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1. **Key Principles and Requirements of the Reflective Peer Review (RPR) Scheme**

1. RPR is a required annual, partnered peer process for academic members of staff and professional services staff who have a role in teaching and/or the facilitation of students’ learning. Staff engage in reciprocal review activities with a peer partner, seeking to enhance their own academic practices. It is highly recommended that a partner is sought outside of one’s own academic school or department to promote cross-disciplinary engagement.

2. ‘Teaching’ and ‘support of students’ learning’ are terms used in their broadest sense in the RPR scheme to encompass all pedagogic activity: including the design of curricula and modules or programmes; the planning, development and marking of assessment tasks; the choice of learning formats and approaches; the use of digital and blended approaches; the support offered in physical and online environments; the specifying of learning objectives (or outcomes); the choice of materials and resource lists; the development of teaching resources; processes linked to quality assurance and enhancement; as well as activities occurring in the classroom, including the virtual classroom. In this sense, teaching and the support of students’ learning have many facets.

3. The RPR process is as a collegial and partnered developmental activity. It is not about performance management of academic staff. It is not the remit of RPR to include observation or reviews that are triggered by poor performance. These should be dealt with quite separately, through normal line management processes.

4. There must be agreement made between the reviewee and the reviewer concerning the purpose of each partner’s RPR, its focus and the criteria to be applied. The final choice of focus for the review will be led and made by the reviewee, as an area of focus for which they are seeking to make an enhancement(s).

5. The RPR processes must always be conducted in a fair, considerate and professional manner. Interactions between the reviewee and the reviewer are confidential, unless disclosure is mutually agreed. Confidentiality between the partners is central in the relationship. RPR involves critical dialogue between partners, which is developmental rather than judgmental, and avoiding subjective opinions. The process and dialogue should be informed by evidence collected by the peer partners.

6. All established University academic and professional services staff who have a role in teaching and/or the facilitation of students’ learning are required to participate annually in RPR.
Partnerships are formed and maintained on an annual basis, during which the two rounds of the reciprocal process takes place in each partner being reviewed (the reviewee) and each partner reviewing (being a reviewer).

7. The partners in RPR are required to annually complete a Reporting proforma (see Appendix 5), recording that the RPR has taken place, naming the partners participating and a brief outline of the focus for their own review activity. The completed Reporting Proforma should be provided to the relevant participant’s line manager for use in annual reporting. Participants will also be encouraged to identify and complete the section asking for examples of good practice from the review activity, so that these examples can be shared and disseminated more broadly. Beyond the requirement to participate at least annually, staff are encouraged to engage with the RPR process more frequently should they wish.

8. All new academic staff joining the University, and required to undertake a probationary period, will be observed/reviewed by their line manager during the first year of their probationary period (three year probation). Thereafter, all academic staff, including those staff still on probation, will participate annually in RPR.

9. Staff who are undertaking the first module of the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (Learning and Teaching in HE) will be exempt from the RPR process during their period of study on that specific module, since the module includes a mentor observation and reciprocal peer review activities.

10. As an annual process in undertaking the RPR, staff should feel safe to reflect on their established practices and underpinning knowledge, skills and professional values. Staff are encouraged to actively reflect on the possible implications for personal practice, and plan for ongoing actions to ever seek to enhance their practice.

11. The RPR scheme also provides opportunities for staff to disseminate examples of good practice, as well as to seek advice and support for specific development(s) or learning needs. Academic staff are encouraged to report on both good practice identified or on development needs emerging in the RPR, as part of the Annual Appraisal with their Line Manager.

12. For those staff who will be participating in RPR for the first time, annual training through the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching is offered. This includes ‘Engaging in Reflective Peer Review’ workshop sessions. Additionally, staff are encouraged to access online support resources for RPR.
13. RPR operates as a quality system to ‘close the loop’ and to help staff see benefits *in and from* the activity. For example, RPR has a significant and complementary role in relation to annual appraisal; it encourages ongoing action planning for continuing professional development; and evidence from the RPR might be used for personal, professional recognition and/or career progression.
2. **Specific Details for Each Round of the Annual RPR Process**

1. Each round of the RPR process consists, for each peer partner, normally in:
   
i. a pre-review meeting between the partners (reviewee and reviewer);
   
ii. the review event / activity itself (for example, an observation or a review meeting);
   
iii. a period for reflection;

iv. a post-review discussion and action planning meeting between the partners.

2. Each round of the RPR process will therefore normally require 2-3 meetings per partner. The structure of the meetings can be flexible, determined by the specific context and focus of the RPR activity.

3. Reviewers are encouraged to take a broad approach to the RPR. They need to be open to alternative pedagogic approaches and practices including, for example, in the approach to teaching used by a reviewee. Reviewers will be expected to prepare for engaging in the RPR process and be familiar with good practice in teaching, informed by contemporary and scholarly sources of pedagogic research.

4. If it is appropriate to the context of the pedagogic practice, more than two members can participate in a RPR activity. The process will still follow the same structure as in all other review activities, i.e. with a pre-meeting, the review event, and the post-meeting discussion.

5. It is recommended to allow a short period of time to pass following the review event or activity in order for both the reviewer and the reviewee to critically reflect upon the review event or activity. This will enable a period of self-reflection for both partners, before meeting for the post-review debriefing and discussion/action planning meeting.

6. The reviewee should be invited to offer their own self-evaluation, prior to the reviewer providing feedback in the post-review discussion meeting. Reviewers are not expected to judge or to provide solutions but, as a critical friend, might offer ideas and suggestions for the reviewee to consider. Reviewers are encouraged to draw from their own experiences and understanding, but recognising the reviewee’s context, knowledge, perspective and practices may be quite different. Feedback to the reviewee can be recorded in writing on the relevant RPR proforma.

7. The post-review debriefing discussion should encourage partners in identifying actions for enhancement (which may include actions for the reviewer as well as for the reviewee). These
actions may be actionable by the reviewee alone, or they may require support from, and discussion with, a line manager e.g. actioned further through the annual appraisal mechanism.

8. The partners in RPR are encouraged to each complete and sign an RPR proforma (see Appendices 1-4) to record the focus for their own review activity, key points discussed, and to outline the action plan(s) proposed. This remains a confidential document between the partners.

9. With agreement between the partners, the person reviewed may draw from this document in, for example, their annual appraisal and/or in a career progression case and/or as evidence for professional recognition (for example within the University of Suffolk PASSPoRT scheme and/or with a PSRB).

10. The partners in RPR are required to also annually complete a Reporting proforma (see Appendix 5), recording that the RPR has taken place, naming the partners participating and the focus of their own review activity. Participants will also be encouraged to identify and complete the section asking for examples of good practice from the review activity, so that these examples can be shared and disseminated more broadly.

11. The completed Reporting Proforma should be provided to the relevant participant’s line manager for use in annual reporting. Where applicable, elements from the Reporting proforma can be passed on to the Executive for the Centre for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, for sharing and disseminating examples of good practice more broadly across the institution.
3. Reflective Peer Review Guidance

3.1 RPR in the University of Suffolk Context
The University of Suffolk seeks to ensure learning and teaching at the University are high quality and innovative, informed by targeted research and scholarly activity, and benefiting from student engagement and feedback. The University promotes a quality and inclusive experience for all students, helping all students to achieve their full potential in employment and in life.

To support these objectives, the University strives to recruit and develop professional and critically reflective academic staff, who are open to adopting flexible and innovative approaches to learning, teaching and assessment, informed by scholarly pedagogical research, self-reflection and engagement with their peers. The University prides itself in its academic staff, whose practices are underpinned by a sound and contemporary pedagogic rationale; and in seeking to create an academic culture where excellence in learning and teaching are actively encouraged and supported.

3.2 The Aims of Reflective Peer Review (RPR)
Reflective Peer Review of teaching at the University of Suffolk has the following aims:
- to help assure and continue to enhance quality in teaching and support of students’ learning
- to promote cross-institutional partnership and collegiality around high quality pedagogical practices
- to increase opportunities for scholarly dialogues about teaching in HE and quality in the support of students’ learning across the academic community
- to assist relevant staff members to build and maintain a record of their teaching or a teaching portfolio
- to facilitate the dissemination and sharing of good practice, innovation and expertise concerning HE teaching and support of student learning within the University
- to draw upon the diversity and strengths of academic staff across the Institution
- to help identify appropriate support or staff development needs to enable and promote the ongoing enhancement of learning and teaching.

3.3 Promoting and Supporting Pedagogical Effectiveness and Enhancements
Reflective Peer Review (RPR) forms an integral part of systematically promoting excellence in teaching and support for students’ learning. The RPR scheme has been designed to support professional development in relation to teaching and support of students’ learning in their broadest senses, extending beyond direct observation of learning and teaching interventions in
the classroom, lab, studio or online settings; to include, for example, the evaluation of a new teaching innovation or approach, the design of a new module or course, or a new assessment, or review of the quality of feedback to students. These examples are by no means an exhaustive list and RPR is open to accommodating other aspects of practice related to teaching and support of learning.

One of the reasons to move away from peer review as solely concerned with direct observations in face-to-face contexts, is a concern that observation can arguably be regarded as a subjective interpretation of a final teaching output (such as a lecture), rather than providing insight into the pedagogical effectiveness of the multifarious processes underpinning and driving that output, or indeed, as an opportunity to explore the rationale informing that output. Pedagogic practice is complex and involves far more than the act of teaching in a face-to-face setting. As outlined in more detail below, RPR at University of Suffolk therefore reflects an intention to offer greater flexibility and breadth of opportunities to enhance any aspect relating to our teaching practices and our support of students’ learning.

The University acts as a champion for the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) as a framework for professionalism in teaching and the support of student learning within higher education. The UKPSF outlines an expectation that staff who teach and support students’ learning are committed to continuing professional development and to the ongoing critical evaluation of their pedagogic practices.

A key strand of associated activity to RPR and also linked to pedagogical effectiveness, is the PASSPoRT (Pathways for Academic and Support Staff to Professional Recognition of Teaching) scheme, incorporating the Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PgCAP) and the CPD recognition pathway. This scheme is fully aligned to the UKPSF and accredited with Advance HE. PASSPoRT provides supported pathways to professional recognition in teaching and the support of learning: via both a programmatic pathway (for Descriptor 1 and Descriptor 2 of the UKPSF); and a continuing professional development (CPD) pathway (against Descriptors 1-3 for Associate Fellowship, Fellowship, and Senior Fellowship). Further information on the PASSPoRT scheme can be found at https://libguides.uos.ac.uk/celt/cpd/fellowship

3.4 Reflective Peer Review as Enriching, Engaging, Enhancing and Evaluating
Engagement in Reflective Peer Review has been shown to bring benefits to both teachers and their students across the HE sector: by enhancing and supporting the learning and teaching processes; in encouraging critical and reflective evaluation of pedagogic practices; and in
promoting the development of new approaches and models for learning, teaching and
assessment.

The University of Suffolk RPR process is underpinned by guiding principles drawn from
contemporary work across the HE sector to develop effective schemes, and designed to
increase academic staff engagement in the process (e.g. Gosling & Mason O’Connor, 2009).
The principles encompassed within the scheme for RPR are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional autonomy</td>
<td>The control of the review process belongs to the individual member of staff being reviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluative and reflective</td>
<td>An overarching objective of the review activity is to stimulate a more reflective and scholarly approach to teaching and the facilitation of students’ learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>It is a developmental process designed to support peer learning amongst colleagues as collegial partners across the institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative</td>
<td>The process requires colleagues to work together collaboratively on the basis of mutual trust and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>RPR should improve professional practice and may directly/indirectly enhance students’ learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic</td>
<td>Talking about teaching and the facilitation of students’ learning promotes critical reflection on one’s practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly</td>
<td>Uses available pedagogic evidence and may lead to contribution(s) to generic and/or subject pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with good professional practice</td>
<td>It reflects how professionals learn and contributes to creating an effective and active community of enquiry around good practice in teaching, learning and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manageable in terms of time</td>
<td>In order to make it part of regular ongoing practice, the process has to be manageable and not add to staff’s work-load burden. It should be factored into the non-teaching aspect of work-load planning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from: Gosling, D & Mason O’Connor, K (2009) Beyond the peer observation of teaching. SEDA Paper 124

The Reflective Peer Review process can be enriching, engaging, and enhancing, and it also has
3.4.1 Why enriching?

Many of us immediately associate peer review of teaching with peer observation. While direct observation of teaching can provide valuable exchanges of ideas and approaches to a variety of teaching situations, it is unlikely to encompass all the elements which comprise the role of the teacher. ‘Teaching’ encompasses the whole breadth of the teaching and learning support/facilitation role. This is a deliberate departure from a narrow scrutiny of teaching as ‘performance’ in classrooms or lecture settings. There is a need for our policy and the processes involved in RPR to embrace diversity in learning and teaching activities, to recognise existing practice and also to foster the good health of teaching as an enriched, creative and scholarly-informed activity. Aspects such as blended course design, quality of assignments in promoting student learning, assessment (both formative and summative), and student support are all potential foci for the reflective peer review and clearly can be more readily reviewed by methods other than direct observation of classroom teaching.

3.4.2 Why engaging?

RPR is a pan-institutional activity for all staff whose role directly impacts on the student learning experience, including staff with a direct teaching role and staff who act to facilitate student learning. It is also an opportunity for staff to engage in an annual, scholarly, peer-assisted reflection on the breadth of their own teaching and learning support practices.

Engaging in RPR signals to our students the University’s commitment and openness to enhance and develop our practices in ways that are collegial and collaborative, focused on modelling and promoting engaging and positive student learning experiences.

3.4.3 Why enhancing?

The RPR scheme aims to enhance the student learning experience and enable lecturers, tutors and professional services staff who support learning to teach and facilitate learning ever more effectively. It is a supportive annual process that promotes a reflective conversation about teaching and the support of students’ learning and that links closely with an individual’s personal and professional development. Peer review differs from teaching observations. The latter are more narrowly focused on discrete ‘observable teaching events’. Instead, peer review aims to enhance teaching practices and give feedback that:

- move beyond simply the teaching approach and its performance
- move away from focusing on content (the connection of individuals across discipline boundaries as partners particularly supports this)
is more specific and meaningful
offers greater challenge or provides new insights
is decoupled from evaluative observations of probationary staff

A review of the literature of peer review and peer observation in higher education suggests there are numerous benefits to peer review of teaching including:

• increased teacher confidence
• greater collegiality among peers across the institution
• encouraging critical dialogue and debate on professional practices
• promoting dissemination of best practice
• improving interactions with students

3.4.4 Why evaluating?

It is vital we reflect upon our practices and evaluate what we do as teachers and facilitators of student learning. We need to ensure that we have a strong rationale and informed evidence base for our practice, informed by contemporary research-informed approaches to HE pedagogy and by our own ongoing critically informed and scholarly practices. Peer review is one of the key mechanisms whereby we can evaluate our practice and engage in critical self-reflection and enhancement.
4. The Processes in Reflective Peer Review (RPR)

It is anticipated for staff to work reciprocally in pairs when engaging in RPR. A reciprocal approach means that each person takes his or her turn in acting as the reviewer and subsequently facilitating a dialogue about the area of practice identified for review. The intention is that within this partnered dialogue, questions are asked to stimulate reflection and discussion, and where appropriate, to provide each other with feedback and support in action planning for ongoing enhancement.

It will be important to remember this is a partnered, not just a one-way process, and it is likely those acting as reviewers are likely to learn as much as their partner from being a reviewer. Normally, partnering will be with colleagues external to one’s own School or professional area. The process for RPR does not exclude the use of a developmental model, particularly for staff less experienced in teaching. In a developmental model, peers work together, but one is more experienced than the other and the intention is to help develop the lesser experienced individual’s teaching practice.

4.1 Personal Planning for Reflective Peer Review

You need to find a partner, ideally from outside your own School or subject area. You need to work with a different partner each academic year, so that everyone can benefit from the diversity of perspectives and from the wide-ranging discussions one can have with different colleagues. You can do this independently, or with support of CELT.

The UKPSF (www.heacademy.ac.uk/ukpsf) provides a descriptor-based framework for standards in teaching and support of learning in HE. Use of the UKPSF may be helpful in reflecting the range of your activities, interests, experience and expertise in relation to teaching and the facilitation of students' learning.

The review activity, and the debriefing dialogue that follows, are determined by an analysis of your own reflection on your personal professional development needs, and can be focused on a variety of teaching, learning or assessment practices. Examples of potential activities for review include (but are not limited to): a course design proposal; the blended design of a course, including enhanced use of Brightspace; an assessment design; the quality of feedback on an assessment; approaches to research supervision; designing a new module; as well as observations of practical demonstrations, lab sessions, tutorials or teaching sessions (whether face-to-face or online).
4.2 The Pre-Review (Planning) Meeting

The person to be reviewed completes Part A of the relevant RPR proforma (see the appendices) and provides this to the partner acting as the reviewer in the first, pre-review (planning) meeting.

The pre-review (planning) meeting is to organise for, and discuss the focus of the review itself and to organise the post-meeting debriefing. As the person being reviewed, you will explain the context and how the event or activity being reviewed relates to other aspects of your teaching and work.

This meeting is also an opportunity to identify a specific focus for feedback, to plan how the review will be conducted, as well as to arrange the post-review meeting and dialogue. It is also an opportunity to outline any specific circumstances or details of which it is useful for the reviewer to be aware.

Ideally too, any resources to be used during the review event should be made available to the reviewer in advance of the actual event (such as PowerPoint slides, handouts, or other documentation).

4.3 The Review Event or Activity

The second meeting is the review activity itself, in which the reviewer uses the provided proforma and completes Section B either during the event or immediately after, to capture their notes of the review event or the observation, including in relation to any specific focus identified for the review.

With any review activity, it is important to inform anyone else involved of the purpose of the reviewer being present, for example if the review is of a module design in which a module team of tutors and/or students are present. With an observation, it is always good practice to inform the students of the purpose of the review, i.e. a reviewer being present to observe the teacher and not them. Any handouts or other materials to be used should also be made available to the reviewer.

If this is not a classroom observation, this second meeting may take the form of a demonstration or presentation to your colleague as the reviewer – such as of the rationale for a particular curriculum design or your reasons for a particular programme’s assessment strategy.

It would normally be expected for an observation or the reviewer’s involvement in a review activity, to last no more than an hour.
4.4 Time for Reflection

We encourage both partners in any form of RPR to take a little time to reflect upon the review activity before meeting up for the post-review dialogue and feedback meeting. It is important to allow time for the reviewer and the reviewee to reflect and consider, and perhaps to undertake further investigation which might add to and enrich the post-discussion (for example seeking out possible theoretical / subject / pedagogical resources to share in the post-review meeting).

4.5 The Post-Review Meeting: Dialogue and Feedback

The post-review meeting provides the opportunity for both partners to share their views and to reflect on the review activity, as well as to discuss what took place. It should be conducted as a critical but constructive dialogue and feedback meeting.

We encourage the person who has been observed or who is being reviewed to initiate this dialogue and to share their reflections upon the activity first. It is important this person shapes and steers the discussion around things they feel are important to discuss prior to the reviewer providing feedback (and sharing any notes made in Section B of the proforma).

The provision of effective feedback is central to the success of the University’s RPR processes. How feedback is provided is as crucial as the process of peer review itself. The chance that teaching enhancement will occur increases when feedback is accurate and specific, is given in a supportive and non-judgmental manner, provides and suggests specific alternatives, is focused and relevant, and allows room for discussion and collegial interactions.

Effective feedback in RPR therefore centres on:

- Being timely, following a period for reflection and critique (ideally within a week of the review activity or the observation).

- Inviting the person being reviewed or observed to speak first. The person being reviewed needs to maintain self-respect as well as to shape and steer the dialogue. It is also likely they will identify areas for development and be self-critical, from which the person acting as a reviewer can offer their viewpoint and help to guide the dialogue to actions for enhancement.

- Trying not to cover too many points or aspects. There is a limit to what can be effectively assimilated, and the reviewer needs to help identify the key aspects upon which to focus in the discussion.

- Making sure the comments made are balanced and constructive. Positive comments on
their own allow no room for improvement, while purely negative feedback is discouraging and demoralising.

- Allowing time for thought and reflection in the dialogue process.
- Avoiding blanket statements or comments. A credible claim or statement describes and identifies evidence in order to rationalise the claim / statement being made.
- Commenting on behaviours or approaches that reasonably can be changed or developed.
- Listening to and respecting the person who is being reviewed. It is not unreasonable for them to disagree with the reviewer’s comments. The person being observed or reviewed should not be discouraged from also being critical and analytical.
- Avoiding being overtly prescriptive about a ‘right’ way to do things. We must always respect there are often alternative approaches that might be equally valid.
- Focusing the dialogue on the educational principles and pedagogical rationale underpinning the decisions and actions made.
- Offering the person being reviewed information about their actions and/or performance and allowing them to consider what action(s) might be taken. Discussion of possible actions can be helpful as well as speculating on the consequence(s) of any decision to change (or not to change). However, it is not the reviewer’s responsibility to proffer solutions.
- Identifying potential actions for the person acting as a reviewer to take in their own teaching and/or support of learning.
- Leading to agreement in an action plan for the reviewee (and potentially also for the reviewer) to seek to progress.

Following the dialogue and feedback, and during the post-review meeting, Section C of the proforma can be completed to record the key points of the discussion, the areas of strength identified and the areas for development or enhancement (which may include aspects for the reviewer also to consider). Together, the partners may agree on a number of aspects from this process that can be reported, including areas of good pedagogic practice and innovative practice that might be shared and disseminated more widely. Both partners are encouraged to sign and date the proforma which is retained by the reviewee as a confidential record.

It is recommended that the exact details of the post-review or post observation discussion remain confidential between the people involved, unless the person being reviewed wishes to share the information (with mutual agreement). An individual may choose to use a written record
of the review for a number of reasons, for example as part of their annual appraisal; in a career progression or promotion case; or as part of evidence in seeking professional recognition such as within the PASSPoRT scheme and/or with a PSRB.

Each Dean of School (or Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching and Student Experience) is required to maintain an annual record that RPRs have been undertaken by all relevant members of staff. The reporting proforma (see Appendix 5) enables those relevant members of staff to report that RPR has occurred and who was involved. The reporting proforma also enables examples of good and innovative practice to be recorded, for sharing and dissemination across the institution (via the Executive for CELT).

4.6 Action Planning and Reporting

The Dean of School or your Line Manager will require annual evidence (using the RPR Reporting Proforma) that you have participated in and completed your RPR. However, the record of the dialogue and feedback between you and your partner remains confidential to you.

During the annual appraisal process, staff should be asked to consider how RPR (in roles as a reviewer and in being reviewed) has influenced their teaching and support of students’ learning practice, but they will not be asked to produce specific records or transcripts. Participants may choose to use and include sections of an RPR record within a case for career progression or as evidence within a submission for professional recognition e.g. within the PASSPoRT scheme (upon consent of both partners).

Action plans arising from RPR and agreed in the feedback and dialogue process might need the support of the relevant manager in order to enact, for example in identifying learning needs and resources for staff development.

Colleagues are encouraged to share examples of good and innovative practice in order that we can share and disseminate such examples across the institution, helping us all to see authentic examples of good practices across the University from which we can grow and continue to develop the quality of our teaching and support of students’ learning in collegial ways.

5. Further Support Resources

Further information and guidance about Reflective Peer Review can be found on the Quality team’s webpages at:  [https://libguides.uos.ac.uk/celt/cpd/RPR](https://libguides.uos.ac.uk/celt/cpd/RPR)
6. Appendices: Reflective Peer Review Proformas

Appendix 1: RPR proforma for observations
Appendix 2: RPR proforma for review of a module design
Appendix 3: RPR proforma for review of an assessment design
Appendix 4: RPR proforma for review of feedback
Appendix 5: RPR reporting proforma
Appendix 1

Reflective Peer Review (RPR): Proforma for Observations

**PART A: to be completed by the reviewee (i.e. the partner being reviewed) in advance of the pre-review meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewee:</th>
<th>Name of reviewer:</th>
<th>Type of session for review / observation: e.g. teaching observation, practical session, supervision session, online tutorial</th>
<th>Status of report: Confidential between partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact info: Contact info: Proposed date for the observation:

1. **Aims of the review activity:** Briefly outline the broad purpose of the review activity

2. **Objectives:** Indicate what you might expect to gain from the review activity (including also what you expect students to gain if relevant)

3. **Observation focus:** Identify any aspect(s) of an observation session that you would like the reviewer to comment on in particular

**PART B: to be completed by the reviewer and to use in preparing for the post-discussion with the reviewee**

4. **A checklist of aspects that might be considered during an observation:**
   - Student engagement and student motivation designed into the session, and extent to which they are achieved
   - Appropriateness of objectives for the session to course/student level
   - Achievement of the learning objectives set
   - Quality of the structure (e.g. in a session outline, summary, links to other teaching)
   - Appropriateness of teaching approach/learning methods
- Extent and form(s) of student participation e.g. challenging learners, asking questions, learner inclusion
- Stimulating teaching, enthusiasm, respect for learners
- Quality and use of audio-visual aids
- Audibility
- Pace
- Vocal Expression

5. General observations / points of clarification

PART C: to be completed to record the post-review / observation dialogue and feedback meeting, and action planning (for the reviewee and potentially also for the reviewer)

6. Suggested areas for development

7. Additional comments in relation to observation focus in Section 3

8. Action Plan (to be discussed and agreed jointly by the reviewee and the reviewer)

We agree that this is a fair record of the RPR of the named reviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of reviewee</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of reviewer</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Reflective Peer Review (RPR): Proforma for Module Design Review

### PART A: to be completed by the reviewee (i.e. the partner being reviewed) in advance of the pre-review meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewee:</th>
<th>Name of reviewer:</th>
<th>Name of module / level / course:</th>
<th>Status of report: Confidential between partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact info:</th>
<th>Contact info:</th>
<th>Proposed date for the review activity:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **Aims of the review activity:** *Briefly outline the broad purpose of the review activity*

2. **Objectives:** *Indicate what you might expect to gain from the review activity (including also what you expect students to gain if relevant)*

3. **Review focus:** *Identify any aspect(s) of the module design that you would like the reviewer to comment on in particular*

### PART B: to be completed by the reviewer and to use in preparing for the post-discussion with the reviewee

1. **A checklist of aspects that might be considered during the review activity**
   - Appropriateness of objectives and the intended learning outcomes (ILOs)
   - Quality of the overall structure of the module
   - Appropriateness of teaching approach(es)
   - Appropriateness of learning activities
   - Extent and form(s) of student participation across the module e.g. how student engagement and motivation designed into the module
   - Assessment strategy: rationale and planning
   - Feedback approach(es) to be used
   - Range and relevancy of learning resources
5. General observations / points of clarification

**PART C:** to be completed to record the post-review / observation dialogue and feedback meeting, and action planning (for the reviewee and potentially also for the reviewer)

6. Strengths

7. Suggested areas for development

8. Additional comments in relation to focus identified in Section 3

9. Action Plan (to be discussed and agreed jointly by the reviewee and the reviewer)

We agree that this is a fair record of the RPR of the named reviewee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of reviewee</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature of reviewer</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Reflective Peer Review (RPR): Proforma for Assessment Review

PART A: to be completed by the reviewee (i.e. the partner being reviewed) in advance of the pre-review meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of reviewee:</th>
<th>Name of reviewer:</th>
<th>Name of module / level / course to which this review activity relates:</th>
<th>Status of report: Confidential between partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
<td>Proposed date for the review activity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Aims of the review activity:** Briefly outline the broad purpose of the review activity

2. **Objectives:** Indicate what you might expect to gain from the review activity (including also what you expect students to gain if relevant)

3. **Review focus:** Identify any aspect(s) of the assessment design that you would like the reviewer to comment on in particular

PART B: to be completed by the reviewer and to use in preparing for the post-discussion with the reviewee

4. **A checklist of aspects that might be considered during the review activity:**
   - Appropriateness of objectives for the assessment
   - The fit of the assessment design with achievement of the module intended learning outcomes (ILOs)
   - Rationale for the assessment design
   - Activities planned to assist and inform the assessment
   - Rationale for the feedback approach used/proposed
   - Range and relevancy of relevant resources for students in undertaking the assessment
   - Any other aspects
5. General observations / points of clarification

**PART C:** to be completed to record the post-review / observation dialogue and feedback meeting, and action planning (for the reviewee and potentially also for the reviewer)

6. Strengths

7. Suggested areas for development

8. Additional comments in relation to focus identified in Section 3

9. Action Plan (to be discussed and agreed jointly by the reviewee and the reviewer)

We agree that this is a fair record of the RPR of the named reviewee

Signature of reviewee  
Date: 

Signature of reviewer  
Date:
Appendix 4

Reflective Peer Review (RPR): Proforma for Feedback Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART A: to be completed by the reviewee (i.e. the partner being reviewed) in advance of the pre-review meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of reviewee:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School / professional area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact info:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Aims of the review activity**: Briefly outline the broad purpose of the review activity

2. **Objectives**: Indicate what you might expect to gain from the review activity (including also what you expect students to gain if relevant)

3. **Review focus**: Identify any aspect(s) of feedback that you would like the reviewer to comment on in particular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART B: to be completed by the reviewer and to use in preparing for the post-discussion with the reviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>A checklist of aspects that might be considered during the review activity</strong>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use and fit with the assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeliness of provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forms used in providing feedback e.g. in writing, orally, via podcasts or video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provision made for feed forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Any other aspects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. General observations / points of clarification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PART C: to be completed to record the post-review / observation dialogue and feedback meeting, and action planning (for the reviewee and potentially also for the reviewer)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Suggested areas for development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Additional comments in relation to focus identified in Section 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Action Plan (to be discussed and agreed jointly by the reviewee and the reviewer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We agree that this is a fair record of the RPR of the named reviewee

| Signature of reviewee | Date: |
| Signature of reviewer | Date: |
Appendix 5

Reflective Peer Review (RPR): Proforma for Reporting on Review Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of person reviewed:</th>
<th>Name of person reviewing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their School / Professional area:</td>
<td>Their School / Professional area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of review:</td>
<td>Date of post-review meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of review activity / observation:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of good and/or innovative practice identified from the review: Please give a brief summary of, and rationale for, the practice(s) identified:

Please complete this form as soon as the post-review discussion has been conducted and submit to your Line Manager or Dean of School (and to the Head of Quality Enhancement if any examples of good and/or innovative practice are identified)