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Date  4 July 2013

Reviewer Details

Name: [Redacted]
Home institution: [Redacted]
Discipline area: Biomedical Engineering
Area of expertise: Biomedical Engineering (Electrical and Electronic Engineering focus)

Subject Review Coversheet

Prepare one of these reports for each subject or capstone project reviewed.

Go8 University: The University of Sydney
Field of Education: Biomedical Engineering
Subject reviewed (Subject Code): Undergraduate Thesis, EIEC4710,4711,4712,4713
Sample size (number of student work assessed): 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assessments</th>
<th>Below Pass</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Credit</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>High Distinction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed in total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree with grade awarded</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade awarded to be unduly high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe grade awarded to be unduly low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please tick one of the following three options for your overall summary judgement of the subject you have reviewed.

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

Any recommendations made are for the purposes of enhancement to the subject and its assessment.  

The learning outcomes, assessment tasks and assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed were appropriate.

HOWEVER, there are some risks to the future quality assurance of the subject and its assessment, as outlined in my recommendations.

There are immediate concerns or risks relating to the learning outcomes, assessment tasks and/or assessment processes set for the subject I have reviewed.

These require immediate action on behalf of the University to prevent reoccurrence in the next review.

Comments (optional)

If you wish, please include further comments which may be used by the associated Faculty or Department in its marketing materials.

none.

Statement of potential conflicts of interest
For example, being involved in collaborative teaching, research or consultancy work with colleagues teaching in the subjects being reviewed.

None

Review of specified learning objectives
1. To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very Well | Completely |

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

- The learning outcomes are stated explicitly in the course outline.
- The learning objectives are listed clearly and linked with assessment.
- The learning outcomes are listed with detailed designated attributes.

2. To what extent are the specified learning objectives appropriate for a final year subject? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

| Not at all | Somewhat | Adequately | Very Well | Completely |

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating

- The project management skills form an important part of the learning outcomes.
- The development of research skills (Engineering/IT specialisation and maths/Science methods) is specified.
- The development of communication skills is enforced.

3. How do the specified learning objectives compare with those of final year subjects from similar universities?

The specified learning objectives are similar to those items at other universities. For example, in the similar courses at the University of Queensland, the aims and objectives are essentially similar to the final year subjects of University of Sydney, and they are also tightly linked to the assessment and graduate attributes.
Review of assessment tasks

1. To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

   Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very Well    Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

**The assessment items appear suitable;**

**The final grade is given based on a good balance of presentation (20%), project management (20%) and thesis (60%). The assessment tasks reflects the specified learning objectives.**

2. To what extent are the assessment requirements and the marking criteria explained clearly? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

   Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very Well    Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

**The assessment details are given;**

**Marking scheme is very clear to the markers and students;**

**The formats of presentation, thesis writing are clearly explained.**

3. To what extent are the assessment tasks and the marking criteria appropriate for a final year subject? (Please mark the box that best represents your view).

   Not at all    Somewhat    Adequately    Very Well    Completely

Please list up to three reasons for making this rating.

**The marking criteria appear appropriate for the final year project.**

**The final year project has two units, that is unit A (1st half year) and unit B (2nd half year), it appears that the final grades are largely based on the result of B. Some specific marks might be considered for unit A.**

4. How do the assessment tasks and the marking criteria compare with those of final year subjects from similar universities?

**The assessment tasks and marking criteria are comparable to those from similar universities. As suggested above, the unit A might be assessed in an appropriate way, for example, an additional presentation is arranged and evaluated before moving to unit B. I could not find assessment details of the final year project online; I think this can be easily addressed.**
Notes for QVS External Reviewers

Submitting QVS reports to the University

1. Within two weeks of receiving the relevant materials, you are required to submit a written report to the QVS coordinator of the university being reviewed.
2. Reports should be addressed and sent to the QVS coordinator of the university for which you conducted the review (see below a list of QVS coordinators for all the Go8 universities).
3. You will be paid an honorarium of $600 per day after your reports have been submitted.
4. You will receive feedback on your full report from the university for which you conducted the review.

Report structure and content

1. Your report is expected to address the following key questions for each subject you review:
   - Are the learning outcomes appropriate?
   - Are the learning outcomes comparable to those of final year subjects in similar universities?
   - Are assessment processes and the determination of grades sound and fairly conducted based on the materials that have been provided for the review?

2. Avoid discussing individual staff by name as your report will be considered by the committees of the relevant Faculties and Departments which are likely to include student representatives.

3. In general, you will draw upon your academic experience and judgement to review the materials provided to you. The following is a list of issues which are suggested for inclusion in your QVS report.

Suggestions for review of specified learning objectives

- To what extent is the information provided about learning objectives clear and sufficient?
- To what extent are the learning objectives "precise, challenging and complete" (Laurillard 2002: 183)?
- How do the learning objectives specified for the subject compare with those of final year subjects in similar universities?

Suggestions for review of assessment tasks and assessment processes

- To what extent are the assessment tasks suitable for the specified learning objectives?
- Is there sufficient variety and complexity in assessment tasks?
- To what extent are the assessment tasks timed appropriately?
- Is the language used in assessment tasks unambiguous, appropriate and inclusive of all students?
- Are the marking criteria sufficiently clear?
- How do the assessment tasks and marking criteria compare with those of final year subjects in similar universities?
- Based on the materials provided for the review, to what extent have the assessment processes been rigorous, equitable for diverse students and fairly conducted?

Suggestions for overall summary comments

- How do the specified learning outcomes and student achievements compare with those of final year subjects in similar universities?
- Are there key issues which should be brought to the attention of supervising committees in the faculty/department, division or wider university?
- Are there examples of good practice that might be noted and disseminated more widely as appropriate?

General points

1. Submitted reports will only be used in accordance with Go8 member university policy (for the monitoring of academic standards within the institution).
2. The university being reviewed will own the copyright of all the materials produced in relation to the QVS review.
3. You will assign all present and future rights relating to the reports and any other materials created in relation to your appointment as a QVS External Reviewer to the university being reviewed. You will also waive any rights including moral rights in connection with those materials.
4. The university being reviewed will make reasonable endeavours to ensure the accurate reproduction of material and information provided by you; all other warranties and undertakings are excluded, including liability for direct or indirect loss to you.
5. You give consent to the university being reviewed to publish any part of your report, electronically or in hard-copy, in internal or publicly accessible websites, reports and/or brochures.

Please return your completed report coversheet and materials to the QVS coordinator in the university which you have undertaken the review for:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>QVS coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>Professor Sue Wills, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Social Inclusion), Interim Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning &amp; Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>Professor Jane Long, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Professor Richard James, Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>Professor Mick McManus, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Dr Dennis Alexander, Special Projects – Quality, Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>Professor Marie Carroll, Director – Academic Affairs Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>Professor Wan-Fong Chua AM, Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
<td>Ms Kim Davidson, Director, Academic Quality Assurance, Division of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Academic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Adapted from the University of Cambridge's coversheet for external examination.
6. Adapted from the QAA code of practice on external examination (2004)