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1. **Why bother with peer review of L&T/support?**
	1. TEQSA requires it (Section 1.4 and 5.3)
	2. Will prevent the introduction of a CLA and teaching to the test
	3. Successful travellers are the key source for powerful professional learning
	4. Peer review of grades up front stops appeals
2. **Purposes of peer review**
	1. To prove quality (summative) and/or improve quality (formative)
	2. Peer supported learning
	3. Builds a change capable, ‘why don’t we’, evidence-based culture
	4. To use peers to identify effective leaders as per TLHE for use in selection and development of new appointments in the same role
3. **Some traps in peer review**
	1. Seeing peer review as only involving
		1. moderation of marking
		2. peer review of teaching
	2. Undertaking peer review without a framework, set of valid quality tests (evaluation criteria) and robust evidence
	3. Failure to wisely use students as peer reviewers using valid criteria and agreed evidence tests.
	4. Thinking all peer review must happen face to face
4. **Focus areas for peer review**

Proving and improving the quality of:

* 1. Program Level Outcomes (PLOs)
	2. Design
	3. Delivery
	4. Support

This can involve:

* + 1. Peer review of individuals, teams or programs
		2. Peer review of inputs and/or outcomes
1. **Ensuring peer review is robust – that it uses a proven quality and standards framework and validated quality checkpoints**
	1. Focus on the quality of impact not just inputs
	2. When reviewing PLOs use of a valid capability framework, weighted peer review, a focus on work ready plus graduates
	3. When mapping using the FLIPCurric quality checkpoints
	4. When peer reviewing the quality of assessment tasks use this section of FLIPCurric
	5. When grading and then calibrating use the quality checkpoints in these sections of FLIPCurric
	6. When peer reviewing the quality of program design use the RATEDCLASS A checkpoints
	7. When reviewing teaching use the key checkpoints for effective teaching identified in Accessing the student voice.
2. **Effective approaches to peer review**
	1. An agreed framework, validated quality checkpoints for focus and evidence based feedback
	2. ‘Lonely planet’ guides written by successful peers in the same role but further down the same change path, including key dilemmas and how to handle them
	3. Students can self-review if given an assessment focused learning guide
	4. For calibration use assessment focused learning guides and require the first lesson to go through it (this calibrates sessionals)
	5. Networks of peers that apply the key quality tests and impact measures identified in FLIPCurric
	6. The Professional Development & Review Process at UTS in the 1990s
3. **System alignment to encourage peer review**
	1. Need promotion rewards for effective peer review and program improvement
	2. Need to use an aligned online Course Development and Review System – one that allows for peer review internally and or externally against proven quality checkpoints for each of the 6 keys in FLIPCurric. This input would be for ‘comment only’, with sign off by a delegated senior officer for aspect under consideration confirming that it has met the quality checkpoints listed. This CDR would follow the FLIPCurric sequence – Right PLOs first, then right mapping, followed by right assessment, right grading, right calibration and finally right ‘fit-for-purpose’ learning methods and resources.
	3. Use of a searchable good practice set of tips and successful exemplars (especially locally successful ones) for each of the 6 keys accessible via the CDR using FLIPCurric, with particular focus on successful approaches to validating PLOs and examples of ‘powerful’ assessment.
4. **‘Good ideas with no ideas on how to implement them are wasted ideas’ & ‘change doesn’t just happen but must be led, and deftly’**
	1. Key lessons from 30 years’ experience and research on effective change leadership and implementation in HE
	2. The effective change leader
5. **What next?**
	1. Most interesting aspect
	2. What next
	3. Ready fire aim