

Review of Teaching Practice

Session/artefact to be observed/reviewed: CSM Benchmarking/Audit documentation for Moodle course pages (C-School), as part of the Shared Design project

Size of student group: C-School students (circa 2K)

Reviewee: Elena Hernández-Martín

Reviewer: Barbara Paes

Note: This record is solely for exchanging developmental feedback between colleagues. Its reflective aspect informs PgCert and Fellowship assessment, but it is not an official evaluation of teaching and is not intended for other internal or legal applications such as probation or disciplinary action.

Part One

Reviewee to complete in brief and send to reviewer prior to the review

What is the context of this session/artefact within the curriculum?

The artefact under review is the CSM Moodle course (page) benchmarking framework that I have recently introduced, which adapts the Anthology Exemplary Course Program (ECP) Rubric (2025) and integrates the Inclusive Higher Education Framework (QAA, 2023).

The project sits within staff development and student experience enhancement overall, rather than a single taught course or activity. It supports initially the Digital Learning team and provides the structure for programme and course teams in reviewing and redesigning their Moodle courses to ensure consistency, accessibility, inclusive practice, and alignment between learning outcomes, assessment, and learner support. It contributes to institutional priorities around student experience, and social justice.

Document to be reviewed:

- **01-CSM Moodle course pages benchmarking: Background**
- **02-CSM Moodle course pages benchmarking: Audit (+How to use + Reference Information)**

How long have you been working with this group/project and in what capacity?

I have been involved in the broader Moodle Shared Designs initiative since joining the Digital Learning team in September 2024 as a consultant to colleagues. This academic year I am jointly leading and managing its rollout across the whole of C-School.

I am working with course leaders and academic teams in my capacity as a digital learning producer and UX design specialist, providing pedagogic, accessibility and inclusivity guidance and practical implementation. My role includes implementing best practice

frameworks, auditing courses, designing prototypes, facilitating workshops, supporting course review processes, and ensuring alignment with institutional priorities.

What are the intended or expected (learning) outcomes?

The intended outcomes of using the benchmarking framework in this context are to:

- Ensure consistency and clarity across all Moodle courses in C-School (and CSM as a whole).
- Embed inclusive practices throughout course design, including accessibility, clear communication, and learner support.
- Align course content, structure, and assessment with sector-recognised pedagogical standards and evidence-based good practice.
- Enable course teams to identify areas for improvement and take actionable steps to enhance the student experience.
- Provide a transparent, systematic method for course review that supports both strategic oversight and local flexibility.
- Facilitate ongoing reflection, evaluation, and sharing of best practice across the school.

What are the anticipated outputs (anything students will make/do)?

Students will participate in the project by taking part in surveys shaped by the benchmarking framework, free-input feedback workshops, and consultation meetings, providing insights into their experiences of navigating and engaging with Moodle courses. Their input will directly inform the design and refinement of course templates and structures in conjunction with the Benchmarking framework. Importantly their contribution will feed toward more CSM tailored benchmarks in future iterations.

By taking part in this process, students will contribute and benefit from:

- Improved clarity and consistency in course navigation and access to learning resources.
- Courses designed with inclusivity and accessibility in mind, supporting diverse learning styles and needs.
- Enhanced opportunities for engagement, collaboration, and feedback within their courses.
- A more transparent and responsive learning environment, where student perspectives actively shape digital course design.

Are there potential difficulties or specific areas of concern?

- The initial mismatch between courses content and structures will produce a difficult to compare and analyse set of data.
- Resistance to standardisation due to concerns about loss of academic autonomy.
- Variability of familiarity with pedagogical frameworks.
- Time constraints within course teams to engage with the overall project and later on to continue to benchmark regularly and make improvements.
- Ensuring that design and inclusivity principles are eventually meaningfully embedded rather than treated as a compliance exercise.
- There is also the challenge to balance consistency across C-School, provided by the framework, and offering flexibility for disciplinary differences and creative pedagogies.

How will students be informed of the observation/review?

This is not applicable to this review.

What would you particularly like feedback on?

- The ease of use for a Teaching team
- About the clarity with which the relationship between the benchmarks relate to inclusivity, and pedagogic practice.
- If a balance between strategic framing and practical application has been reached.

How will feedback be exchanged?

Via email or Team's meeting?

Part Two

Reviewer to note down observations, suggestions and questions.

Document 01

- Clear explanation of motivation and aims, with expected outcomes. In my view, the framework strikes a good balance between strategic framing and practical application.
 - o ***Response (EHM):** The decision to integrate two complementary frameworks was intentional. One framework provides the logistical and structural foundations required for robust course design (Anthology Exemplary Course*

Program (ECP) Rubric), while the other foregrounds principles relating to student experience, wellbeing, and care (Inclusive Higher Education Framework (QAA). The intention was to ensure both operational rigour and pedagogic sensitivity.

- Well organized with clear correlation of indicators with QAA alignments and explanation. However, the Point value column is not explained, and its numeric classification was unclear.
 - o **Response (EHM):** *This is a valid observation. The point system is inherited directly from the Anthology Benchmark Framework, and I acknowledge that this is not sufficiently explained in the current iteration. I will incorporate a clear explanation of the scoring system to enhance transparency and usability.*

- Clear connection between ECP and QAA principles and the benchmark indicators.
- The majority of indicators, particularly those related to accessibility, have well-defined and comprehensive outlines: it is easy to grasp what is expected, and the examples are helpful and succinct.
- Some vague language in the indicators makes the expected outcome unclear. For example, “LMS tools are used efficiently”. What does efficient means? Is there a reference for good and bad use? I acknowledge that this is one of the aspects that is hard to write since it will vary for each course. Maybe it could include referencing, links, and examples so each course would have a reference to lean onto when adapting it to their context.
 - o **Response (EHM):** *The accompanying chart in Document 01 provides illustrative examples within the “Explanation / Area of Activity” column, and further references are included in Document 02 (Reference Information tab). However, I acknowledge that these explanations may require refinement to make them more explicit.. I will review this section to enhance clarity and reduce potential ambiguity.*

| | Indicator (Exact wording) | QAA Principle(s) Alignment | Explanation / Area of Activity |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Technology use | 1.8 LMS tools are used efficiently to reduce the labour intensity of learning (e.g., providing links to needed resources, using native LMS tools where available) | Wellbeing, empathy & authenticity | Builds student engagement and authenticity in curriculum design. |

- The nature of the document 01 is not completely clear. Is the background exclusive for the reviews of practice/PGCert, or is this a presentation file for the courses? I believe the introduction was very rich and could be adapted into an introduction tab in document 2.

- o **Response (EHM):** Document 01 was developed as supporting documentation for Document 02 (the data recording tool). While Document 02 is primarily a working document for reviewers from the Digital Learning team, to gather and analyse data, Document 01 has also been used as a standalone document when presenting the rationale and benchmark framework to stakeholders. I will consider further clarifying the relationship between the two documents and how they are intended to be used.

Document 2

- Organized, easy to fill document.
- First impression: quite dense. After getting accustomed it is quite simple to engage with.
 - o **Response (EHM):** I agree that the density may initially appear overwhelming. However, this structure was designed to be fit for purpose, accommodating a substantial amount of data across multiple courses. Care was taken to create visual distinctions between sections to aid navigation. Maintaining all data within a single spreadsheet is important to ensure consistency in compilation, comparison, and analysis.
- Question: will it be presented as a single editable excel document for all courses or each team will fill their own file, which will be compiled later? Multiple access could be hard to manage.
 - o **Response (EHM):** Each course will receive its own data presentation rather than working directly within this master spreadsheet. Findings will be translated into a more accessible and digestible format (e.g., PowerPoint visualisations and charts). In this first iteration, the data is intended primarily for use by the Digital Learning team. Following implementation of design improvements, courses will be re-evaluated to enable comparison and demonstration of progress. This approach could subsequently be adopted on an annual basis to support ongoing quality monitoring.
- The instructions could be a bit better explained. I could understand what was expected, but #6 writing is not so clear. Which benchmarks are different: QAA and ECP, or different indicators? Why same ratings have different grades? ('working towards' is 1,5; 2,0 and 2,5).
 - o **Response (E):** The instructions were initially drafted as guidance following a training session with colleagues and were not originally intended to function as a standalone explanatory resource. I recognise that if the framework is to be disseminated more widely — for example, to other UAL Digital Learning teams — the guidance will need to be expanded and clarified. I will revise the instructions to ensure they are self-explanatory and accessible without prior training.

Overall, I think the framework is clear and well-structured. Strategically, it's a useful diagnostic tool for identifying areas that need more work or where the academic team might need additional support. Although the Excel spreadsheet looks dense at first glance, it's straightforward and easy to complete. All the presented goals seem to have been met, and most of my comments and suggestions are minor details or stem from my own curiosity about the process. Potential difficulties acknowledged are realistic and depend on course's and student's engagement, which is always a challenge. However,

it seems evident to me the benefits of the proposed framework in reducing noise and align course's strategies and goals.

Part Three

Reviewee to reflect on the reviewer's comments and describe how they will act on the feedback exchanged. Reviewee should return this to the reviewer once complete.

The feedback provided has been constructive and valuable in identifying areas where greater clarity, transparency, and contextual framing are required. While the core structure and strategic rationale of the framework have been positively received, the comments highlight the importance of ensuring that documentation is self-explanatory, particularly if it is to be shared beyond its initial audience.

In response to this feedback, when circulating these documents, I will:

1. Provide a clear explanation of the benchmark scoring system and its origins.
2. Review and refine indicators that may contain ambiguous language, ensuring that expectations are explicit and supported by clear examples.
3. Clarify the distinct purposes and audiences of Documents 01 and 02.
4. Revise the instructional guidance within Document 02 to ensure it functions effectively as a standalone resource.

This feedback has helped me reflect on the importance of designing documents clearly and explicitly, particularly when developing frameworks intended for auditing and comparing courses virtual learning pages at large scale, with potentially an institutional-wide application.