It is clear from ANU by 2020 that the University is paying greater attention to ways in which we might demonstrate the quality of our teaching, and the support mechanisms we might put in place to enhance the quality of teaching or to improve poor practice, where that is necessary. This document outlines the CASS Peer Review process. Such a review, once initiated, would be conducted by a team of two: one colleague from the same or a strongly related discipline, and one education/curriculum design professional.

The quality of coursework teaching depends on three aspects of the work:

1. currency and selection of the content covered in the course, and how that contributes to the achievement of program learning outcomes,
2. design of the curriculum, including alignment (assessment—learning activities—learning outcomes), the ways in which academic achievement standards are conveyed to students, the ways in which functioning knowledge (the application of declarative knowledge) is taught, and plans for the provision of appropriate, timely, detailed formative feedback, and
3. presentation, lecturing, tutoring, classroom management, interpersonal, online facilitation, marking, and feedback skills exhibited by the academic staff member.

The quality of HDR student supervision can be judged on the following aspects of the task:

1. timeliness and quality of guidance provided throughout the period of supervision, including meetings, feedback on drafts, etc,
2. student progress during the period of supervision, and
3. examination reports on theses supervised.

The evidence for a report on a person’s abilities in teaching and/or research supervision can be collected from artefacts generated as part of teaching practice and from observation of the performance aspects of teaching. This would require a desk review of curriculum documentation and teaching resources (Course Outline, Wattle site, course description on Study@ANU, material produced by the staff member for the purpose of approvals for new/revised courses/programs, etc) and observation of the staff member at work (lecturing, tutoring, facilitating online discussions, etc).

A teaching/supervision evaluation peer review based on these aspects of academic work might be initiated either by the staff member concerned or by his or her supervisor, and could be used in at least three different ways.

1. **Evidence of high quality teaching and/or supervision**
   A staff member putting together a portfolio for the purposes of promotion or teaching awards would be able to include such a report as evidence of the high quality of his or her teaching practice, along with SELS data and referees’ reports.

2. **Identification of appropriate professional development**
   A staff member might commission a peer review of teaching to help him or her identify appropriate professional development activities for him/herself, and refer to this in Statement of Expectations discussions and negotiations about Development Needs and Opportunities.
3. **Investigation of low SELS results**

A report such as this could be commissioned by a supervisor (e.g. as a result of low SELS results) to assist in the investigation of the **underlying causes of low SELS results**.

**Collection of evidence**

Evidence for the review might be collected from the following, among others:

- Curriculum documentation: Course Outlines, paperwork for Education Committees, marking rubrics, proposals for changed or new curriculum prepared for peer discussions
- Observation of interactions with students in lectures, tutorials, seminars, individual meetings
- References from peers
- Peer reviews of research papers and monographs
- Citations for awards for teaching or supervision
- Interviews with the person under review
- Personal reflections on teaching
- References from others who have interacted with students taught by the person under review (employers of graduates, intern hosts)
- Comments from guest lecturers
- SELS / SET results

**Evidence**

Evidence for the review would be drawn from teaching activity by the person over time and may include, but is not limited to, material about the following aspects of teaching.

1. **Discipline expertise**: University teachers are valued for their discipline knowledge, so it would be useful to include evidence that the person is an acknowledged expert in his or her field, including recognition for research successes, or previous acknowledgement of teaching expertise in the discipline.

2. **Performance skills in the classroom**: There are a range of face-to-face and online teaching skills that could be evaluated. For example, the reviewers would take time to observe how well the person lectures, facilitates, moderates, questions, elicits, and manages the classroom or the online learning environment. The reviewer might also comment on enthusiasm, engagement, style, technique, energy, and so forth.

3. **Documentation**: Key to the review would be all the material developed by an individual as part of the design, development, documentation, approval, and delivery of courses and programs.

   For example:
   
   a. Materials developed by the staff member for the approval of new or revised courses and programs, including material for the handbook, curriculum documentation prepared for College and University education committees, business case material prepared to support applications for the approval of new courses and programs, etc
   b. Course Outlines
   c. Wattle sites
   d. Other artefacts created for teaching purposes, like
      i. Handouts
      ii. Models
      iii. Displays
      iv. Materials prepared for demonstrations, fieldwork, or groupwork
   e. Commentary on these materials reflecting on curriculum design theories, processes and approaches
   f. Any other evidence of good curriculum design and alignment
4. **Innovation and risk**: The reviewers will be looking for evidence of creativity, imagination, and innovation in the teaching practice of the person. Such innovation could be in any aspect of teaching practice: classroom teaching, lecturing, online facilitation and moderation, use of technologies, off-campus learning events, assessment, peer-assisted learning and/or assessment, or collaboration with other groups within and across discipline boundaries. The reviewer would comment on how the person introduced and managed curriculum innovation, learning from mistakes and mitigating risk for students.

5. **Student engagement**: The reviewers would look at the frequency and extent of interaction between the academic and the students, particularly when theses supervision is also included in the review.

6. **Research-led teaching**: The reviewers would take into account evidence of research-led teaching, including descriptions from the person of how this was incorporated into the curriculum.

7. **Feedback**: Feedback is an important aspect of university teaching, so the reviewers would need to review feedback mechanisms, timelines, and types. The reviewers would look at all forms of feedback, on both formative and summative assessment.

8. **Student evaluations**: Student comment on teacher is important, and the reviewers may review the results of evaluation surveys completed by students and/or talk to students taught by the person.

9. **Scholarship of teaching**: The reviewers would explore the theoretical foundations of the person’s teaching practice, and how these have shaped the approach the person takes to the role of teacher.

10. **Ongoing evolution and continuous improvement**: The reviewers would look for evidence that the person has developed, evolved, and improved over time.

11. **Employer recognition**: The reviewers may comment on the reputation among employers of students or courses taught by the person, particularly where graduates are well-regarded.

12. **Peer recognition**: The reviewers may seek out referees’ reports from the person’s other peers.

13. **Self-identified areas for improvement**: The review may include a statement from the person under review, outlining self-identified strengths and weaknesses, and professional development activities already underway to improve weak areas of expertise.

**Report**

In the final report, the reviewers will comment on as many of these aspects of teaching as are applicable in the circumstances, rating the individual’s performance and citing from the evidence collected. The sections of the report may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Summary or overview
- Introduction
- Discipline expertise
- Performance skills in the classroom
- Documentation
- Innovation and risk
- Student engagement
- Research-led teaching
- Feedback
- Student evaluations
- Scholarship of teaching
- Ongoing evolution and continuous improvement
- Employer recognition
- Peer recognition
- Self-identified areas for improvement
- Conclusions and recommendations
- Appendices