# PEER REVIEW PROPOSAL

## Definition of Terms

1. Instructor: The person who is being reviewed
2. Reviewer(s): The person(s) who is((are) reviewing the Instructor
3. QEC: Quality enhancement cell, Namal College

## Proposals

1. The QEC proposes the conduct of a peer review process as a means to engage the faculty in reviewing and enhancing the quality of teaching of fellow faculty members.
2. The peer review process shall be discussion oriented with a more humane nature. The focus shall be on encouraging a faculty member to improve and enhance his/her teaching methodology.
3. The reviewer(s) that shall review an instructor will not themselves be reviewed by the the same instructor.
4. The review team shall consist of 2-3 faculty members.
5. The instructor under review shall be given an opportunity to decide the session in which he/she would like to invite the reviewer(s).
6. If needed, the reviewer(s) may request the Instructor to attend one more session to include in the review process.
7. The review process shall consist of the following four stages



* 1. Pre-observation
     1. The instructor and reviewer(s) shall meet for a pre-session meeting to discuss
        1. Module goals
        2. The goals of the session
        3. Materials the Instructor has organized to support learning
        4. Teaching methodology
        5. Position of the session in the overall syllabus
  2. Observation
     1. The reviewer(s), during the lecture session, shall make a focused and purposeful study about, but not limited to:
        1. Instructor knowledge of the subject
        2. Teacher-student interaction
        3. Clarity
        4. Student participation
        5. Learning of students
        6. Instructor’s methodology of assessing student learning
        7. Quality of lecture slides and their suitability and alignment with the learning outcomes
  3. Post-observation
     1. The instructor and reviewer(s) shall have a follow-up meeting to discuss the impressions from the session, concerning the points mentioned in ‘Observation’, meeting expectations from the session, as discussed in pre-observation, and have a mutual conversation about teaching and learning
  4. Reflective summary
     1. A brief, written analysis by the instructor and reviewer(s) with the focus on formative peer review process, and discussed with respective HoD. It may include the following points
        1. What was learned about teaching and student learning
        2. Actions taken based on feedback
        3. Benefits/drawbacks of peer review process
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