of Academic Programs	• Receives moderation reports, analyses the data and presents a summary report to the Academic Board annually.

5.3.5.2 Detailed steps in Grade Moderation include the following:

Grade moderation at the end of the teaching period is performed once the assessments are marked and before the grades are released. Below are some suggested steps:

1. After the grading, a sample of marked assessments should be reviewed by an internal moderator to check for consistency and alignment with the rubric's assessment criteria and the learning outcomes.

2. The moderator(s) should look for the following:

    a. Consistency of marks

    b. Adherence to the rubric and assessment criteria

    c. Fairness and transparency on grading

    d. Whether the feedback is constructive and informative giving the student suggestions of how to improve

3. The moderator may ask the marker / assessor / lecturer for more information or explanation of the marking or grading.

4. After moderation, grades may be adjusted where there is an anomaly (eg. High fail rate) before they are finalised. Any adjustment should have a rationale that is documented.

5. The Grade distribution of each unit should be assessed and reviewed.

6. A report of this moderation should be presented to the CAC outlining the outcomes and any recommendations to modify the marks, assessment tasks or rubrics.

5.3.5.3 Special Triggers for Special Moderation event

There are several instances where grade and grade distribution moderation events are specifically performed. This may include where grades awarded to individual students across multiple units may have unusual patterns or a high number of distinctions or failures.

5.3.5.4 Post Grade Moderation Actions, Reflection and Continuous Improvement

1. *CAC Discussion and Approval of Grades*: The College / School Academic Committee reviews all the moderation reports and recommendations and approves the final grades.

2. *Notification of Moderation Results*: Once the moderation processes are completed the College or School Academic Dean will notify the Dean of Academic Programs that the results have been moderated.

3. *Grade Reporting*: Final grades are entered into the University's student management system and communicated to students.

4. *Review of Moderation Process*: After the moderation processes are complete, faculty and teaching staff should reflect on the effectiveness of each of the moderation processes. This includes evaluating whether the guidelines were

followed, whether issues arose during the process, and how the process can be improved in future assessments.

5. *Implement Changes*: Based on the feedback and reflections from the moderation processes, changes may be made to future assessment tasks, rubrics, or grading procedures to improve consistency, fairness, and alignment with learning outcomes.

5.3.6   *Peer Review of Assessments*

5.3.6.1   The Peer Review of Assessment exercise is to be held once per year and is coordinated by the Dean of Academic Programs or delegate.

5.3.6.2   Each College and School will put forward to the Academic Dean at least one unit from each of the disciplines they have taught in that year to be peer reviewed. In the event of specific units were highlighted to be reviewed, then they will be added to the regular practice to the peer review event.

5.3.6.3   A sample of all new units and when an academic has assessed a unit for the first time should be included in the Peer Review process.

5.3.6.4   Below are the steps to be followed:

1. Colleges / School in consultation with the Discipline Groups should nominate one unit from each of the main disciplines they are teaching (Theology, Biblical Studies, History, and Practical Theology) that are usually taught across the university to be part of this exercise annually.
2. Once the four units (delivered in either of the previous 2 semesters) are nominated, each College should prepare the following items:
   a. Unit Records
   b. Unit Guides as shared with students on ARK
   c. Rubric or Assessment Criteria for each assessment task in the units as shared with students
   d. Up to 3 de-identified student's graded work (covering various grades as much as practicable)
3. Each College / School nominate one or two of their lecturers / markers who marked the unit's student work to be part of the exercise.
4. College / School to upload all the documents and nominated names to the UD Peer Review Portal / site.
5. External institutions delivering similar or equivalent units will be identified and invited to participate in this exercise.
6. The external institution will nominate the equivalent unit and the academic who will be part of the Peer Review exercise.
7. The external institution will provide to the Dean of Academic Programs the required documentation for the unit as per item 2 above.
8. Once all the documents and nominations are in the portal, the Dean of Academic Programs or delegate will arrange the Peer Review Process and meeting.
9. All nominees including those external to the University of Divinity will receive the de-identified students' work along with the rubrics / assessment criteria

used to mark the work as well as a list of questions to be filled as part of the review.

10. All nominees will input their answers, observations, and recommendations.
11. At the Zoom meeting arranged by the Dean of Academic Programs the nominees will have the opportunity to discuss the outcomes of their reviews of the submitted units with each other for each of the Disciplines.
12. Outcomes of this meeting will include recommendations related to the alignment of assessment tasks and rubrics to the ULOs, the assessment practices, as well as the feedback to the students.
13. The outcomes will be presented in a de-identified report by the Dean of Academic Programs or delegate to the Academic Board and circulated to all the participating Colleges / Schools.

5.3.6.5 Roles and Responsibilities - At the University of Divinity there are several roles and responsibilities in the Peer Review process as outlined in Table 4.

Table 4. Peer Review of Assessments Roles and Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
Discipline Group	• Nominate one unit per annum per discipline to be peer reviewed across the Colleges / School deliveries at the University. • Receives report and recommendations from Dean of Academic Programs after it had gone to the Academic Board.
College / School Academic Dean	• Provide sufficient context about the assessment, including the unit learning outcomes, course objectives, and any specific pedagogical aims that the assessment is designed to meet including the college / school stakeholder background and requirements as well as the background of the student cohort. • Coordinate the collating and uploading of all the documents needed on to the University's Peer Review Portal. • Nominate the academic responsible for the specific unit to be reviewed. • Ensure that a summary of the outcomes of this exercise is prepared with commendations and recommendations for improvements and reported to the Academic Committee. • Ensure the recommendations approved by the Academic Committee are implemented for future delivery of the reviewed units.
Peer Reviewers	• Carefully review the assessment task(s) to determine if it appropriately aligns with the unit's learning outcomes, is clear, and provides students with enough guidance to demonstrate their learning.

	- Assess the rubric or assessment criteria for clarity, fairness, and alignment with the assessment task and the unit learning outcomes. - Review the quality of the marking and feedback given to student, in line with the assessment rubric or grading criteria for that assessment task and the unit learning outcomes. - Verify that the assessment is academically rigorous and appropriately challenging for the level of study, particularly for postgraduate students. - Ensure that the review is inclusive and unbiased, accounting for the contextual theological perspectives, cultural values, and learning needs of the student cohort and college / school stakeholders. - Provide feedback in a respectful, professional, and collegial manner, focusing on improving the quality of the work being reviewed. - Offer actionable suggestions for improving the assessment task, assessment rubric, and/or grading. Be specific in the comments aiming to enhance the clarity, relevance, and effectiveness of the assessment.
Lecturer / unit coordinator	- Review and critically reflect on the feedback provided by peer reviewers. Assess how well the feedback addresses the alignment, clarity, academic rigor of the assessment task, and the marking of student work. - In collaboration with the Academic Dean, use the feedback to refine the assessment task, assessment rubric, or grading criteria, ensuring that it aligns with the feedback received and better supports student learning.
Dean of Academic Programs	- Organise and coordinate peer review sessions among University academic staff and external institutions. - Clearly communicate expectations for the peer review process, including the criteria to be used, the format of feedback, and timelines. - Offer support to academic staff involved in the peer review process, answering questions and providing guidance where needed. - Monitor the quality and consistency of peer review feedback, ensuring that all reviews are objective and aligned with the assessment criteria. - Maintain the confidentiality of the peer review process and ensure that all materials are handled appropriately. - Receive Peer Review reports, analyses the data and presents a summary report to the Academic Board annually.

5.3.6.6 Post-Peer Review Actions, Reflection and Continuous Improvement

1. CAC Discussion and Approval of Grades: The College / School Academic Committee reviews all the Peer Review reports and recommendations.

2. Review of Assessment Processes: Faculty and teaching staff should reflect on the effectiveness of each their assessment processes and how they can improve future assessments where applicable.

3. Implement Changes: Based on the feedback and reflections changes may be made to future assessment tasks, rubrics, or grading procedures to improve consistency, fairness, and alignment with learning outcomes.

4. Recognition of Scholarship Activity: All participating academics will receive a certificate of participation and continuing education from the Dean of Academic Programs at the Office of Vice Chancellor in recognition of their scholarship activity.

Appendix A – Pre-Study Period Moderation (College-based Validation) Form

Assessment Validation Form

Unit Code & Name		Teaching Period (Year):	
College / School		Delivery Mode / Location:	
Unit Convenor / Lecturer			

Section 1: Material Provided

- o   Unit Guide
- o   Assessment Task(s)
- o   Assessment Task Marking Rubric(s) and / or assessment criteria

Section 2: Validation of Assessments Tasks

To what extend do the items below have been met?	Mostly Met	Met	Not Met	Comments
There is clear alignment between the assessment task/s and the unit learning outcomes.				
The assessment measures student achievement of the intended learning outcome/s at an appropriate AQF level.				
The assessment is as objective and as fair as possible, taking into account the diverse student needs.				
The weighting is appropriate to the requirements of the tasks or questions.				
Marking criteria, rubrics and guides are clear.				
The marking criteria, rubrics and guides align with the unit learning outcomes.				
The cumulative weight of the rubric criteria prioritises achieving the learning outcomes.				
The descriptors of performance in each criterion adequately differentiate between each grade level.				
Assessment task(s) have been created to minimise the inappropriate use of GenAI tools.				
Clear instructions are provided to students on the use of GenAI				
Examination papers only:				
All relevant materials have been provided within the papers.				

Alternate, equivalent versions of exams or assessments are available for special/alternative examinations.				
The presentation and layout of the assessment paper is in the clearly formatted.				

Section 3: General Comments

Please write your summary regarding where are the gaps and how they can be met.

Your Comments:

Section 4: Acknowledgement

Academic Dean's name and signature		Date:	

Appendix B – Mid-Assessment Moderation (College-Based) Form

Mid-Assessment Moderation Form

Unit Code & Name		Teaching Period (Year):	
College / School		Delivery Mode / Location:	
Unit Convenor / Lecturers			
Triggers for moderation	☐ New Lecturer ☐ Multiple markers ☐ Too many low or high marking ☐ Other …………………….		

Section 1: Material Provided

- o Unit Guide(s)
- o Assessment Task(s)
- o Assessment Task Marking Rubric(s) and / or assessment criteria
- o A set of de-identified marked assessment tasks with feedback (maximum of five with mixture of high, middle and low marking)

Section 2: General Observation

To what extend do the items below have been met?	Mostly Met	Met	Not Met	Comments
Marking criteria, rubrics and guides are clear.				
The marking criteria, rubrics and guides align with the unit learning outcomes.				
The descriptors of performance in each criterion adequately differentiate between each grade level.				
Assessment task(s) were created to minimise the inappropriate use of GenAI tools.				
Clear instructions are provided to students on the use of GenAI				
The marking of assessment tasks were in line with the rubrics and assessment criteria				
Students were given clear and constructive feedback				

Section 3: Individual Students Performance (*For each student*)

Student Identification: ……………………………………… Assessment Task# …………………………

Questions	Answer	Constructive Feedback and Suggestions
To what degree do you agree with the grading of the student's performance?		
To what degree was the feedback to the student objective, clear and precise?		
To what degree did the feedback back to the student provide clear information, guidance and opportunities for improvement?		
In general, what are your commendations about the marking and feedback?		
In general, what are your recommendations for improvement for this assessment?		

Section 4: General Comments

Please write your summary of all the assessments regarding the gaps and what needs to be done to fix them.

Your Comments:

Section 4: Acknowledgement

Moderator's name and signature		Date:	
Academic Dean's name and signature		Date:	

Appendix C – Grade Moderation Report (College-Based) Template

Grade Moderation Form

College			Year		Semester	
Names of Moderators						

1.   Moderation Items chosen

(Indicate from this list which items were chosen for review this semester. If you used many, in different forms, please indicate the number of times it was used.)

Moderation Item	Number of Times Used	Number of Units	Number of Students
a) distribution of grades in the unit and in equivalent units			
b) the number and proportion of Fail grades			
c) the number and proportion of Distinction and High Distinction grades			
d) mean or median grades			
e) grades of different groups participating in a unit, such as classroom-based or online-based students, or where several units access the same learning materials			
f) differences in grade distribution from previous iterations of a unit			
g) differences in grade distribution between different Assessment Tasks in a unit.			

2.   Grade Adjustments Record

List the units in which adjustments were made:

Unit	Adjustment (student or cohort)	Adjustment made	Reason	Record Updated	Examiner Advised	Further Action Required

Appendix D - Peer Review (University Coordinated) Templates

Peer Review Unit Process

College / School		Date:	
Unit Code & Name		Discipline:	

Material Provided

- o Unit Guide(s)
- o Assessment Task(s)
- o Assessment Task Marking Rubric(s) and / or assessment criteria
- o A set of de-identified marked assessment tasks with feedback (maximum of three with mixture of high, middle and low marking)

Background information

College / School should provide the contextual background to the assessment requirements including stakeholder requirements, pedagogical perspectives, and student cohort needs.

Contextual perspectives:

Reviewer's Responses

Section 1: Unit Contents (optional)

To what extent do the Unit Contents and the topics in the Lecture Notes and Activities cover the unit learning outcomes as indicated in the unit descriptor?	
To what extend do the assessments reflect the unit content and topics covered in	

this unit in line with the contextual information provided?	
What are the gaps (if any) in the contents and what needs to be corrected?	

Section 2: Assessment Constructive Alignment to Course Outcomes and Unit Learning Outcomes

Questions	Assessment Task 1	Assessment Task 2	Assessment Task 3	Assessment Task 4
Please specify the Task Description *(remove items or edit as required)*				
To what extent do the Unit Descriptor and Assessment Guidelines provide key information on the assessment task/s to assist students to complete the work?				
To what extent is the assessment task designed for what was intended to be learned?				
To what degree are the assessment tasks progressively developed in complexity and challenge to the student through the various assessment tasks?				
Do the assessment tasks allow the student to think or be creative, rather than repeat what they can find in a textbook or lecture notes?				
To what extent are the assessment tasks authentically designed?				
To what degree has the assessment tasks design mitigated against the inappropriate use of GenAI?				

To what degree does the assessment task enable students to demonstrate attainment of the relevant Unit Learning Outcomes?				
Does the assessment task have a rubric or assessment criteria?				
To what degree does each of the rubric / assessment criteria align with the Unit Learning Outcomes?				
To what degree is the rubric / assessment criteria helpful in assessing the student's achieving their learning outcomes?				
To what degree are the criteria's descriptors clear and effective?				
How confident are you that the rubric / assessment criteria measure how students demonstrate attainment of the relevant ULOs?				
What are the gaps (if any)? *What is needed to be done?*				

Section 3: Individual Students Performances *(multiple students)*

Student Number: …………………………………………………………….

Unit: …………………………………………………………………………..

Assessment Task# ……………………………………………………

Questions	Answer	Constructive Feedback and Suggestions
To what degree do you agree with the grading of the student's performance?		
To what degree was the feedback to the student		

objective, clear and precise?		
To what degree did the feedback back to the student provide clear information, guidance and opportunities for improvement?		
In general, what are your commendations about the marking and feedback?		
In general, what are your recommendations for improvement for this assessment?		

Section 4: General Comments

Please write your summary regarding gaps in any of the following areas and how they may be fixed.

1. Constructive Alignment of each assessment to the Unit Learning Outcomes,
2. Efficacy and effectiveness of the assessment methods in line with the Learning Outcomes.
3. Effectiveness of the marking of the students submitted work in line with the Rubrics and assessment criteria.
4. Informative and constructive nature of the feedback given to the student to help them achieve their learning outcomes.
5. What are the best practices ideas you detected?
6. What are the gaps and what do we need to do about it?

Your Comments:

Section 5: Acknowledgement

Moderator's name and signature		Date:	
Discipline Review Convenor's name and signature		Date:	