

Faculty of Humanities Peer Review of Teaching

| Contents | Page |
|--|-------------|
| Faculty of Humanities Peer Review Policy | 1-6 |
| Appendix A. Number of reviewers required | 7 |
| Appendix B. Guidelines for academic teaching staff being peer reviewed | 8 |
| Appendix C. Guidelines for Peer Reviewers | 9-10 |
| Appendix D. Guidance on review of Unit Specification & (ILOs) | 10 |
| Appendix E. Guidance on review of methods & feedback to students: | 11 |
| Appendix F. Peer Review eLearning prompts | 12 |
| Appendix G. Person Specification for School College Peer Reviewers | 13 |
| Appendix H. Faculty Peer Review of Teaching Review Form | 14-20 |

Purpose of Faculty Peer Review of Teaching

This University Policy has been tailored for the Faculty of Humanities, with additions and enhancements included in text boxes where relevant.

This document sets out the principles and process for Faculty Peer Review of Teaching (FPRT). FPRT provides a uniform process for assessing teaching across the University. It will enhance teaching quality by encouraging dissemination of good practice and by ensuring consistency in support for all colleagues engaged in teaching. It will also provide compatible information about teaching across the institution. FPRT may be supplemented by local processes as required.

The Peer Review of teaching is a supportive process whereby colleagues act as reviewers and explore a reviewee's teaching performance with them through the direct observation of their interaction with students and the review of their teaching materials and course unit design. Alongside other information about colleagues' teaching, FPRT will build a comprehensive picture of a teacher's strengths and areas for development that can be used to enhance, manage and modify performance as necessary, and thereby facilitate career progression and enhance teaching quality across the institution.

By forming a part of colleagues' portfolio of information related to teaching, and by encouraging reflection and developmental activity, FPRT may also play a role in satisfying pressure for teaching staff to have some teaching qualification.

The process should:

- promote a culture in which good teaching is valued;
- enhance the quality of teaching by providing an effective framework for the identification and dissemination of good practice;
- provide a supportive and constructive framework for teaching staff to monitor, reflect on and improve the quality of their teaching, and from which both the reviewer and reviewee can benefit;
- link to training and development opportunities when appropriate and play a role in shaping the programme of training and development activity offered by the University;
- feed into performance and development reviews, course unit meetings and programme evaluations as appropriate;
- lead to outcomes that should be kept on the staff file under normal conditions of confidentiality;
- assist with applications for promotion.

The effectiveness of the process as a whole, the level of engagement with it, and the addressing of any issues that may be identified as a result of it, should be managed and monitored through:

- the Annual Monitoring exercise (to confirm that the process is taking place);
- School Quality Committees (for more detailed discussions)
- Annual Performance Review.

Reviewers

A College of Peer Reviewers of Teaching will be established at Faculty level. This College will consist of colleagues with broad teaching experience who are trusted to assess teaching fairly across the range of disciplines within the Faculty and to provide thoughtful and sensitive feedback to reviewees. The members of the College will receive training developed for the purpose and the work will be recognized through work load allocation models or equivalent.

There will be a person specification for the role which should be adhered to across the University, but the process for appointing members of the College of Peer Reviewers will be determined at Faculty level.

Within Humanities, each School (SEED, SALC; SoSS; Law and MBS) will establish its own Peer Review College of Teaching. Each Peer Review College will be limited to a nominated group of teaching colleagues to ensure integrity, rigour and consistency in their approach ('School College reviewers'). These colleagues will be selected on the basis of demonstrating their broad teaching experience. They will be trained to assess teaching fairly across the range of disciplines within their School

Each reviewee will be assigned one reviewer from the College (from outside the reviewee's discipline area) along with a local discipline reviewer.

The discipline reviewer should not teach on the same course unit as that of the person under review, or have been involved in its design. The School College reviewer should be asked to declare any conflicts of interest before taking part. The Head of Discipline Area (or equivalent) should not act as reviewer, except where required (e.g. academic probation review).

Each member of the School's Peer Review College will have met the person specification prepared by the University which has been enhanced by the Faculty (Appendix G)

Every review will be carried out by one member of the College of Peer Reviewers and one colleague from within the same discipline as the reviewee. Where it is felt that the presence of two reviewers might disrupt the teaching, a School may determine that the review is carried out solely by the member of the College. However a member of staff should also have the right to request to also have a discipline colleague involved.

Each School can determine who within the School should act as a discipline- specific reviewer, some may opt to have a small set of reviewers, whereas others may wish to involve as many colleagues as possible. Any reviewer should have passed probation and should have at least three years teaching experience. All reviewers will undergo training delivered at University or Faculty level.

Frequency of FPRT

Under normal circumstances, every member of staff with a normal teaching load should undergo FPRT every five years.

In Humanities, Schools review their teaching staff on a six-year cycle using FPRT, except MBS which reviews every three. FPRT will map onto existing School Peer Review policies and procedures with the addition of a second reviewer from a different discipline

More frequent FPRT will be carried out under the following circumstances:

- colleagues on probation should undergo FPRT in their first or second AND third year, normally the mentor will be one of the reviewers;
- colleagues who are going forward for promotion can request to undergo an extra FPRT so that information from a recent review can be included in the documentation for promotion;
- where serious concerns have been raised about a reviewee's performance through a previous FPRT an additional FPRT will be arranged before the next scheduled session to confirm that performance is improving as a result of action taken.

It is recommended that a process for more frequent local peer reviews of teaching be developed at School level. This process may include regular more frequent review of all staff, but should certainly take place under the following circumstances:

- in cases where the course unit that is being delivered is new;
- where very poor Unit Survey results have given rise to serious concern.

Organisation of the review

A schedule for FPRT is drawn up at School level annually. It is anticipated that a member of the professional support staff with responsibility for HR matters acts as co-ordinator of peer reviews, but that input is sought from an academic member of staff, e.g. Head of Discipline/Division or T&L Director, as necessary. In each School there must also be one academic member who has oversight of the process.

A request for the appropriate number of members of the Peer Review of Teaching College is forwarded to Faculty in good time, and a local peer reviewer is assigned

for each reviewee. Once the names of the two peer reviewers are known, this should be communicated to the reviewee.

Should a reviewee wish to change their reviewer(s) this should be communicated to the peer review co-ordinator within a week of the initial selection having been made known to the reviewee, in order for the request to be considered and for other arrangements to be put in place if necessary. To inform the selection of a more appropriate alternative reviewer or reviewers, the reviewee should make it clear why they disagree with the initial choice of reviewer(s).

Preparation for the review

The reviewee is made aware of which semester the FPRT will take place in and is asked to make accessible the necessary documentation and information about the time and place of the contact hours for that semester.

At this stage, the reviewee is also asked to provide contextualizing information. This may consist entirely of existing documentation, but a separate explanatory document may be required. The reviewee may wish to submit a document outlining their approach to teaching or highlighting any areas that they wish particular attention to be paid to in the review. If appropriate, past Unit Survey information can be made available to the reviewers. If necessary, a pre-meeting of the reviewer(s) and reviewee may be held to discuss the documentation submitted or any other aspect of the teaching. The reviewer(s) should ensure that the reviewee understands the process of the review and how the resulting data can be used.

The two reviewers agree which contact hours to observe and give the reviewee at least one week's notice of each chosen time slot.

Reviewer(s) should not be supplied with the forms from previous reviews as part of the process unless the reviewee is happy for the reviewer(s) to see it. In cases where a review has been organised as a follow up after low unit survey results or other serious concerns raised in a previous review, the reviewer(s) should be provided with information about the reason for the review in order that the review can be tailored appropriately.

Scope of the Review

Peer Review should take a holistic view of the reviewee's teaching, considering written materials and online and blended learning resources as well as observing at least one face-to-face session. Where the reviewee is involved in more than one type of teaching (lecture, practical, tutorial etc), or teaches on more than one course unit, the observations should ideally cover some of the breadth of activity.

Reviewers may wish to consider:

- Design of course materials (written documentation), such as the course unit outline, content, learning outcomes and assessment requirements.
- The balance of teaching methods employed and whether it is appropriate for the stated aims and learning outcomes.
- Methods of feedback & assessment, including materials provided online, hand-outs, assignments or exam scripts, assignment guidance and marking schemes etc. (See Appendix E)
- If appropriate, past Unit Survey information can be made available to the reviewers.
- Online & blended learning resources. *The reviewee will arrange for both reviewers to be granted*

access to Blackboard materials for the required time period via the local PSS staff with Campus Solutions access.

Outcome of the Review

The reviewer(s) should produce a written document using the FPRT form. This will involve the reviewers assessing the reviewee's all-round teaching performance on a four-point scale:

- All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of very high quality, few or no suggestions for improvement could be made.
- All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of high quality, but some suggestions for improvement could be made.
- Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were of good quality, but a number of suggestions for important improvements can be made and some developmental activity is recommended.
- Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were deemed to raise sufficient concern that urgent developmental activity was recommended).

The form requires the reviewers to provide comments motivating the assessment, to identify good practice and recommend development activity where appropriate. The form requires comment on four major areas: (i) documentation (e.g. quality of course unit information, lecture handouts and or slides etc), (ii) contact sessions (e.g. structure of lecture, quality of communication etc), (iii) assessment and feedback (e.g. relation between assessment and intended learning outcomes, nature and timing of feedback to students) and (iv) course unit structure. On some team taught units, the reviewee may have limited input to some of these headings, comments should be limited to areas on which the reviewee has had an influence.

The agreed form is made available to the reviewee within two weeks of the final observation. If the reviewers require further information, the reviewee may be asked to provide this, or a meeting may be held between reviewers and reviewee before the form is signed off by the reviewers. The reviewee is given the opportunity to add written comments on the process and the outcome.

A copy of the completed form is retained by the reviewee and a copy is forwarded to the reviewee's line manager for information, and so that an action plan for implementing the recommendations can be formulated, if appropriate. The FPRT form is then filed along with other information such as Performance and Development Review outcomes and subject to the same conditions of confidentiality. It should form part of the documentation reviewed as part of the P&DR process and it will may also be taken into account in promotion.

If the P&DR is carried out by someone other than the line manager, the line manager should ensure that the reviewee is happy for the proxy reviewer to see the form, and ensure that the proxy reviewer receives it if so.

The reviewer who is a member of the College of Peer Reviewers is responsible for ensuring

that the examples of good practice are forwarded to the appropriate person for dissemination. The report of the review process is not retained by either reviewer.

The output from the FPRT is one of a set of documents which feed into the assessment of a member of staff's teaching, it also includes for instance information about teaching contribution, Unit Survey results and other student feedback, local peer review and external examiner report.

As in the case of REFPE, there is no appeal against the assessment itself. Concern about procedural irregularity should be raised with the academic within the School who has oversight of the FPRT.

Schools should develop a method for ensuring that the exercise is monitored (via the continual / annual monitoring exercise) and for compiling any examples of good practice, training and development needs arising from the operation of the exercise as appropriate, in order that they can be fed through to Faculty. The 'good practice' section of the form could be extracted and sent to the School coordinator by the School College reviewer.

A meeting of the Faculty Peer Review Network will be held annually after the end of teaching in semester 2. School Coordinators and School College members will be invited to the meeting to discuss training needs and share practice arising from the operation of the peer review exercise and good practice arising from teaching.

Appendix A. Number of reviewers required

The following information has been produced to demonstrate how many School College Peer Reviewers will be required within each of Humanities' schools if each peer reviewer carries out reviews on a 6 year cycle, and with each reviewer undertaking 5 reviews per year with each review taking 5 hours. These are indicative numbers; schools may decide how many reviews each reviewer will complete but the principle of a college of reviewers must be maintained.

The numbers listed do not include the internal discipline reviewers required to assist with the process.

It has been calculated that School Peer Reviewers will be required to nominally allocate five hours per review for pre-reading course material, observation of seminar/ lectures and then the reporting process. It is also recommended that schools add in an extra two reviewers to manage clashes and additional requests for review (e.g. those approaching promotion but not scheduled for review).

| School | Total Number of Academic staff requiring Review | Annual number of reviews on 6 year cycle | Number of School peer reviewers required (carrying out up to 5 reviews each) | *Notional hours of additional input (based on the 5 reviews per reviewer model). |
|--------|---|--|--|--|
| MBS | 224 | 38 | 8 | 8 reviewers, 5 reviews each @ 5 hours: 200 notional hours |
| SALC | 360 | 60 | 12 | 12 reviewers, 5 reviews each @ 5 hours: 300 notional hours |
| SEED | 181 | 31 | 7 | 7 reviewers, 5 reviews each @ 5 hours: 175 notional hours |
| SoSS | 189 | 32 | 7 | 7 reviewers, 5 reviews each @ 5 hours: 175 notional hours |
| Law | 65 | 11 | 2 | 2 reviewers, 5 reviews each @ 5 hours: 50 notional hours |

Appendix B. Guidelines for academic teaching staff being peer reviewed

To assist academics being reviewed in getting the most from the process, the following guidelines are suggested:

- Your reviewer(s) will ask you for information on the time and venue of your teaching and decide which session(s) they wish to observe in the chosen semester. They should provide you with at least one week's notice of each chosen slot.
- Your reviewer(s) may ask you to provide contextualizing information in advance of your review. This may consist entirely of existing documentation, but a separate explanatory document may be required.
- Alternatively, you may wish to submit a document outlining your approach to teaching or highlighting any areas that you wish they pay particular attention to in the review. If appropriate, past Unit Survey information can be made available to the reviewer(s).
- If necessary, a pre-meeting between yourself and your reviewer(s) may be held to discuss the documentation submitted or any other aspect of the teaching that you would like them to consider. Your reviewer(s) should ensure that you understand the process of the review and how the resulting data can be used.
- In the session that is to be reviewed, consider whether you are going to explain the presence of the reviewers to your group.
- Teaching is a personal and complex skill. Consider how you will react to feedback and discussion with your reviewers.
- You will be provided with a copy of the form within two weeks of the final observation and given the opportunity to add written comments on the process and outcome, alternatively your reviewer(s) may contact you to discuss the feedback or to request further information
- Choose and take ownership of several points for development. These could be several small points or one bigger issue. Make sure these are recorded and send a copy of the forms to your Head of Department.
- Consider how you could achieve the points for development.
- Decide on a method to achieve the points for development.
- Agree with your reviewers the aspects of good practice to be recorded.

To assist reviewers in getting the most from the process, the following guidelines are suggested:

- Obtain information on the reviewee's contact hours and with the discipline reviewer, agree which session(s) to observe. Ensure that you provide at least one week's notice of each chosen slot.
- Seek contextualizing information. This may consist entirely of existing documentation, but a separate explanatory document may be required. You may wish to discuss their approach to teaching in a pre-meeting or ask them to use the explanatory document to highlight any areas they wish particular attention be paid in the review. You may also wish to request past Unit Survey information.
- You should ensure that the reviewee understands the process of review and how the resulting data can be used.
- Discuss with the reviewee whether you are able to contribute to any discussions in class.
- Make notes to help you construct accurate feedback. Feedback should be evidence-based rather than subjective.
- Consider process more than content, and look for the many dimensions that occur within a session, such as structure, student engagement, re-iteration of key points, communication strategies, etc.
- Ensure that you seek out and report any items of good practice. Reach agreement with the reviewee and second reviewer concerning the aspects of good practice observed, and record them.
- If the good practice is felt to be worthy of wider dissemination, check that the reviewee is happy for this to be reported on. The 'good practice' section of the form could be extracted and sent to the School coordinator.
- Reach agreement with the discipline reviewer concerning action points, and record them.
- Complete the relevant observation form along with the discipline reviewer. The form requires comment on four major areas. On some team taught units, the reviewee may have had limited input to some of these headings, comments should be limited to areas on which the reviewee has had an influence. If you need further information, ask the reviewee to provide it,
- The form should be made available to the reviewee within two weeks of the final observation. You may wish to organise a meeting with the reviewee before the form is signed off. The reviewee should be provided with the opportunity to add written comments on the process and outcome.
- A copy of the form should be provided to the reviewee and a copy forwarded to the reviewee's line manager for information and for use in discussing and implementing the recommendations, if appropriate.

- The reviewee may wish to discuss potential points for development. It is quite likely that you know of other ways of developing a particular aspect, and you could share this with the reviewee.
- Neither reviewer should retain a copy of the form.

Appendix D. Guidance on review of Unit Specification & Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)

Reviewers will consider written teaching materials which could include a session plan, student assignments or reading lists as part of the peer review process. The following prompts might be of use:

- The contents of the unit specification should be reviewed in light of the University template available online at:
<http://www.tlso.manchester.ac.uk/quality-framework/unitspecifications/>
- A clear and appropriate statement of aims and intended learning outcomes forms an important element in programme design, in quality assurance and in focusing student learning. How clearly are the ILOs defined? The University's [Guide to Writing Aims and Intended Learning Outcomes](#) should be of use in reviewing unit ILOs and in suggesting clarifications where necessary.
- Consider whether the balance of teaching methods employed (lecture, seminar, work shop, online and blended learning activities), is appropriate for the stated aims and learning outcomes.
- Does each teaching session have its own ILOs where appropriate?
- How well are the methods of assessment matched to ILOs?
- Is it clear what is core, and what is supplementary reading? How current are the resources used?

Appendix E. Guidance on review of methods & examples of feedback to students:

The University of Manchester is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively.

Methods and examples of feedback provided to students should be considered as part of the peer review process, including materials provided online, hand-outs, assignments or exam scripts, assignment guidance or marking schemes. Methods of feedback will vary according to assessment type, discipline, level of study and the needs of the individual student.

The aim should be to seek an objective overview of practice. The following prompts may be useful in reviewing feedback:

- Does the assessment strategy relate to that for the programme as a whole?
- Is the amount of assessment appropriate?
- Is the assessment clearly linked to the intended learning outcomes?
- Are the grading criteria appropriate and clearly explained?
- Do the grading criteria relate to the ILOS?
- Is there an opportunity for students to receive formative feedback before the main piece of assessment?
- Is information provided in unit outlines and course materials to inform students of the mechanisms by which they will receive feedback and the forms it will take for both formative and summative work?
- Does it help students understand their marks or how their performance might be improved in future?
- Does the Blackboard page for the unit have a clear section explaining the feedback mechanism that the unit will follow?
- Are there opportunities for tutor/peer interaction and are these well used?
- Is the course making the most of the opportunities for giving feedback? For example: immediate feedback through, discussion boards, multiple choice questions; podcasts; hot spots for the whole class pointing to extra materials; audio summary feedback to the whole group; Grademark for online assignment marking; peer feedback?
- Is the feedback timely? Is it clear to students that it IS feedback?

Appendix F: Peer Review eLearning Prompts

These points should be seen as a starting point for discussion. The reviewer should look at the Blackboard 9 course, and also consider any other eLearning activity outside of Bb9, for example blogs, wikis, Twitter, Facebook, in-class technologies, etc. These activities may only become evident during discussion with the course convenor.

Expectations and orientation

- Has the time commitment of the eLearning elements been built in as part of the guided learning hours, and is this clear to the students?
- Is it clear how the online resources will be used in conjunction with the face to face teaching, and how the student will use them?
- Is it clear what the student is meant to do with each piece of information/activity? Does it specify whether it is optional or not? Is the aim of the activity clear, e.g. they will then be better able to undertake a piece of marked assessed work, they will gain a deeper knowledge of a specific aspect, they will be able to relate one aspect of the learning to another etc.?

Context

- Is there a clear pathway through the material?
- Is the material organised in such a way that the student can easily relate it to the overall learning structure, e.g. week by week or topic by topic?
- Navigation/signposting/context. Can a student find their way around easily, and back to parts they've already seen etc? Is the online experience consistent throughout the course, e.g. are the same terms and naming conventions used throughout; is the structure and signposting for each area similar?.

School's Peer Review College):

- * Any College reviewer should have passed probation and should have more than 4 years teaching experience to be able to judge which aspects of the reviewees' teaching are most effective*
- * An ability to present the outcome of the review honestly, constructively and sensitively to the person reviewed*
- * The flexibility to engage with content material not related to the reviewer's own field*
- * Enough experience of different styles of teaching and awareness of support available to be able to suggest ways of enhancing strengths and addressing shortcomings, where appropriate*
- * A willingness to ensure consistency also by taking on up to five reviews per year*
- * Preparedness to undertake the STDU training (2 hour session plus some reading)*

College reviewers would be expected to undertake this role for a period of up to six years. College members should undergo training developed for the purpose (by STDU) and the work will be recognised through work allocation models or equivalent.

It is estimated that each review will take approximately 5-6 hours and that each School College reviewer will be asked to undertake about 5 reviews per year. This will be included in workload models.

The School College Reviewer is required to take the lead in organising and undertaking the review, completing the paperwork and providing feedback to the reviewee.

The discipline reviewer should observe, advise and input to the process.

Form to be completed as part of Faculty Peer Review of Teaching

To be completed and agreed by the two reviewers and made available to the reviewee for comments within two weeks of the final observations.

A copy of the form should also be sent to the reviewee's line manager. Neither reviewer should retain a copy of the form.

This form contains a number of headings under which the reviewers are expected to add comments, with supporting evidence wherever possible. Each heading lists a number of questions. These are meant as prompts only; the lists are not assumed to be exhaustive, nor is it expected that each of the questions is responded to in the comments. Where more than one session has been observed, the form should be adapted as appropriate.

In some cases, the lecturer may not have has responsibility for determining all aspects of the course unit, the course unit may have been designed by a course leader, the course unit outline may have been put together by someone else, etc. Comments here should be limited to areas where the reviewee has had influence.

| | |
|--|----|
| Name of reviewee | |
| Name of reviewers | 1. |
| | 2. |
| Date | |
| Course unit code | |
| Mode of delivery (FT/ PT/ Blended) | |
| Room | |
| Level | |
| Academic Year | |
| Programme(s) of which the unit forms a part¹ | |
| Type of contact session (lecture, tutorial etc.) | |
| Name of reviewee's line manager | |

¹ There is no need to list programmes from which there are only occasional students.

A. Documentation

This may include both paper-based and electronically available information.

What documentation / material was considered (this must include unit specification)?

- Was the information about crucial aspects of the course communicated clearly in the documentation (e.g. structure of course, contact sessions, eLearning elements, expectations between contact sessions, intended learning outcomes, reading lists, extra resources, etc.)?
- Are the intended learning outcomes appropriate for the level and the topic(see Appendix D for further guidance)
- Were the online resources appropriate for the nature of the content and method of delivery (see Appendix F for further guidance)?

Consider strengths and areas for improvement

B. Contact sessions

- Was the session clearly structured?
- Was there explicit linking to previous and/or subsequent sessions?
- Was the communication clear in all respects?
- Was the use of visual aids appropriate (this includes white board and hand-outs, not just electronically transmitted)?
- Were there any issues with control of the class?
- Was the pace appropriate?
- Was the timing right?
- Are the teaching methods appropriate?
- Was there any attempt at interaction with the class?
- Was there good use of illustrative examples?
- Were there links to previous work?
- Was advice given on follow up work/forthcoming work signalled?
- When reviewing small group teaching (such as tutorials, workshops and seminars), were students given adequate opportunity to participate in discussion? How attentive and engaged were the students? Were their questions answered appropriately?

Consider strengths and areas for improvement

C. Assessment and feedback

- Is the amount of assessment appropriate?
- Is the assessment clearly linked to the intended learning outcomes?
- Do the students get some form of feedback before the main piece of assessment?
- Does it help students understand their marks or how their performance might be improved in future?
- Is information provided in unit outlines and course materials to inform students of the mechanisms by which they will receive feedback and the forms it will take for both formative and summative work?
- Does the Blackboard page for the unit have a clear section explaining the feedback mechanism that the unit will follow?

Consider strengths and areas for improvement

D. eLearning materials (see Appendix F)

Consider strengths and areas for improvement

D. Course unit design

- Is the course unit well structured? Is there a clear pathway through the materials and is the relationship between the face to face teaching and eLearning materials clearly defined?
- Are the kinds of sessions involved (lectures, tutorials, practical sessions etc.) appropriate?
- Were there opportunities for personalised learning?
- Was provision made for those with difficulties?

Consider strengths and areas for improvement

Overall assessment based on material reviewed (please tick one option)

| | |
|--|---|
| | All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of very high quality, few or no suggestions for improvement could be made |
| | All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of high quality, but some suggestions for improvement could be made |
| | Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were of good quality, but a number of suggestions for important improvements can be made and some developmental activity is recommended |
| | Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were deemed to raise sufficient concern that urgent developmental activity was recommended) |

Recommendations for dissemination as good practice/teaching awards

Acting as a mentor

Best on Blackboard Competition

Teaching and Learning News (Faculty & School)

Teaching and Learning Show case

Teaching Awards

Web exemplar

If the reviewee agrees to further dissemination of the practice, provide further detail. The reviewee could be asked to provide a note about the practice to assist with dissemination.

Recommendations for development activity or training

Signatures

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|------|--|
| Peer reviewer 1 | | Date | |
| Peer reviewer 2 | | Date | |

Reviewee's comments

| |
|--|
| |
|--|