



MASSEY UNIVERSITY

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INITIATING PEER REVIEW

The following steps are designed to support the peer review process. They map out the major decision points and issues for consideration for the Paper Coordinator depending on the type of formative peer review.

Step 1: Decide on the Type of Review

The first step is to decide what type of peer review you wish to undertake: *Paper Design Review*, *Focused Teaching Review* and *Comprehensive Review*. This decision should be based on what you want to learn from the review and requires you to be clear about the nature and purposes of peer review. Read the background information on the Peer Review Website <<http://peerreview.massey.ac.nz>>

Step 2: Prepare for your Peer Review

Be clear about the focus of the review. This applies to all formative review types as you cannot review everything; thus ensure that you focus on what is useful for your purpose. You may wish to put together your own list of points that you want the reviewer to address by selecting particular dimensions from the Peer Review Framework and other relevant instruments. The key point is to identify and understand the criteria by which judgements will be made about the quality of your teaching and paper design. You then need to think about what you will make available to the reviewer and when and over what period you would like the review will take place.

Step 3: Selecting the Reviewer

The next step is to select a reviewer. This could be a close colleague with knowledge of your subject or it might involve a group of people, including students, student advisors, relevant teaching consultants and academics from outside of your discipline. Remember comments you receive are only as good as the reviewer's own expertise and professional standing in the area. If you intend to use the review as evidence to support claims about your teaching, then the recognised expertise of the reviewer is central to the way this evidence will be judged. That said, the reviewer should be someone you can trust and who can complete the review according to your timeline. Confirm their willingness and availability to complete the review well ahead of time.

Step 4: Briefing the Reviewer

It is important to fully brief the reviewer. This does not have to be a long process but you need to agree on the method of gathering the information. Of course, this will depend on the type and purpose of the review. In the case of Paper Design Reviews, familiarise the reviewer with the Peer Review Framework and add them to your Stream environment. This can be done by 'adding a new user' within Stream or by contacting the ITS helpdesk. Decide on the overall process and timeframe. Peer reviews are always context specific and you need to ensure that the process provides a time to discuss the scope of the review and then to debrief afterwards. It is also useful to discuss the extent to which the review is confidential, the opportunity you might have in responding to issues raised by the reviewer and any input you might have in the final report. You should also agree on the nature of the report and the intended audience, as this will influence your reviewer's feedback.

Step 5: Arrange the Review

Inform the reviewer when the paper is ready for review. Make course materials and relevant reviews and evaluations of the paper available to the reviewer. Confirm they can access the Stream environment. Clarify the finished state of the paper and identify any work still in progress. Allow sufficient time for the reviewer to explore the evidence you have selected for the review. In the case of focused or comprehensive reviews, invite your reviewer to attend relevant lectures, tutorials, labs, etc. Where appropriate inform students of the peer review. Consider requests from the reviewer for additional information. Send the reviewer the relevant peer review form or instrument.

Step 6: Getting the Report

Reviews are understandably very sensitive processes and you need to be prepared for a range of comments. Your reviewer has accepted the task of providing honest and constructive feedback but some comments may differ from your own perceptions. In many respects this is the most valuable feedback you can receive as differing viewpoints encourage deeper conversations about your teaching and paper design. Ideally, you should request a debrief meeting with the reviewer to discuss their feedback and suggestions for course improvement. Collect any course materials and close off the reviewers access to your Stream environment. Thank the reviewer for the time and effort they have spent in undertaking the peer review.

Step 7: Following up on the Review

Make immediate changes to your paper. Develop an action plan to address any longer-term suggestions for improvement. If appropriate discuss the review with colleagues and/or a relevant teaching consultant. If you have a Stream environment, when the paper is ready, submit the Stream Completion Checklist so your online learning environment can be made available to students. Based on feedback identify any professional development opportunities relevant to improving your teaching and paper design. Consider attaching your report to your annual performance review and record any credits earned from peer review for any future application for a Teaching Development Grant. Securely store the Peer Review Report for later reference.