**School of Law Peer Review of Teaching Review Form**

To be completed and made available to the reviewee for comments within two weeks of the final observations.

The completed form should be sent electronically to the Staff Resources Office michelle.outlaw@manchester.ac.uk

copying in carolyn.abbot@manchester.ac.uk

The reviewer should **not** retain a copy of the form.

This form contains a number of headings under which the reviewer is expected to add comments, with supporting evidence wherever possible. Each heading lists a number of questions. These are meant as prompts only; the lists are not assumed to be exhaustive, nor is it expected that each of the questions is responded to in the comments.

In some cases, the lecturer may not have has responsibility for determining all aspects of the course unit, the course unit may have been designed by a course leader, the course unit outline may have been put together by someone else, etc. Comments here should be limited to areas where the reviewee has had influence.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of reviewee** |  |
| **Name of reviewer** |  |
| **Date** |  |
| **Course unit code**  |  |
| **Mode of delivery** **(FT/ PT/ Blended)** |  |
| **Room** |  |
| **Level** |  |
| **Academic Year** |  |
| **Programme(s) of which the unit forms a part[[1]](#footnote-1)** |  |
| **Type of contact session (lecture, tutorial etc.)** |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **A. Documentation**  |
| This may include both paper-based and electronically available information. |
| What documentation / material was considered (this must include unit specification)? |
|  |
| * Was the information about crucial aspects of the course communicated clearly in the documentation (e.g. structure of course, contact sessions, eLearning elements, expectations between contact sessions, intended learning outcomes, reading lists, extra resources, etc.)?
* Are the intended learning outcomes appropriate for the level and the topic(see Appendix D for further guidance)
* Were the online resources appropriate for the nature of the content and method of delivery (see Appendix F for further guidance)?
 |
|  |
| *Consider strengths and areas for improvement* |
|  |
| **B. Contact sessions** |
| * Was the session clearly structured?
* Was there explicit linking to previous and/or subsequent sessions?
* Was the communication clear in all respects?
* Was the use of visual aids appropriate (this includes white board and hand-outs, not just electronically transmitted)?
* Were there any issues with control of the class?
* Was the pace appropriate?
* Was the timing right?
* Are the teaching methods appropriate?
* Was there any attempt at interaction with the class?
* Was there good use of illustrative examples?
* Were there links to previous work?
* Was advice given on follow up work/forthcoming work signalled?
* When reviewing small group teaching (such as tutorials, workshops and seminars), were students given adequate opportunity to participate in discussion?  How attentive and engaged were the students? Were their questions answered appropriately?

*Consider strengths and areas for improvement* |
|  |
| **C. Assessment and feedback** |
| * Is the amount of assessment appropriate?
* Is the assessment clearly linked to the intended learning outcomes?
* Do the students get some form of feedback before the main piece of assessment?
* Does it help students understand their marks or how their performance might be improved in future?
* Is information provided in unit outlines and course materials to inform students of the mechanisms by which they will receive feedback and the forms it will take for both formative and summative work?
* Does the Blackboard page for the unit have a clear section explaining the feedback mechanism that the unit will follow?

*Consider strengths and areas for improvement* |
|  |
| **D. eLearning materials (see Appendix F)***Consider strengths and areas for improvement* |
|  |
| **D. Course unit design** |
|  |
| * Is the course unit well structured? Is there a clear pathway through the materials and is the relationship between the face to face teaching and eLearning materials clearly defined?
* Are the kinds of sessions involved (lectures, tutorials, practical sessions etc.) appropriate?
* Were there opportunities for personalised learning?
* Was provision made for those with difficulties?

*Consider strengths and areas for improvement* |
|  |
|  |
| **Overall assessment based on material reviewed** (please tick one option) |
|  | All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of very high quality, few or no suggestions for improvement could be made |
|  | All, or almost all, aspects of the teaching reviewed were of high quality, but some suggestions for improvement could be made |
|  | Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were of good quality, but a number of suggestions for important improvements can be made and some developmental activity is recommended |
|  | Some aspects of the teaching reviewed were deemed to raise sufficient concern that urgent developmental activity was recommended) |
|  |
| **Recommendations for dissemination as good practice/teaching awards** |
| Acting as a mentor 🞏Best on Blackboard Competition 🞏Teaching and Learning News (Faculty & School) 🞏Teaching and Learning Show case 🞏Teaching Awards 🞏Web exemplar 🞏 |
| ***If the reviewee agrees to further dissemination of the practice, provide further detail. The reviewee could be asked to provide a note about the practice to assist with dissemination.*** |
| **Recommendations for development activity or training** |
|  |
| **Signatures** |
| Peer reviewer  |  | Date |  |
| Reviewee |  | Date |  |
|  |
| **Reviewee’s comments** |
|  |

1. There is no need to list programmes from which there are only occasional students. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)