

Peer Review of Teaching for Promotion Purposes. Trialling the Documentation and Procedures Developed for an ALTC Project.

Presenters/facilitators:

Geoffrey Crisp* (geoffrey.crisp@adelaide.edu.au) & Kerrie Le Lievre (kerrie.lielievre@adelaide.edu.au). Centre for Learning and Professional Development, University of Adelaide, Adelaide Australia

Outcomes

By the completion of the workshop participants will be able to:

- Use the peer review documentation developed as part of the ALTC project ‘Peer Review of Teaching for promotion Purposes’.
- Understand the complexities associated with summative peer review and the differences between using documentation for formative or summative reviews.

Intended audience

Staff involved in academic promotion processes; staff supporting and advising academics applying for promotion. Academic development staff and discipline-based teachers involved in staff development and learning and teaching improvement plans.

About the facilitators

Geoffrey Crisp is the Director for the Centre for Learning and Professional Development at the University of Adelaide. Geoff is a HERDSA Fellow and ALTC Associate Fellow; he is the leader for the ALTC project on ‘Peer Review of Teaching for promotion Purposes’. Kerrie Le Lievre is the project officer for two ALTC projects, the Peer Review project and the Research Skills Development project; Kerrie has a PhD in English Literature.

Background / Context

Excellent teaching should be recognised, valued and rewarded in a similar manner to excellent research. One of the fundamental pillars for the recognition of excellent research is through peer review.

This workshop will allow participants to trial the documentation prepared as part of the ALTC project on peer review for promotion, to explore both the internal and external peer review processes developed for promotion committee reports. The documentation can be used for both formative and summative purposes and participants will have an opportunity to assess the suitability of the forms for their personal and institutional use.

Participants will be placed in teams of peer reviewers and actively work through the training materials developed for internal peer reviewer teams and then peer review a teaching activity presented on video. Participants will exchange their peer review reports and discuss any differences that arise in the reports. Participants will then review the documentation for external peer review teams and undertake a practice peer review of a teaching portfolio.

The peer review forms have been designed to be flexible, covering broad dimensions of learning and teaching that could reasonably be expected to be present in the practice of an applicant for promotion. At the same time, individual institutions may include additional criteria relevant to the local educational context. Because the definition of what constitutes good teaching practice is often described in different ways at the discipline level, participants will be encouraged to explore the peer review framework for its suitability for all teachers in

all teaching situations and provide feedback on the articulation of the broad dimensions of teaching in the documentation.

Overview of activities

This session will present protocols and tools for summative peer review of classroom teaching and teaching portfolios. It will give participants the opportunity to test the training materials and documentation for peer review in a workshop setting.

Detailed plan of workshop activities

1.	Welcome and overview of session	5 mins
2.	Distribution of Internal Peer Review documentation, brief introduction to the process	5 mins
3.	View DVD of teaching session	5 mins
4.	Fill in individual Internal peer review form	15 mins
5.	Group discussion: differences and similarities between reports, and the reasons for these. Discussion of assessment criteria and use of evidence.	25 mins
6.	Distribution of External Peer Review documentation, brief introduction to the process	5 mins
7.	Read exemplar of teaching portfolios/application for promotion	15 mins
8.	Fill in individual External peer review form	15 mins
9.	Group discussion: differences and similarities between reports, and the reasons for these. Discussion of assessment criteria and use of evidence.	20 mins
10.	Questions, comments, feedback.	10 mins
	Estimated length of session	120 mins

References

http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/pdfs/PeerReviewHandbook_eVersion.pdf

<http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/evaluations/resources/peerReview.html>

http://www.uow.edu.au/cedir/peer_review/