Peer Review of Online Delivery

This document will form part of a wider peer review system that will also encompass face-to-face elements of a module delivery. Peer Review of online delivery can either be for a full module’s online content, or for a discrete online learning activity. The following pages include checklists for both types of activity.
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Peer review of online components of a full module.

The following checklist is for use if the reviewer and reviewee decide to review the whole online content of a module. It is anticipated that this activity will take approximately 1 hour to do properly. If the module is delivered by a team rather than an individual module leader then the full teaching team can be invited to participate in the review. If this is not possible then at the very least they should be made aware that the review is taking place and be given access to any relevant comments and the summary.

It is expected that the review will take the form of a discussion with the reviewer and reviewee working through the checklist together. If both the reviewer and reviewee feel there is a need for more expert help with regard to e-learning then they may invite a learning technologist to participate as a consultant. This could be an e-learning co-ordinator, a member of the e-learning team in CLQE or an experienced academic member of staff. If they are unsure who may be appropriate then advice should be sought from the schools E-learning coordinator, or Assistant Dean Learning and Teaching.

Checklist for online module
This crib sheet below should be used a guide to what could be in an online module and how it may be designed and managed. While it is comprehensive it is by no means exhaustive and will be reviewed regularly. Likewise, the list is certainly not prescriptive and in no way suggests that technologies, tools or techniques should be incorporated within a module for any other than sound pedagogical reasons. Decisions on whether to adopt any e-learning tool or technique will depend on the learning strategy determined by the module team and documented on the UTREG 2 form.

Student Access to the Online Module
Are students directed to the module via Blackboard?
If the online content of a module is held outside of Blackboard, is a clear link that works both internally and externally to the university?

Communication/Announcements/Notices
Are notices/announcements to students managed electronically, If not, how is staff/student communication effected?
Are communication areas managed effectively? including removal of out of date items.
Are any other tools used and if so how successful are they?

Navigation and Structure
Are button/link labels appropriate and informative and do all buttons/links have content?
Is the content well organised e.g. in sections and folders?
Are the number of clicks required to access items minimal?
Are students aware when and where new items are available (such as regular updates e.g. weekly or announcements posted)?

Interface Design/Look and Feel
Is the module interface well designed? For example is there consistent use of colours/fonts etc., Is module/subject branding used e.g. inclusion of a banner, the interface is well presented and uncluttered?
Are only e-tools in use available? (e.g. in Blackboard communications area have tools that are not in use been removed from the menu?)

Module Contents
Is there a module guide present - based on minimum standard (including learning outcomes, assessment details and assessment criteria) or using school template?
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Is there a clear statement regarding module delivery, e.g. proportion of the module that is face-to-face and online and what staff and students should expect.
Is there a module schedule available? Are staff contact details available?
Are learning materials available as required and are they organised appropriately e.g. weekly or by topic?
Is there a clear explanation of folders and files contents?
Is there a reading list available, does this use the LIS reading list tool?
Is there a link to DISSC available?

Assessment
Is there timely information on assessments available from the top level menu?
Is there any online summative assessment and if so has this been moderated and risks assessed?
Do you have any contingency plans in the event of technical problems?

Quality of content
Are documents well presented and structured, including, grammar, spelling, layout, use of white space etc?
Is the format of the document accessible to ALL students (e.g. use of Word 2007)? If not what is being done to make sure all students have equitable access?
Are documents easily readable on screen?
Is a sans-serif font used e.g. verdana or arial? (For printable documents is Arial point 12)
Are any other efforts made to enhance the inclusivity of the site e.g. use of Course Genii?

Use of Media
Has file size been considered e.g. download times?
Are large files hosted on a server external to Blackboard e.g. streaming server?
Are any of the following media used: audio/podcast; video; pictures/graphics; animation?
If so are they used effectively?
Is there any evidence of the use of media causing access problems for students e.g. plug-in requirements?

Use of other e-tools such as Discussion Forums; blogs; wikis
Are they available and moderated? Are students participating? Are there timely responses from staff?

Formative online tests/quizzes
Are they available? Are they used by students? What tool is being used to develop them? Are they easy to access? Are they assessing at an appropriate level?

Group tool used
Have separate areas for groups been created? Are these group areas actively used?

Virtual classroom/chat
Is it available? Is it being used effectively?

External links
Are they well organised (e.g. in folders)? Are they relevant? Are they all active?

Copyright
Are there any contravention/questions?

Feedback/Evaluation
Are there opportunities for students to receive ongoing feedback?
Are there opportunities for students to give ongoing feedback/evaluation?

Problems/concerns
Are there any other problems/concerns identified?
Are there any areas of particularly innovative/beneficial practice?

E-Learning Model
Where does the model fit with respect to the University’s E-Learning Model?
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Peer review of online learning activity.

Peer Review of an online learning activity. For example an activity involving a discussion forum; a blog or podcasts. It is expected that review of an activity would include the context for that activity.

It is anticipated that this activity will take up to 1 hour to do properly. If the module is delivered by a team rather than an individual module leader then the full teaching team can be invited to participate in the review. If this is not possible, then at the very least they should be made aware that the review is taking place and be given access to any relevant comments and the summary.

It is expected that the review will take the form of a discussion with the reviewer and reviewee working through the checklist together. If both the reviewer and reviewee feel there is a need for more expert help with regard to e-learning then they may invite a learning technologist to participate as a consultant. This could be an e-learning co-ordinator, a member of the e-learning team in CLQE or a more experienced academic member of staff. If they are unsure who may be appropriate then advice should be sought from the school’s E-learning Coordinator or Assistant Dean Learning and Teaching.

Checklist for online activity

Module Context – complies with the minimum standard
Modules hosted on schools Intranet
Are students directed to the module via Blackboard?
If the online content of a module is held outside of Blackboard, is a clear link that works both internally and externally to the university?

Module Content
Is there a module guide present - based on minimum standard (minimum including learning outcomes, assessment details and assessment criteria) or school template?
Is there a clear statement regarding module delivery, e.g. proportion of the module that is face-to-face and online and what staff and students should expect.
Is there a module schedule available? Are staff contact details available?
Are learning materials available as required and are they organised appropriately e.g. weekly or by topic?
Is there a clear explanation of folders and files contents?
Is there a reading list available, does this use the LIS reading list tool?
Is there a link to DISSC available?
Are button/link labels appropriate and informative and do all buttons/links have content?

Learning Activity

Objectives
Are the objectives of the activity clearly stated and appropriate?

Preparation
Are the following made clear?

- Structure of the activity,
- Activity start, end times and milestones
- Size/quality of deliverables
- Links with previous sessions
- Links to follow-on activities
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Activity tasks
Are they appropriate to the level of the module?
Are tasks clearly stated?
Is there linkage with the module learning outcomes?

Pace
Are the timings appropriate?

Student Participation
Do students engage with the activity?
Is the level of student response appropriate to the module level and learning outcomes?

Staff Participation
Are staff actively involved and providing support and guidance?
e.g. in an online discussion this could include encouraging the reluctant and preventing people dominating the activity.

Use of resources
Are online materials relevant and appropriate?
Do all students have access to all required resources?

Assessment of activity
Does the activity form part of a summative or formative assessment?
If summative, have risks been assessed?
Have students had previous experience of this type of activity, or chance to practice?

Feedback
What feedback is given to students regarding the learning activity?
What opportunities do students have to give feedback/evaluate the learning activity?
Have any other problems/concerns been identified?

E-Learning Model
Where does the model fit with respect to the University’s E-Learning Model?
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Comment Sheets
The content of this sheet will remain confidential between the reviewees and reviewer. Use extra sheets if required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comments and Issues/Areas for development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Suggestions
The content of this sheet will remain confidential between the reviewees and reviewer.

| Has the discussion resulted in any other ideas/suggestions for enhancing the module? (please give details) |%
|-----|---|

| Please identify any suggestions for improvement |%
|-----|---|

| Please identify the module’s type of blend and its levels with reference to the University’s E-Learning Model. |%
|-----|---|
| (Please circle) |%
| Type of Blend |%
| B1, B2, B3, B4 |%
| B/D |%
| D1, D2, D3 |%
| Presentation |%
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |%
| Organisation |%
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |%
| Communication |%
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |%
| Construction |%
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |%

| Any other comments/possibilities for dissemination? |%
|-----|---|
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Discussion Summary

Concerns/Problems and areas for Development
Please review the Comments and Issues/Areas for development resulting from the discussion and identify what actions need to be taken and who should take responsibility for this. As you do this it will be useful to have access to the Help material and recipe sheets on the ‘staff Lounge’ tab of Blackboard and also the training events/material available from both the e-learning and staff development teams (where will staff dev stuff be?). It is likely that many concerns identified can be resolved by accessing currently available resources.

Otherwise list the concern and identify an action and person responsible to carry it out. If you are need advice on this contact either the E-learning Co-ordinator or Learning and Teaching Coordinator for advice.

If any areas of good practice have been identified please include them in the form below and indicate willingness to be involved in any dissemination of the good practice and if support would be required to do this. Dissemination activities could be either university-wide or in school events and could include activities such as: participation in a showcasing event; a learning and teaching event or E@T lunch, or an online case study.
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## Summary Sheet

A copy of this sheet should be sent to the subject/section leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewed by:</th>
<th>Module Leader/Team:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module code:</td>
<td>Module Title:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns/Problems and areas for development</th>
<th>Agreed Action</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovative/Beneficial Practice</th>
<th>Preferred Dissemination Event</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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