# **Notre Dame Proforma for Peer Feedback/Review of Face to Face Teaching[[1]](#footnote-1)**

This form could be used in both a formative (peer feedback) or summative manner (peer review).

Section A covers questions that concern any delivery/context type while Section B is delivery/context specific. The suggested method of using this form is to modify it so that a review always begin with items from Section A and then moves to items identified for the relevant context in Section B.

**Type of review (lecture, tutorial etc.):**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Date:** |  | **Semester:** |  |
| **Year:** |  | **Time:** |  |
| **Academic Reviewed:** |  | **Reviewer:** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |

**Section A**

1. Addressing Learning Goals

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| How effective was the educator in linking the content and process to the student learning outcomes? |  |  |  |
| To what extent was the delivery aimed at developing learners’ mastery, confidence and self-esteem? |  |  |  |

1. Demonstrating enthusiasm and stimulating curiosity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| *Reviewer view regarding the student experience:* |  |  |  |
| Were inclusive strategies used? |  |  |  |
| What was the level of rapport? |  |  |  |
| What was the general level of interest? |  |  |  |
| Was there any particular aspect which appeared to engage the students? |  |  |  |
| Did the educator project accessibility, availability to answer questions after the session? |  |  |  |
| *Reviewer experience:* |  |  |  |
| Did they appear to know their content? |  |  |  |
| Was enthusiasm for the subject demonstrable? |  |  |  |
| Were the Objects of the University present? |  |  |  |
| Was unusual or intriguing information presented? |  |  |  |
| Was friendly controversy[[2]](#footnote-2) used? |  |  |  |
| *Strategies* |  |  |  |
| What methods were used to attract and retain students’ attention? |  |  |  |
| What methods were used to encourage student participation? |  |  |  |

1. Encouraging critical thinking and student learning

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| *Strategies; what was used to:* |  |  |  |
| Encourage critical thinking, problem solving, and reflection? |  |  |  |
| Encourage self-directed learning? |  |  |  |
| Encourage student engagement and/or participation? |  |  |  |
| Check students’ understanding? |  |  |  |
| Develop student digital literacies? |  |  |  |

1. Structure of the delivery

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Did you find the presentation clear, coherent, and well structured? |  |  |  |
| Was the relationship to previous material explained? |  |  |  |
| Were the methods appropriate to the objectives of the session? |  |  |  |
| How appropriate was the pace, and the time-management? |  |  |  |
| How appropriate was the management of the audience (handling questions, disruptions, time in/time out, etc.) |  |  |  |

1. Clarity

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Was the presentation clearly articulated? |  |  |  |
| How audible/visible was the presenter/and/or materials? |  |  |  |
| Was the clarity of explanations (e.g. use of analogies, illustrations, examples) clear? |  |  |  |
| How effective were any resources/material used? Eg suitability/quality of visual aids, powerpoint, student worksheets/handouts |  |  |  |

**Section B**

***Tutorials***

1. Strategies and behaviour

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Was there a strong level of rapport, interaction, & engagement with students (use of names etc.)? |  |  |  |

1. Management/leadership of tute activities

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were the tasks and their purpose clear? |  |  |  |
| Was the individual/group management and involvement effective? |  |  |  |

1. Demonstrating effective facilitation skills

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Did the questioning technique allow for deep learning? |  |  |  |
| Were responses to student questions and answers handled well? |  |  |  |
| Was the discussion inclusive of all students? |  |  |  |
| What role did the tutor play? |  |  |  |

1. Structure of the tutorial

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Was the learning related to other elements of the teaching program (lectures etc.)? |  |  |  |
| Was a variety of effective activities, approaches, strategies used? |  |  |  |

***Laboratory Fieldwork/Observation***

1. Demonstrating features of effective communication

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were the demonstration skills effective? |  |  |  |
| How effective was the explanation technique employed? |  |  |  |

1. Safety and other procedural issues referred to by the demonstrator

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were students taught how to use equipment safely? |  |  |  |

1. The demonstrator encouraged student cooperation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were effective strategies employed so that students worked cooperatively? |  |  |  |

***Clinical***

1. Role model of a clinician

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were students provided with an authentic role model? |  |  |  |

1. Engagement with students

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| What steps did the clinician take to support students when in the presence of patients? |  |  |  |
| In the absence of patients did the clinician use appropriate tone; individual/group engagement? strategies |  |  |  |

1. Management/leadership of clinical session?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Did the clinical effectively facilitate links between practice and theory? |  |  |  |
| Was the briefing/debriefing session well handled? |  |  |  |
| Did the management of the session allow for deep learning? |  |  |  |

1. Demonstration/explanation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area of focus** | **Aspects done well** | **Aspects that could be improved upon** | **Suggested action(s)** |
| Were techniques well explained? |  |  |  |
| Were procedures well demonstrated? |  |  |  |

**Reviewer Reflection**

* Have you addressed the specific areas nominated?
* Are there specific examples of good/particularly impressive practice that you would like to highlight?
* Have you emphasised areas where the teacher may have done particularly well, and why you think this is: be specific in your examples?
* Have you provided clear feedback on where teaching can be developed or are there new approaches the teacher may apply?

**Action**

Comments on feedback from reviewer(s)

Action(s) to be taken

Reflection on action(s) taken
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1. This template draws from the work of SOA&S (Sydney); SOM (Fremantle); *UTAS Guide to Peer Review of Teaching* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Students are encouraged through respectful, albeit potentially provocative, questioning and debate to reflect on their ‘world views’ [↑](#footnote-ref-2)