



The HE peer review process at ncn

HELPING US RECOGNISE SCHOLARSHIP
THAT IS ALREADY THERE?

Damian Fidler
HE Scholarship Development Manager
new college nottingham

What can Peer Reviews (of Teaching) look like?

Many different forms, often evolving in response to college and HE culture

Range from: graded appraisals with criteria - 'observational surveillance' (or intrusion?) to: purely developmental opportunities for staff to collaborate (Gosling and O'Connor 2009)

Can be seen as having resonance beyond immediate inception as a measurement of standards, auditing and quality enhancement (Sachs and Parsell 2014)

Can foster positive inclusion and engagement by diverse staff teams (Fidler 2016b)

Can raise awareness of a more distinct 'scholarly' ethos/ shared experience to help identification as a HE teacher (Gosling 2014)

The Peer Review process at ncn

An opportunity for HE teaching staff to review one another without overbearing guidance or metrics


Dialogue about the process removes concept of 'observations' and 'grading'

Evaluations of what is seen are only guided by headings in the feedback form

The University Centre collated and synthesised all reviews to report on main themes in 'formal' analysis and disseminated findings to all HE teaching staff

The Peer Review process at ncn

Process at ncn: matches staff members up in pairs, across sites and some disciplines; staff pre-meet; perform review(s); feedback and offer developmental advice; reflection by both 'peer' and 'reviewer'

 SUPPORTING STAFF THROUGH HIGHER EDUCATION PEER REVIEW FEEDBACK FORM			
Campus & Room		Date	
Reviewer		Review Time	
Peer being Reviewed		Lecturer Status	FT / PT
No. of students on register		No. of students present	No. Lat
Academy		Mode of Study	FT / PT
Course Title / Year of course	BA/FdA HNC / HND		
Context of lesson: Briefly outline the focus of the review as agreed by peer and reviewer (See 4 in HE Peer review guidelines)			
Developmental Feedback based on focus of review			
Student feedback: (if appropriate) Part of the review can involve speaking with students to gain their perspective. Their understanding of the session? <i>E.g. currency etc</i> Were they engaged in the session? Student comments on how their learning experience could be enhanced			
Key strengths and best practice to be shared			
Areas for suggested development:			
Suggestions for Cross-college scholarly activities (CPD)			
Signature of Reviewer/date:			
Signature of Peer/date:			
Personal reflection of the review: You are encouraged to reflect on the discussion			

Peer Reviews in 15/16

93% coverage (54/58 reviews took place in semester one)

Data themed and coded into: evaluations of what happens in HE sessions; developmental advice; learner perspectives; and suggestions for CPD

Qualitative nature of feedback made this time very time consuming!

Commonalities / peculiarities as expected...

Key findings from Peer Reviews

A resolute focus on TLA in observed practice and developmental advice to this effect with almost half of comments to appraise (see Fidler 2016a)

High praise for 'effective pedagogy': industry expertise; vocational relevance; **interactive learning (learner-led); stretch and challenge; skilled Q and A; planning and structure; measurement of learning**

...Demonstrating a scholarship of teaching? or SoTL (Boyer 1990)

Recommendations for ncn's HE provision

Peer Review process important and relevant to concepts of scholarship

Action planning to address aspirations of staff

Identification/ sharing of best practice

Creates outcomes to the mutual benefit of staff and college as a community of practice

Full Peer Review Report disseminated to all HE staff and SMTs

HE encouraged to flourish from its FE pedagogy which compliments rather than restricts (*research vs teaching?*)

Collective feedback 'weight' can effect changes to provision

Revisions to our guidance and process continue for 16/17

Advice for others..?

Consider the ways to positively **engage** as many teaching staff as possible

Consider ways in which structured **integration of expertise** can be effected by POT

Consider the **richness of data** that can be elicited in the process

Advice for others..?

Consider ways to allow staff to determine what is most important to them to **define the meaning of the review process** - as “non-judgemental dialogue” (Kell 2009)

Ensure all staff understand that **feedback will be analysed and acted upon**

Ensure that staff are appraised as ‘scholars’ of teaching (SoTL) in HE
(not just in FE!)

Next steps...

Further improvements to the process?..

- Involve wider students services and resource providers?
- Involve trainee teachers, or students of teaching and learning?
- Ensure all peer observations are cross-disciplinary?
- *Develop to use as one of many measures of teaching, as recognition of SoTL (Gunn and Fisk 2013)*
- *Utilise the process to enhance as another 'overlapping' form of scholarship of integration? (McKinney 2012)*

References:

- Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- Fidler, D. (2016a). *The Peer Review process at new college Nottingham – helping us recognise scholarship that is already there*. [online]. London: AoC. Available at: <https://www.aoc.co.uk/sites/default/files/CS%20-%20NCN%20-%20peer%20review.pdf> [accessed on 1/7/16]
- Fidler, D. (2016b). *What is the role of a HE peer review of teaching in FE colleges*. [online]. London: AoC. Available at: <https://www.aoc.co.uk/june-2016-what-the-role-he-peer-review-teaching-in-fe-colleges-damian-fidler> [accessed on 1/7/16]
- Gosling, D. (2014). Collaborative Peer-supported Review of Teaching, in, Sachs, J., and Parsell, M., eds. *Peer Review of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: International Perspectives*. (pp. 13-32). London: Springer
- Gosling, D., and O’Conner, K. M. (2009). eds. *Beyond the Peer Observation of Teaching*. London: SEDA.
- Gunn, V. and Fisk, A. (2013) *Considering teaching excellence in higher education: 2007-2013*. York: Higher Education Academy.
- Kell, C. (2009). Peer Review of Learning and Teaching: Cardiff University’s approach to peer-assisted scholarly reflective practice, in, Gosling D., and O’Conner K.M. (2009). eds. *Beyond the Peer Observation of Teaching*. (pp. 37-36). London: SEDA.
- McKinney, K. (2012) ed. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in and across the Disciplines*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Sachs, J., and Parsell, M. (2014) eds. *Peer Review of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: International Perspectives*. London: Springer