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**Introduction**

Curtin University has endorsed a Peer-based Professional Learning (P-BPL) Pilot Program which will enable teaching staff to participate in the following range of peer review of teaching activities to enhance and assure teaching excellence (see Procedures in Appendix 1):

- **Developmental peer review of teaching** is conducted by trained reviewers and provides participants with formative feedback to inform plans for professional learning and teaching development. It is linked to Phase 1 in Curtin’s model and outcomes are used for teaching development.

- **Collaborative peer review of teaching** is reciprocal observation and discussion between colleagues. It is linked to Phase 2 in Curtin’s model and outcomes are used for teaching development.

- **Open-door classroom** involves highly skilled innovative teachers inviting peers to attend nominated teaching sessions followed by informal discussions. This is an opportunity for sharing ideas and practices in authentic situations. It is linked to Phase 2 and is not a review.

- **Evaluative peer review of teaching** is conducted by trained reviewers and provides participants with summative (or final) feedback about their teaching. The outcomes of this will provide evidence of teaching excellence for use in applications for promotion and teaching awards.

The P-BPL program is delivered through the Curtin Learning Institute. Curtin’s Foundations of Learning and Teaching (FOLT 3) program provides an introduction to peer review of teaching and further professional learning opportunities are available to support participation in Curtin’s model of peer review of teaching. See Figure 1 for an overview of professional learning strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Developmental PRT (see Phase 1)</th>
<th>Collaborative PRT (see Phase 2)</th>
<th>Open Door (see Phase 2)</th>
<th>Evaluative PRT (see Phase 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>A formative teaching evaluation conducted by trained reviewers.</td>
<td>A reciprocal formative teaching evaluation conducted by peers.</td>
<td>Individuals register to observe ‘Open Door’ Teachers, and chat with them about the teaching session.</td>
<td>A summative teaching evaluation conducted by trained reviewers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Overview of Peer-based Professional Learning Program and Strategies

This *Guidelines* document provides:

1. The motivation and rationale for implementing peer review of teaching; see pp. 2-3.
2. Curtin’s model and approach to peer review of teaching; see p. 4.
3. Guidelines for implementing peer review of teaching at Curtin; see pp. 5-20.
5. Supplementary resources; see pp. 25-35.
PEER-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PILOT PROGRAM 2014

‘REFRESH YOUR THINKING, GAIN NEW INSIGHTS, IDEAS AND MOTIVATION – AND RECONNECT WITH YOUR PEERS’

‘SHARE KNOWLEDGE, EXPERIENCE AND STRATEGIES’

‘FOSTER A CULTURE IN WHICH TEACHING IS VALUED AND TEACHING EXCELLENCE IS RECOGNISED’

‘ENGAGE IN REFLECTIVE PRACTICES THAT STIMULATE TEACHING DEVELOPMENT AND PROFESSIONAL LEARNING’

‘ENGAGE IN EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE THAT ENHANCES STUDENT LEARNING’

‘GENERATE EVIDENCE OF TEACHING EXCELLENCE THROUGH PEER REVIEW, REFLECTION, AND REFINEMENT’

PEER-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PROVIDES OPPORTUNITIES FOR STAFF TO ENGAGE IN A VARIETY OF COLLEGIATE ACTIVITIES TO ENHANCE AND ASSURE TEACHING QUALITY. THE RANGE AND BENEFITS OF ACTIVITIES INCLUDE:

OPEN DOOR

Learn from conversations generated by watching others teach.

Highly skilled innovative teachers invite peers to see what they are doing in a nominated live teaching session (any format) and then have a conversation with them about it.

- Recognise and showcase innovation and excellence in teaching in authentic and diverse situations.
- Stimulate healthy discussion to generate creative ideas to engage students and enhance teaching.
- Stimulate motivation to engage with other peer-based professional learning.
- Coaching for open door teachers.

COLLABORATIVE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

Learn from conversations generated by reciprocal observation of teaching.

Peer partners agree to observe and provide each other with feedback on their teaching.

- Open to all regardless of experience or status.
- Peer partnerships can be formed during FOLT 3, within or across units, schools and faculties.
- Provides staff with formative feedback which identifies teaching strengths, weaknesses and ideas for teaching development.
- Builds rapport amongst peers.
- Enhances team building.

DEVELOPMENTAL PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

Develop teaching by responding to feedback aligned to criteria.

- Evidence-based teaching and career development aligned with Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria and Expectations for Academic Performance.
- Skilled reviewers empower staff to enhance teaching and learning.
- Coaching for reviewers within a community of practice.
- 360º feedback survey.
- Peer mentoring.
- Enabled through WPPR process.

EVALUATIVE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

Skilled reviewers conduct criteria-based summative teaching evaluations.

- Skilled reviewers evaluate teaching and provide staff with a report which staff can use to build their case for academic promotion and recognition of teaching excellence through awards.
- Teaching excellence is recognised and rewarded.
- Coaching for reviewers within a community of practice.
- Enabled through WPPR process.
- Professional learning support for key stakeholders.

CONTACT US

Curtin Learning Institute  Curtin University, Building 105  Phone: (+618) 9266 2305  E-mail: cli@curtin.edu.au
Rationale for Peer Review of Teaching at Curtin

As an institution and as individual teachers we need to demonstrate excellence to meet the needs of our students and achieve our goals. Peer review of teaching enables “teaching staff [to] demonstrate reflective and innovative practice in their teaching, and participate in formal activities associated with inquiry into effective teaching” (Curtin Academic Standards, 2011, Standard 4.2). Figure 2 shows the drivers for teaching excellence within the context of Curtin’s Enterprise Agreement (2012-2016) and Strategic Plan 2013-2017. Key drivers are;

1. Curtin Enterprise Agreement (2012-2016): The provision of role-related work planning, professional and career development (Sections 55-56); and multiple data sources to evaluate teaching (Section 57.2a).


4. Curtin Expectations for Academic Performance: Enable staff to provide evidence of teaching excellence across academic Levels A-E.

5. Establishment of the Curtin Academy “will promote a culture of teaching excellence through development of a model which will engage our outstanding teachers, allowing them to provide colleagues the opportunity to learn from their expertise and exceptional pedagogical repertoire” (Curtin Teaching, Learning and Student Experience Plan 2013-2017, p.6)

   - Formative low stakes teaching evaluations enable staff to identify and target opportunities for pedagogical innovation, professional and career development in a supportive non-threatening environment.
   - Summative teaching evaluations provide staff with evidence of teaching excellence for use in recognition and reward processes. They provide Curtin with quality assurance measures.
   - The combined implementation of formative and summative approaches to peer review of teaching will promote a culture in which teaching excellence is recognised, fostered and rewarded.
Curtin’s Model and Approach to Peer Review of Teaching

Curtin’s approach incorporates direct and indirect observations of teaching activities, self-reflection, peer discussions and enables staff to develop and provide evidence of teaching excellence. It consists of three phases embedded in the University’s Work Planning and Performance Review (WPPR) and Academic Promotions processes (see Figure 3).

This approach is supported by procedures and guidelines. Individuals in teaching-focused and teaching and research roles will have the opportunity to discuss their participation in peer review of teaching through the WPPR process. Line managers of teachers who are employed on a casual or short term contract basis who do not participate in the WPPR process will ensure such teachers also have opportunities for peer review of teaching (see Appendix 1, p. 23).

Phase 1: Formative teaching evaluations facilitate an evidence-based approach which informs planning for professional and career development. Typically, a developmental approach is used but in some cases it may be more appropriate to use a collaborative approach (see introduction for definition of terms and description of professional learning).

- Individuals aspiring for academic promotion may want to adopt a more formal approach by using Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria and trained reviewers; see guidelines (p. 12) for information about exceptional cases.

- Individuals whose main focus is to develop their teaching may want to adopt a less formal approach by selecting an observation schedule appropriate to their needs and asking a suitable peer to review their teaching; see guidelines (pp. 13 - 18) for further information.

Phase 2: Individuals adopt an evidence-based approach to engage with professional learning and reflective practices, such as collaborative (reciprocal) peer review of teaching, development of teaching portfolios, mentoring and targeted relevant professional development programs. Typically, evidence of teaching excellence in Phases 1 and 2 is substantiated through Peer Review of Teaching – Reflective Statements.

Phase 3: Summative teaching evaluations facilitate an evidence-based approach to assure reward and recognition processes, where evidence of teaching excellence is required. Typically, evidence of teaching excellence in Phase 3 is substantiated through Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Reports.

Figure 3: Curtin’s peer review of teaching model
Peer review of teaching facilitates professional learning directly linked to teaching and learning. It enables staff to engage in reflective practices which underpin teaching excellence (Kane, Sandretto and Heath 2004). A combination of formative and summative peer review of teaching facilitates continuous improvement in teaching as staff progress from one career stage to another over several years (Bernstein 1996; Cavanagh 1996; Cosser 1998; Green et al. 1998; Ory 1991). At Curtin, the WPPR process provides staff with opportunities to plan work activities, and short and long term goals. Curtin’s Peer Review of Teaching Procedures indicate that line managers are responsible for:

- Ensuring all academic staff undertaking teaching activities have opportunities to engage in peer review of teaching; and
- Incorporating peer review of teaching in the annual Work Planning and Performance Review as a teaching related duty (see Appendix 5 or http://www.curtin.edu.au/cli/peer-review-teaching/index.cfm).

Planning for participation in peer review of teaching is a dynamic process which requires flexible approaches to accommodate a diversity of staff needs and contexts. If it is helpful, staff may choose to use or not to use the Teaching Development Plan Template (see Appendix 5 or http://www.curtin.edu.au/cli/peer-review-teaching/index.cfm).

**Phase 1: Formative teaching evaluation**

Formative teaching evaluations underpin evidence-based approaches to planning focused professional learning strategies designed to enhance teaching quality and career development. Informal and collaborative models of peer review of teaching provide limited formative feedback whereas the developmental model provides comprehensive formative feedback. Please choose the option that best suits your own needs and those of your teaching area.

**How do you know whether or not to use informal, collaborative or developmental models?**

In cases where individuals are on casual or short term contracts or very new to teaching, formative teaching evaluations may be best facilitated informally. For example, unit coordinators have found it helpful to observe their tutors and provide them with feedback either individually or as a group. Others have invited tutors to observe model sessions either face to face or online.
FOLT 3 participants are asked to participate in collaborative peer review of teaching and as a result they receive feedback which they can use to develop their teaching. The feedback derived from participation in collaborative peer review of teaching is helpful and can be used for planning further development, but it is usually not aligned to Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria and is conducted by peers rather than recognised reviewers. Collaborative peer review of teaching is useful for targeting specific areas of teaching development and will be discussed further in the next section.

Staff in teaching focussed and teaching and research roles may require a more comprehensive approach which is provided through use of developmental peer review of teaching, conducted by recognised reviewers, aligned with Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria and further supported by a 360° feedback survey which is also aligned with these criteria but includes 4 or 5 items for each criterion to which peers, students, line managers and individuals themselves are asked to respond.

The key questions to consider when deciding which method to use are:

1. What are the relevant short and long terms goals of the individual?
2. What are the relevant associated organisational needs?
3. What resources are required?
4. What relevant resources can be accessed?
5. Which method best meets the specific combination of individual and organisational needs and can be achieved with the available resources?

What is the developmental peer review of teaching?

**Definition:** A comprehensive formative teaching evaluation conducted by trained reviewers using specified criteria for developmental purposes. It is not reciprocal.

**Purpose:** To provide participants with formative feedback based on Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria to develop and refine their teaching.

**Positioning:** Phase 1 in Curtin’s model of peer review of teaching; see Figure 3.

What professional learning is available to support developmental peer review of teaching?

- FOLT 3 (participants and reviewers)
- Teaching Excellence: Expectations and Evidence (all)
- Leading Peer Review of Teaching (reviewers and line managers)
- Coaching for reviewers
- Link to Australian University Teaching Criteria & Standards Framework http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au/
How is it done?

Developmental peer review of teaching is conducted by trained reviewers, and is reflective and developmental. The key stages are:

1. Match reviewers and participants.
2. Use the peer review cycle with a focus on Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria.
3. Engage in reflective practices, including a 360° survey.
4. Transform teaching using evidence-based strategies:

It is a professional learning process which requires:

1. Integrity, respect, courage, excellence and impact (Curtin’s values).
2. An action learning approach: iterative cycles of planning, action, data collection, reflection, and communication.
3. Transfer of learning using evidence-based formative teaching evaluations to enhance and develop teaching excellence.

How are reviewers and participants matched?

Individuals are recognised as reviewers when they have completed the following professional learning successfully:

- FOLT 3 or similar prior learning
- Teaching Excellence: Expectations and Evidence
- Leading Peer Review of Teaching; and
- Coaching for reviewers

Information about reviewers, including availability and expertise, is available on the Curtin website (http://www.curtin.edu.au/cli/peer-review-teaching/index.cfm). Individuals use this information to select and invite reviewers to conduct formative teaching evaluations.
How does the peer review cycle work in developmental peer review of teaching?

Planning (see Chapter 4, HERDSA Guide - Bell 2005, 2012)

Once the reviewer has accepted the participants’ invitation, the reviewer schedules a 30 minute meeting with the participant. Agenda items for the meeting include:

1. Greeting, establishing a rapport and a safe working relationship, getting to know each other.
2. Clarifying the purpose and elements of the review and focus on teaching excellence criteria.
3. Understanding the participant’s teaching situation.
4. Attending to logistics – times, places, durations for observation and discussion and any associated documentation relevant to the review.

Observation (see Chapter 4, HERDSA Guide - Bell 2005, 2012)

The observation extends for the agreed duration and encompasses the agreed foci.

1. The reviewer arrives at the location five minutes prior to the designated time if the session is a face-to-face or synchronous online teaching session. The reviewer sits in an unobtrusive position which provides a good line of sight to the teacher, students and learning activities. This minimises disruption to the session. It enables the reviewer to observe how the teacher arrives on time, sets up the learning space and interacts with students prior to the commencement of the session. It allows the teacher to acknowledge and communicate with the reviewer if necessary. It also gives participants time to get used to the reviewer being in the room. In other situations which require the reviewer and the teacher to be present at the same time, the reviewer arrives up to five minutes early or on time. In cases where the reviewer is reviewing teaching resources or portfolios the reviewer may do this privately.

2. The teacher introduces the reviewer to the students and explains why the reviewer is there. This is particularly important in situations where the class size is small and it is obvious to students there is a visitor in the room. In other situations, it is up to the discretion of the teacher and the reviewer whether or not they introduce the reviewer to students.

3. The teacher teaches his or her class as he or she would usually do in face-to-face or synchronous online teaching situations. In other situations teachers provide reviewers with access to teaching and learning materials and resources which will be reviewed. For example, the teacher may provide access to Blackboard, assessment items, course materials which they developed, unit outlines – whatever is appropriate to the teaching situation.

4. In face-to-face or synchronous online teaching situations the reviewer observes and takes notes without interrupting the teacher. Typically, teachers do not interact with the reviewers during the session either.

5. At the conclusion of the observation, the reviewer and the teacher may exchange pleasantries to signal the end of the observation session and comment briefly on the session but no formal feedback should be discussed at this stage.
Prior to the discussion - reflection

1. Both the reviewer and the teacher reflect on the session/materials/resources in light of Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria in preparation for the discussion.

Discussion (see Chapter 5, HERDSA Guide - Bell 2005, 2012)

The discussion should be scheduled for the agreed duration as soon after the observation as possible; allowing sufficient time for teachers and reviewers to reflect on the session. Typically, a conversation about the reviewed session would be scheduled for 30 minutes. Subsequent meetings for planning can be scheduled if necessary. Alternatively, the teacher and reviewer opt to include planning for further development in the discussion session and schedule a one hour meeting.

The discussion between the reviewer and the teacher is confidential. The same ethical principles applied in research should apply in this situation to minimise harm and risk.

1. The discussion must be conducted in a collegial and respectful manner in an environment of trust.
2. The reviewer may prompt the teacher by asking open questions such as “How do you think the session went?” to initiate the conversation. Throughout the conversation the reviewer may continue to ask probing questions to deepen the reflection.
3. Both participants engage in active listening. Paraphrasing, rephrasing and clarifying are helpful ways of demonstrating active listening.
4. Whilst the teacher receives ‘feedback’ on their teaching, it is important that such feedback is arrived at through a two-way reflective process in which the reviewer and teacher engage in a rich conversation.
5. Feedback should be constructive.
6. Frameworks such as the radar reflection activity (p. 11) can be used to facilitate the provision of constructive feedback.
7. The person being reviewed owns the feedback.
8. Feedback should be used to develop teaching quality.

Reflection (see Chapter 6, HERDSA Guide - Bell 2005, 2012)

Reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action occurs throughout the peer review of teaching process. At the conclusion of the peer review cycle reflection shapes the way forward and is used to inform further development. It also informs the reporting process.

1. Individually, reviewers and teachers complete a Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement which asks for a description and outcomes of the focus of the review, reflection on the experience and what you learned from it, an outline of what you plan to do as a result of the review and responses to questions about demographics.
2. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement is an online survey activated through this link https://curtin.asia.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6YC35hFS13qkdcV
3. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement online survey is sent to the Curtin Learning Institute to monitor the program.
4. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement can be used to provide evidence of teaching excellence.
What additional reflective practices support developmental peer review of teaching?

By contacting the Curtin Learning Institute, participants will have the opportunity to participate in a 360° Survey based on Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria. The 360° Survey provides participants with reflective feedback from self, peers, colleagues, and students; see Figure 5. The coordinator of the 360° Survey will provide participants with a report on the results of the survey which they will discuss with participants.

![Figure 5: Relationship of significant others to self in the 360-degree survey (after London & Beatty, 1993)](image)

How can evidence from peer review and the 360° Survey be used to transform teaching?

Participation in developmental peer review of teaching provides participants with comprehensive evidence from reviewers and the outcomes of the 360° Survey. Additionally, you may also have access to evidence from students through eVALUate and you may or may not have completed a teaching portfolio. So how can you use this evidence to enhance teaching and learning – and your career? To find out where you are on the teaching excellence continuum, complete the Radar Reflection Activity.
Radar Reflection Activity

**Aim:** To identify areas in which teaching excellence has been demonstrated and show where improvement is warranted to inform planning for improvement.

**Rationale:** Radar charts are used to show relative values of items which are not directly comparable. In this radar chart Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria are shown as seven distinct items which can be rated separately in relation to a five point scale representing expectations of academic performance where 0 = unsatisfactory, 1 = satisfactory, 2 = good, 3 = excellent and 4 = outstanding.

**Process**

1. Prior to the discussion, reviewers and teachers individually reflect on the reviewed session and use the radar chart to create graphic representations of their perceptions of the extent to which teaching excellence was demonstrated.

2. In the discussion, reviewers and teachers compare and contrast their depictions of teaching excellence using the radar charts.

3. Through discussion and exemplification with reference to CEAP and Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria reviewers and teachers reach agreement about areas in which teaching excellence was demonstrated and identify areas which warrant improvement. Reviewers and teachers discuss strategies to address the identified needs.

![Figure 6: Radar Reflection Activity](image-url)
What do you need to do to develop and be recognised for teaching excellence?

To find out where you need to go on the teaching excellence continuum, refer to Curtin’s Expectations for Academic Performance: Teaching Quality Dimensions (see Appendix 4) for information about expectations at your current level and the level above.

- In exceptional cases, where participants demonstrate teaching excellence in all criteria consistent with expectations beyond their current level, individuals may ask reviewers, also, to complete a summative evaluation to provide them with Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Report, which can be used as evidence in applications for academic promotion, reward and recognition.

- Typically, participants would discuss opportunities to develop their teaching with their line managers in the WPPR process and subsequent meetings. This process is designed to provide individuals with role related work planning and staff development opportunities which enable them to achieve individual and institutional goals, including academic promotion and recognition of teaching excellence.

Opportunities to develop your teaching: (see Appendix 5 for template)

1. Develop an action plan to target your specific needs by responding to feedback from reviewers, the outcomes of the 360° Survey, and feedback from students through eVALUate. The following strategies may be useful to include in your plan:
   - Action learning – to explore innovations in teaching
   - Mentoring and coaching
   - Collaborative peer review of teaching
   - Professional learning targeted to your needs and aligned with Curtin’s strategic priorities [http://www.curtin.edu.au/learningfortomorrow/index.cfm](http://www.curtin.edu.au/learningfortomorrow/index.cfm)
   - Develop your teaching portfolio
   - Engage in scholarship of teaching
   - Review and reflect on examples of teaching excellence; see ‘Resources’ [http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au/](http://uniteachingcriteria.edu.au/)

2. Implement your action plan and when ready, arrange for a summative review of your teaching.
Staff Development

In Phase 2 the focus is on staff development informed by the outcomes of Phase 1. In consultation with line managers, staff select from a range of activities to develop their teaching. The focus of this section of the guidelines is on collaborative peer review of teaching and the ‘open door’ strategy but activities may also include:

1. Development of a teaching portfolio
2. Formal professional development programs
3. Informal mentoring and coaching

![Figure 7: Phase 2 Focus]

Phase 2: Collaborative Peer Review of Teaching

**Definition:** Reciprocal observation and discussion of teaching between colleagues.

**Purpose:** To share teaching practices with peers to enhance teaching.

**Positioning:** Phase 2 in Curtin’s model of peer review of teaching; see Figure 3.

What professional learning is available to support developmental peer review of teaching?

- FOLT 3
- [http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/](http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/) The Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) website is part of a two year project funded by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) / Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT): QUT, Curtin, The University of Adelaide and the University of Technology Sydney.
How is it done?

Collaborative peer review of teaching is reciprocal, reflective and developmental. The key stages are:

1. Establish peer partnerships.
2. Use the peer review cycle to target specific areas of teaching.
3. Engage in reflective practices.
4. Transform teaching using evidence-based approaches

It is a professional learning process which requires:

1. Integrity, respect, courage, excellence and impact (Curtin’s values)
2. An action learning approach: iterative cycles of planning, action, data collection, reflection, and communication
3. Criteria to direct evidence-based formative teaching evaluations to enhance and develop teaching excellence

How are peer partnerships established?

Peer partnerships are established during FOLT 3. Alternatively, teachers may invite others to form a peer partnership with them outside of FOLT 3. Typically, peer partnerships work best in relationships characterised by trust and respect. Partners may be selected because of their expertise or rapport with individuals. (See Chapter 4, HERDSA Guide – Bell 2005, 2012)

How does the peer review cycle work in collaborative peer review of teaching?

Planning (See Chapter 4, HERDSA Guide – Bell 2005, 2012 and p.8 of these guidelines)

- Planning for collaborative and developmental peer review of teaching is very similar.
- Use the planning process on p.8 of these guidelines.
- In Phase 2 participants focus on outcomes from Phase 1 to enhance teaching quality.
Who: Select a peer partner who will observe your teaching and whose teaching you will observe. Together, plan the following in a pre-observation meeting.

Why: State what you want to achieve by doing this. Provide your partner with some background about your teaching situation.

What: Decide what aspect(s) of your teaching to review; e.g. student engagement in face to face or online settings, assessment and feedback, learning activities and resources, learning environment. (For guides on teaching plans - see Bell 2005, pp. 57-62)

When: Decide the date, time, duration and frequency of observations, then schedule appointments for observation sessions and post-observation discussion meetings.

Where: Identify the locations for observations and meetings.

How: Select a suitable observation schedule.

During the planning session select an observation schedule that meets your needs and you feel comfortable using. Use the selected observation schedule to guide your observations and inform your discussion. Select from the following examples.

1. See CLI example in Appendix 1.

2. See (Bell 2005, pp. 63-71) for examples of observation schedules.

3. See website for more examples:

- http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/tools/undertaking-your-review.jsp
  (Some examples listed below but more available online.)

- Lecture/tutorial - Open Comment:

- Lecture/tutorial – Structured Comment:

- Online Teaching- Open Comment:
  http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/documents/tools/online-scale-open.pdf

- Online Teaching- Structured Comment:
  http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/documents/tools/online-scale-structured.pdf

- Observation for collaborative and developmental peer review of teaching is very similar.
- Use the observation process on p. 8 of these guidelines.
- In Phase 2 participants focus on outcomes from Phase 1 to enhance teaching quality.
- The box below outlines how Curtin’s Values are embedded in peer review of teaching during the observation stage.

**Integrity:** Honour the commitments you made in the planning stage. Arrive on time. Stay for the agreed duration. Record your observations in an informed and accountable manner.

**Respect:** Show professional courtesy. Don’t interrupt the class if you are observing. If you are being observed, introduce your peer partner to the students and put them at ease regarding the visitor in the room. Be mindful of diverse conceptions of teaching and value the teaching of others.

**Courage:** Embrace peer review as an opportunity to enhance your teaching. Overcome the fear of being observed and focus on teaching your students. Overcome the fear of intruding in another’s territory and observe with integrity and respect in a culture of teaching excellence.

**Excellence:** Be aware of Curtin’s criteria for and commitment to teaching excellence. Look for demonstration of teaching excellence and acknowledge your partner’s achievements. Look for opportunities to enhance teaching through innovation.

**Impact:** Fulfil the roles of observer and observed to achieve the goals of your peer partnership agreement. As you observe, be mindful of opportunities which could be developed with your peer partner.

Discussion (See Chapter 5, HERDSA Guide – Bell 2005, 2012 and p. 9 of these guidelines)

- Discussion in collaborative and developmental peer review of teaching is very similar.
- Use the discussion guide on p. 9 of these guidelines.
- In Phase 2 participants focus on outcomes from Phase 1 to enhance teaching quality.
- The box on the next page outlines how Curtin’s Values are embedded in peer review of teaching during the discussion stage.
Integrity: Prior to the discussion, use the criteria in the agreed observation schedule to reflect on the teaching observation and prepare your contribution to the discussion. Engender trust by being open, honest and consistent.

Respect: Create a safe collegial environment in which to conduct your discussion. Maintain confidentiality within the peer partnership. Have a conversation about the observed session, by creating opportunities for the observed to reflect on the session first. Deepen the reflection by asking probing questions. Provide and respond to constructive feedback.

Courage: Be aware of potential bias which could undermine the discussion, and actively work to counter its effects. Use the discussion as a learning experience and take responsibility for giving and receiving constructive feedback to enhance teaching excellence and build positive peer partnerships.

Excellence: Use the discussion as an opportunity to enhance creativity and innovation in teaching.

Impact: Actively follow up on the outcomes of the discussion to make positive changes where appropriate. Encourage each other to succeed, be it in designing activities or assessment to enhance student learning or in seeking recognition for teaching excellence.

Reflection (see Chapter 6, HERDSA Guide - Bell 2005, 2012 and p. 9 of these guidelines)

Reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action occurs throughout the peer review of teaching process. Reflection shapes the way forward and is used to inform further development.

The following guide can be used to aid reflection following the discussion stage. Please be aware that this guide is a personal document and not part of the reporting process: http://www.peerreviewofteaching.org/documents/tools/reflection-sheet-post-peer-review.pdf

The following reporting process occurs at the conclusion of the peer review cycle:

1. Both peer partners, individually, complete a Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement.

2. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement is an online survey activated through this link https://curtin.asia.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6YC35hFS13qkdcV

3. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement online survey is sent to the Curtin Learning Institute to monitor the program.

4. The Peer Review of Teaching Reflective Statement can be used to provide evidence of teaching excellence.
The ‘Open Door’ Strategy

**Definition:** ‘Open-door’ teachers promote teaching excellence in collegial authentic situations by sharing their practice with peers. This is not a ‘review’. It is ‘sharing’ practice.

**Purpose:** This strategy enables teachers to learn from each other.

What professional learning is available to support developmental peer review of teaching?

- ‘Open Door’ Induction
- ‘Open Door’ Coaching
- FOLT 3 (optional)
- Teaching Excellence: Expectations and Evidence (optional)

**How do Open Door Teachers do it?**

‘Open Door’ teachers may showcase any aspect of their teaching which is excellent.

1. ‘Open Door’ teachers nominate times and describe sessions to which up to two people at a time are able to attend.

2. Once ‘Open Door’ teachers are notified of registrants for specified sessions, they email registrants to confirm the details of the session and schedule a meeting for the follow up conversation.

**How do Open Door Participants do it?**

Participants may observe as many sessions as they like.

1. Participants register online to attend specified sessions (include link).

2. Participants acknowledge the emails from ‘Open Door’ teachers and attend sessions as agreed and have conversations with the ‘Open Door’ teachers at the agree times.

**General Principles**

The same ethical principles that are required in research apply in observing the teaching of others and sharing teaching practices with each other;

1. Confidentiality
2. Respect
3. Do no harm
4. Voluntary participation
5. Option to withdraw at any time without penalty

**Evaluation Survey**

‘Open Door’ teachers and participants may be asked to complete a brief survey to evaluate the initiative during the pilot program.
Recognition of Teaching Excellence

In Phase 3 the focus is on recognition of teaching excellence informed by the outcomes of Phases 1 and 2. In consultation with line managers, teachers explore options to gain recognition for their teaching excellence. The focus of this section of the guidelines is on evaluative peer review of teaching but options for recognition of teaching excellence include:

1. Academic promotion  
2. Teaching awards  
3. Career development

Phase 3: Evaluative Peer Review of Teaching

**Definition:** Evaluative peer review of teaching is conducted by trained reviewers and provides participants with summative feedback based on Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria.

**Purpose:** Participants use this feedback as evidence in applications for academic promotion to support their claims of teaching excellence.

**Positioning:** Phase 3 in Curtin’s model of peer review of teaching; see Figure 3.

What professional learning is available to support developmental peer review of teaching?

Typically, participants and reviewers in evaluative peer review of teaching will have completed the following professional learning and have participated in Phases 1 and 2. However, in exceptional circumstances individuals may start in Phase 3 without completing Phases 1 and 2.

- FOLT 3 (participants and reviewers)
- Teaching Excellence: Expectations and Evidence (participants, reviewers, line managers, and panel members)
- Leading Peer Review of Teaching (reviewers and line managers)
- Coaching for reviewers
How to do it:

This model is summative and conducted by preferably two reviewers - one a discipline expert and the other a teaching and learning expert. The key stages involve;

1. Match reviewers and participants
2. Use Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria
3. Engage in the peer review cycle.
4. Use feedback as evidence to be included in applications for academic promotion and recognition of teaching excellence.

It is a professional learning process which requires:

1. Integrity, respect, courage, excellence and impact (Curtin’s values)

Similarities to developmental model:

- Select and invite reviewers listed on the Curtin website
  www.curtin.edu.au/cli/peer-review-teaching/index.cfm
- Use Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria
- Live Curtin’s values throughout the peer review cycle

Differences to developmental model:

- It is summative, not developmental and the outcomes are used for promotional purposes.
- Reviewers complete a Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Report: see Appendix 6

Continuous Improvement:

Phase 3 provides summative feedback about teaching which can be used to provide evidence of teaching excellence in applications for promotion and teaching awards. However, continuous improvement is necessary to sustain teaching quality in a dynamic higher education environment. Once individuals have completed Phase 3 they may choose to recommence the cycle at either Phase 1 or Phase 2 according to their own and organisational needs. Ongoing participation in Phase 2 provides an efficient way of sustaining teaching excellence. Where there has been a lag in time or a change in role or teaching duties, individuals may benefit from receiving more comprehensive feedback associated with Phase 1.
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Appendix 1: Peer Review of Teaching Procedures

1. LEGISLATION/ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT/POLICY SUPPORTED
   Staff Performance and Development Policy

2. IMPLEMENTATION PRINCIPLES
   2.1. The University's commitment to assuring a high quality education experience for students will be supported by peer review of teaching.
   2.2. Peer review of teaching will be aligned with the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency's threshold standards (2011):
      (a) Section 2.6 – requires identification, implementation and dissemination of quality teaching practices;
      (b) Section 4.5 – requires quality assurance for delivery of educational programs onshore and offshore whether programs are delivered by Curtin or their partner institutions; and
      (c) Section 5.3 – effective management of staff recruitment, workload, promotion, induction, performance review and professional development.
   2.3. The opportunity or recommendation to undertake peer review of teaching will be included in the annual Work, Planning and Performance Review.

3. PROCEDURAL DETAILS
   3.1. Peer review of teaching opportunities will include:
      (a) Collaborative peer review of teaching
         Collaborative peer review of teaching involves reciprocal observation and discussion between colleagues. The outcomes of this are used for development of teaching.
      (b) Developmental and evaluative peer review of teaching
         i. Developmental peer review is conducted by trained reviewers and provides participants with formative feedback about their teaching. The outcomes of this are used for development of teaching.
         ii. Evaluative peer review is conducted by trained reviewers and provides participants with summative feedback about their teaching. The outcomes of this will provide evidence of teaching excellence.
      (c) Open-door classroom
         Open-door classroom involves highly skilled innovative teachers inviting peers to attend a nominated teaching session followed by an informal discussion.

4. RESPONSIBILITIES
   In addition to any responsibilities set out in section 3,
   4.1. The Curtin Learning Institute (Curtin Teaching and Learning) are responsible for:
      (a) Development and dissemination of appropriate peer review of teaching guidelines;
      (b) Providing professional development for participants and reviewers; and
      (c) Monitoring and evaluating the peer review of teaching initiative.
4.2 Line managers are responsible for:
(a) Ensuring all academic staff undertaking teaching activities have opportunities to engage in peer review of teaching; and
(b) Incorporating of peer review of teaching in the annual Work, Planning and Performance Review as a teaching-related duty.

4.3 Academic staff undertaking teaching activities are responsible for:
(a) Reflecting on and developing their teaching.

5. **SCOPE OF PROCEDURES**
These procedures apply to all academic staff undertaking teaching activities at all University campuses except in teaching situations where it would be inappropriate to do so.

6. **DEFINITIONS**
(Note: Commonly defined terms are located in the Policy Preferred Definitions. Any defined terms below are specific to this document)

7. **SCHEDULES**
Nil

8. **RELATED DOCUMENTS/LINKS/FORMS**
- Curtin Expectations for Academic Performance
- Staff Performance and Development Policy
- Curtin University Academic, Professional and General Staff Enterprise Agreement 2012 – 2016
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency and the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Manager</th>
<th>Deputy Vice- Chancellor, Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Contact        | Academic Lead, Curtin Learning Institute  
Tel: 9266 2864 |
| Approval Authority | Academic Board |
| Review Date   | 1st March 2017 |

**REVISION HISTORY** *(filled out by Legal and Compliance Services)*

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Revision Ref. No.</th>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Approved</td>
<td>28/03/2014</td>
<td>Academic Board</td>
<td>AB 5214</td>
<td>Attachment 3 to document No 00282/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the teacher engage students and facilitate active learning?</td>
<td>How does the teacher explain what students need to know in this lesson?</td>
<td>How does the teacher manage the learning environment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How does the teacher build rapport and credibility with the students?</td>
<td>How does the teacher scaffold the learning and provide feedback to students?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis

### Strengths

### Challenges

## Follow-up

### Debrief
Set a time for teacher and observer to discuss the teaching observation.

### Action Plan
Where to from here?
## Appendix 3: Criteria for providing evidence of teaching excellence at Curtin: Rubric for use in formal peer review of teaching

### 1. Design and Planning
- Engages positively with the planning of active learning strategies and uses them in a variety of contexts within the Curtin Converged model and leads activities, units and courses / School / Faculty to achieve quality assurance across all aspects of teaching. Engages with internal expertise to lead strategic engagement. Shares effective teaching practices nationally.

### 2. Teaching and Resource Development
- Contributes to curriculum and resource development through applying learning design principles effectively to refine curriculum materials and technologies to enhance student engagement and create / adapt learning materials that promote quality learning. Demonstrates currency of policy compliance and proves effectiveness in terms of supporting student learning.

### 3. Assessment and Feedback
- Creates innovative authentic assessments for varied teaching contexts and manages quality assurance in units teaching teams and, (2) proven success in innovative use of new technologies to enhance learning. Mentors colleagues and demonstrates institutional impact.

### 4. Developing Effective Learning Environments
- Demonstrates success in leading a teaching team to sustain a positive learning environment and attend to diversity issues present among the student cohort within a specific setting, and (2) changing stakeholder expectations and reimage learning. Engages in (tier 1) professional development and scholarship, (2) proven effectiveness in terms of supporting student learning.

### 5. Leadership and Management
- Gains significant acclaim for strategic initiatives. Gains significant acclaim in curriculum design through: (1) new initiatives. Gains significant acclaim in curriculum development and review nationally. Gains significant acclaim in curriculum development and review internationally. Gains significant acclaim in curriculum development and review nationally.
6. Evaluation of practice and continuing professional development

- Seeks ways to improve various aspects of teaching and learning by obtaining and analysing formal and informal feedback from students and peers. Identifies areas for improvement and addresses these with support.
- Systematically collects and analyses multiple data sources including self-reflection, to plan an integrated and consistent approach to enhance teaching effectiveness across different teaching contexts. A plan of action is implemented and regularly reviewed to evaluate improvements and calibrate goals accordingly.
- Sustains high levels of teaching effectiveness and across varied settings and inspires and supports the teaching team to achieve individual teaching effectiveness goals to assure quality outcomes at the unit level. Actively explores and implements improvement strategies to assure high teaching effectiveness is sustained in units.
- Leads course / School / faculty initiatives to improve teaching effectiveness informed by appropriate data sources. Makes a significant contribution to national projects that advance the goals of teaching effectiveness and undertakes reviewer and consultant functions in this area.
- Contributes to advancements in teaching effectiveness nationally and internationally. Gains significant acclaim in developing innovative strategies and resources to guide developments in teaching effectiveness in different settings. Gains recognition as a respected scholar and expert consultant in this field.

7. Professional and personal effectiveness

- Establishes an academic profile and engages in scholarly practice with support, guidance & direction from a team leader to: (1) foster quality teaching and learning practices, and (2) cultivate a community engagement and service orientation.
- Develops and sustains a personal academic profile within facilitative conditions by: (1) engaging in scholarship of teaching and learning activities that contribute to improvements and developments in one’s teaching and the unit / area, (2) seeking opportunities to engage in service and community activities.
- Advances an academic profile independently by (1) leading scholarship of teaching and learning activities, (2) contributing to strategic projects that lead to unit / course / School improvements and developments, and (3) makes a significant service contribution to professional communities.
- Sustains an advanced academic profile, through: (1) scholarship and leadership activities that achieve strategic developments at scale; (2) contribution and leadership within national projects to forge developments that improve teaching and learning; and (3) contribute through service within professional bodies and through community engagement.
- Manages a distinguished academic profile through: (1) scholarship and leadership activities that produce innovative institutional, national and international developments in teaching and learning; (2) acclaimed contributions to national and international projects; and (3) outstanding service to professional bodies and communities.

8. Examples of evidence demonstrates achievement of criteria.

- eVALUate TER: 80% agreement or higher for 2 consecutive years in most units taught.
- eVALUate TER & USR: 80% agreement or higher for 2 consecutive years in most units taught.
- Formal peer review of teaching report.
- Teaching evaluation review report shows potential for leadership in teaching and learning, participation in internal and external teaching related activities.
- Completion of FOLT role related professional development, and/or enrolment in a formal teaching qualification.
- Teaching portfolio
- Formal peer review of teaching report.
- Teaching evaluation review report shows evidence of effectiveness in all areas of teaching and a growing profile of service and leadership.
- Tutor feedback on preparation, organisation and mentoring support.
- Effective supervision of honours/postgraduate students to completion.
- As per Level B plus:
  - Teaching evaluation review report gives feedback from community partners on achievement of outcomes.
  - Recipient of a faculty or university teaching award.
  - Peer reviewed scholarship of teaching publications.
  - Details of applications for teaching grants.
  - Successful leadership in major T&L projects and roles such as peer review and mentoring.
- As per Level C plus:
  - External expert review and report.
  - Teaching awards and prizes at University and above
  - Partner and/or lead investigator on externally funded teaching and learning projects.
  - Mentoring and supporting teaching staff.
  - Peer reviewed SoTL publications.
  - Textbook publications or teaching innovations adopted by other universities.
  - Invitations to contribute to T&L at University, in the discipline and nationally.
- As per Level D plus:
  - A national and international leadership profile in T&L.
  - National and international awards, fellowships and honorary memberships.
  - Lead investigator on externally funded teaching and learning projects.
  - Sustained record of quality peer reviewed teaching publications.
  - Leadership in mentoring and supporting colleagues in all aspects of teaching and learning.
  - Leadership in external professional bodies and T&L networks.

[Participant] is employed at Level__

Meets expectations for Level__  Yes / No

Exceeds expectations for Level__  Yes / No
## Appendix 4: Curtin Expectations for Academic Performance: Teaching Quality Dimensions

### Table 1: Teaching and Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level A</th>
<th>Level B</th>
<th>Level C</th>
<th>Level D</th>
<th>Level E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality teaching as demonstrated by University approved data from student surveys, peer review processes and student outcomes</td>
<td>A contribution to teaching delivery commensurate with the role</td>
<td>Evidence of improvement and innovation in response to student feedback</td>
<td>Involvement in Honours and/or Graduate level teaching where appropriate</td>
<td>Contributions normally expected at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to the effective supervision of honours and Masters level coursework students where appropriate</td>
<td>Responsibility for preparation and delivery of substantial components of courses/units in collaboration with other colleagues as appropriate</td>
<td>Continued demonstration of commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
<td>Leadership of major curriculum initiatives and/or pedagogical developments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven ability to deliver high quality teaching across a range of modes and levels with evidence of ongoing reflective improvement and successful curriculum innovation</td>
<td>Significant and strategically relevant contributions, at Faculty and/or School level(s), to curriculum development and pedagogical innovation</td>
<td>An outstanding contribution to scholarship in research or teaching and learning including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An established and ongoing record of peer reviewed publications in the highest quality educational journals</td>
<td>- Evidence of an exceptional and ongoing contribution to a field of educational practice including:</td>
<td>- Citation indices</td>
<td>- Major international text books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Substantial impact on scholarship and teaching practice over time</td>
<td>- Prizes and awards from prestigious international educational bodies</td>
<td>- Election to learned academies or professional bodies</td>
<td>- Contributions to educational policy development at State and/or National levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key:
- Identical dimensions at the same level
- Similar dimensions at the same level
- Similar dimensions at a different level
- Dimensions not observed elsewhere
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identical dimensions at the same level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar dimensions at the same level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similar dimensions at a different level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimensions not observed elsewhere</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Teaching Focussed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality teaching as demonstrated by University approved data from student surveys, peer-review processes and student outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A contribution to teaching delivery commensurate with the role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to curriculum innovation and content design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of improvement and innovation in response to student feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Honours and/or Graduate level teaching where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions normally expected at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for preparation and delivery of substantial components of courses/units in collaboration with other colleagues as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of ongoing reflective improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to the effective supervision of HDR students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proven ability to deliver high quality teaching across a range of modes and levels with evidence of ongoing reflective improvement and successful curriculum innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant and strategically relevant contributions, at Faculty and/or School level(s), to curriculum development and pedagogical innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A record of success in winning significant external grants to support teaching projects and initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued demonstration of commitment to excellence in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership of major curriculum initiatives and/or pedagogical developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An emerging record of peer reviewed publications in the highest quality educational journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular invitations to present at major national or international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An outstanding contribution to scholarship in teaching and learning including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An established and ongoing record of peer reviewed publications in the highest quality educational journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evidence of an exceptional and ongoing contribution to a field of educational practice including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Citation indices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Major international text books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prizes and awards from prestigious international educational bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Election to learned academies or professional bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Evidence of major international impact on curricular design and/or pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Substantial impact on scholarship and teaching practice over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contributions to educational policy development at State and/or National levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Teaching Development Plan Template

The Teaching Development Plan template is a tool which can be used in the WPPR process for line managers and individuals to enhance evidence-based development and transformation of teaching. Use of the Teaching Development Plan Template is similar to that of the Research Plan template and provides line managers and individuals with opportunities beyond the WPPR template to focus more specifically on evidence-based development and transformation of teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Teaching Development Plan should be attached to your WPPR template. Alternatively, you may write your Teaching Development Plan directly within the WPPR template under Work Performance Objectives - Teaching &amp; Learning – Professional Development or other Support required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING PROFILE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the suggested headings as a guide to prepare a brief profile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEACHING DEVELOPMENT GOALS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the suggested format as a guide to outline 1 year (primary) teaching development goals and 2-3 year (secondary) teaching development goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHING DEVELOPMENT PLAN: 20xx – 20xx [YEAR 1 – YEAR 3]

STAFF MEMBER: [TITLE / NAME]

SCHOOL / AREA: [xxxxxxxxxxxxxx]

TEACHING PROFILE

1. **Teaching Area**
   Enter text in narrative or dot point form

2. **Scope and significance of teaching area**
   Enter text in narrative or dot point form

3. **Teaching Workload Allocation and Timing**
   Teaching time as allocated by Head of School

4. **Current Scholarship of Teaching**
   Summary of current scholarship of teaching being undertaken - narrative or dot point form
   (consider listing in a structured order, for example by $funding or impact or chronological order)

5. **Current HDR Student Supervision**
   Outline HDR supervision being undertaken in line with Register of Supervisors of Higher Degree by
   Research Students Policy and Procedures
   Lead Supervision
   . List
   Co-Supervision
   . List

6. **Scholarship of Teaching Outcomes Previous 3 Years**
   Summary of scholarship of teaching achievements from last planning period - narrative or dot point
   form (consider listing in a structured order, for example by $funding or impact or chronological
   order)

7. **Evidence of Teaching Excellence Previous 3 Years**
   Enter text in narrative or dot point form
1. Teaching Development Goals

1.1 Primary Goals 20xx (Year 1)

Here you should identify the teaching development and transformation activities you will focus on in the first year of this Teaching Development Plan.

You may wish to consider using the table below to outline your foci for developing and transforming your teaching in line with Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria and strategic initiatives; see http://www.curtin.edu.au/learningfortomorrow/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curtin’s Teaching Excellence Criteria</th>
<th>Learning for Tomorrow – Foci</th>
<th>Teaching Development – Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and planning of learning activities, units and courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and supporting student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and giving feedback to students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing effective learning environments, student support and guidance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of student learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of practice and continuing professional learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and personal effectiveness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You may wish to consider using the table below to outline prospective papers/grants and funding sources in any scholarship of teaching projects you plan to undertake.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper or Grant Application Title</th>
<th>My Role</th>
<th>Lead Author / Investigator</th>
<th>Co-Authors / Investigators</th>
<th>Submit to</th>
<th>Potential Impact / Outcomes</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Secondary Goals 20xx – 20xx (Years 2 and 3)

Here you should identify the teaching development activities that you anticipate being your focus in the forthcoming 2/3 year period. You may wish to consider using the tables above to outline prospective activities.

2. Key Performance Indicators /Measures / Targets

Here you should use your planned teaching development activities, as listed above, to identify your key performance objectives (KPIs) and the relevant measures against which you will be assessing your achievements. Your KPIs and measures should be aligned with Curtin Expectations of Academic Performance (CEAP) and agreed with your Head of School.

- Some examples of Teaching Development KPIs:
  - eVALUate Unit Summary Report – student satisfaction ≥ 80%
  - eVALUate Teaching Evaluation Report – student satisfaction ≥ 80%
  - Peer Review of Teaching – Reflective Statement demonstrates excellent or outstanding performance
  - Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Report demonstrates excellent or outstanding performance
  - Teaching Portfolio demonstrates excellent or outstanding performance
  - Target number or % of high quality scholarship of teaching publications
  - Target number of grants to lead / support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMITTED AND APPROVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Member’s Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of School/line Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Report

Peer Review of Teaching – Assessor(s) Report

Reviewer’s name: 
Reviewer’s staff ID: 
Participant’s name: 
Participant’s staff ID: 
Participant’s current level: 
Level being applied for: 
Date of summative review: 
Details of summative review: 
(What was reviewed)

Performance is scored on a five point scale (0-4) where 4 is outstanding, 3 is excellent, 2 is good, 1 is satisfactory and 0 is unsatisfactory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Excellence Criteria</th>
<th>Performances Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design and planning of learning activities, units and courses</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teaching and supporting student learning</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment and giving feedback to students</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing effective learning environments, student support and guidance</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Integration of scholarship, research and professional activities with teaching and in support of student learning</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Evaluation of practice and continual professional learning</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Professional and personal effectiveness</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement of compelling evidence of teaching excellence

Reviewer’s signature: 
Date: