

Procedure for Peer Review of Teaching

This document describes the recommended procedure for the Peer Review exercise for the evaluation of teaching at the National University of Singapore. Please read this document before initiating and conducting the Peer Review exercise.

POLICIES

1. Peer Reviews, as described in this document, are required in the evaluation of teaching for consideration for promotion and tenure, re-appointment as well as various teaching awards such as the Outstanding Educator Award. The Peer Review can also serve to provide teaching faculty with useful feedback for the improvement of their teaching.
2. Peer Reviews have two parts: (i) review of classroom teaching (Section A) and (ii) review of module folder that cover teaching/assessment materials (Section B). The classroom observation (Section A) and the module folder (Section B) will be for the same module.
3. The Peer Review team may consist of up to 4 reviewers, at least 2, one of whom shall belong to another Department. Reviewers should be assigned by the Head of Department on a rotating basis across years.
4. As far as possible, the responsibility of reviewing peers should be distributed among faculty members who have at least three years of teaching experience and are effective in teaching. Seminars, dialogue sessions, and workshops on peer reviewing will be conducted at CDTL from time to time to share experiences and good practices. Similar sessions can also be arranged at departments/faculties/schools.
5. Collectively, the review team is expected to have sufficient familiarity with the procedural and pedagogical aspects of peer review, and content knowledge.
6. A module folder should contain (i) module outlines that spell out the intended learning outcomes, syllabus, readings, etc., (ii) teaching/learning materials, (iii) continual and final assessment, and (iv) the reviewee's account of the module's accomplishments which may also include student work. The module folder submitted should not contain materials older than 3 years.
 - Details of the classes to be observed and the module folders to be reviewed should be entered into the Online Peer Review System by the Department Peer Review in-charge. The Peer Review of a module should contain the review of at least one sample of classroom teaching and at least one module folder. It is recommended that all reviewers should observe the same class(es) barring exceptional circumstances. The Peer Review report should be based on all the classroom observations made and the module folders examined.
 - The reviewers are strongly encouraged to meet the reviewee prior to the observation of the classroom teaching as well as after the completion of the review. At the pre-observation meeting, the reviewers should attempt to gain an overview of the reviewee's teaching in general as well as the module/lesson to be observed. The post-review meeting will provide reviewers with an opportunity to seek clarifications and/or give feedback to the reviewee on his/her teaching.

Note: Module folders should be submitted directly (outside of the online PR system) to the respective peer reviewers before the classroom observation date.

7. The reviewers are to each complete and submit a Peer Review report independently of each other. This is to ensure that each reviewer will give his/her own independent assessment of the reviewee's teaching.
8. After formal endorsement of the Peer Review reports by the Head and the Dean, a collated, anonymised Peer Review Report will be made available to the reviewee through the Online Peer Review System.
9. If the reviewee feels that the Peer Review report is unfair or prejudiced, (s)he will have one opportunity to respond to the Peer Review report within a two-week timeframe.

Revised Peer Review Form:
Notes on selected items in the form

Section A: Classroom Teaching

Question	Item in the form	Explanatory notes
1.	<i>Preparation for, organization and effectiveness of the classroom activity in achieving the learning objectives.</i>	Reviewer is encouraged to observe more than one teaching session conducted by the faculty member, including online sessions (e.g. live or on-demand webcasts, online tutorials).
4.	<i>Degree of student engagement facilitated by the faculty member within the constraints of the class size.</i>	Reviewer to identify activities/behaviours demonstrating students being engaged (e.g. student attentiveness, questions asked by faculty member/students, paired or group discussions, student presentations). Note that the degree of student engagement could be constrained by large class size (e.g. class size of 100 students and above).
5.	<i>Faculty member's ability to show the relevance of the day's topic, its relation to other topics within or outside of the module.</i>	Reviewer to identify how the faculty member relates the day's topic meaningfully to other topics within or outside of the module (e.g. connection to preceding or subsequent classes, practical applications of the day's topic in real-life environment).

Section B: Teaching and Assessment Materials

Question	Item in the form	Explanatory notes
7.	<i>Currency and relevance of the teaching materials (textbooks, readings, cases etc) for the target learning objectives.</i>	The teaching materials should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be aligned with target learning outcomes of the module and • contain updated knowledge and practices within the subject domain, • be appropriate to the level of module and of the students.
9.	<i>Usefulness of information technology (IVLE, Internet, software, videos, animations etc.), if applicable.</i>	Faculty members are encouraged to use IT in their lessons and modules in a way that enhances teaching and learning. Rather than just reporting if IT is used, reviewers are asked to evaluate the way it is used and its effectiveness. This criterion may not apply to all faculty members or modules as the use of IT is not mandatory.
11.	<i>Effectiveness of the continual assessment tasks (essays, tutorials, projects, practical exercises, etc) and/or final examinations in differentiating students with differing accomplishments.</i>	Continual assessment tasks and/or final examination ¹ questions crafted by the faculty member are able to differentiate students with differing accomplishments (e.g. tasks/questions with different level of difficulty).
12.	<i>Appropriateness of the assessment tasks in challenging the students to think independently and to apply knowledge effectively.</i>	In case of group projects, there should be some element of assessing individuals.

Peer Review Implementation – Workflow

