Embedding Peer Review
Case Study of a fully blended Communication subject
June 2009

This case study contains:

INTRODUCTION

Introducing this Case: A Peer Review of a Communication subject in a Blended Learning Environment

This case study is part of a two stage Peer Review which had both formative and summative purposes. The teacher wanted to address questions about assessment of students' online work in an internationally recognised and highly innovative subject she had developed and improved over several years. This review is very detailed as the Reviewee wanted to learn more about their subject in some depth. The Reviewer had been part of the teaching team for this subject in previous semesters and was also part of the project team and could allocate the time to converse with the reviewee and to document what emerged.

Some points to note about the subject in this Case Study are that it is:
- Taken as both a core and elective by a mixture of undergraduate and postgraduate students from across different faculties in the university.
- A fully blended subject where lectures and tutorials are delivered mainly face to face, supplemented by some virtual classroom work.
- Class discussions and two of the three assignments involve extensive online work by the students.

The first Peer Review focused on the strategies used to encourage greater student directed and managed participation in the online wikis that were part of an assignment. When this review was completed it was decided to continue the process by doing a second review of the same subject, by the same reviewer. The second review went on to evaluate the marking of the assignments that flowed from the online group work and class discussions. This is the review that is the subject of the following Case Study.

This case study is interesting because it shows the value of the formative process of Peer Review in a fully blended subject for the teaching practice of experienced and innovative teachers, and how the same review can also be used for an ultimately summative purpose.

The Process for this Formative and Summative Peer Review

The following elements were chosen by this reviewee from the range of review processes available:

The Three Stages of Conducting a Peer Review

1. Preparing the Review
♦ The **Briefing Template** was completed which outlines the extent of the review, what will not be included, and sending it to the reviewer.
♦ Students were informed prior to the peer review by posting the **Briefing Statement for Students** in the subjects' Blackboard site and sending an email advice.
♦ A **Pre-Meeting Discussion** took place between the teacher and reviewer based on the information from the Briefing.

2. The Reviewing Process – Doing the **Peer Review** included looking at the online work by students about their assigned emerging technology in their Blackboard wikis, discussion linked to the wiki, subject documentation, assignment outlines and a range of grades and feedback. The Reviewers' Framework was completed concurrently.

3. Following up and Reporting – the process was relatively lengthy in this Case Study example because both the reviewee and reviewer wanted to fully explore aspects that arose during the review in a formative way:
♦ A **Debrief Meeting** with the teacher of approximately one hour was held once the review had been done.

♦ Then the documentation of the full Review in the **Reviewers Framework** was finalised.

♦ The compilation of a short **Peer Review Summative Report** was the final stage of this first round of reviewing.

♦ A **Second Round of Reviewing** with another peer from a different discipline is planned as a part of the reflection, discussion and **Action Plan** based on findings of this Review.

Planning Your Review

Briefing Template: An Overview of Your Review Goals

1. Goals of Your Peer Review
What do you hope to get out of this Peer Review?

I am interested in learning how well the design of the second assignment in 50482 ([Subject])is suited to my stated goals for the assignments – and the subject overall (namely: valuing collaboration, team work and active participation in online elements of the subject).The peer review will help me to review how effective the current assessment criteria for the 2nd assignment (especially those related to participation and group activity) are for assessing and rewarding "useful" presence in the activities being assesses. I also want to learn how to effectively communicate to students
a) what is being valued in the assignments (and the subject);
b) what they need to do to successfully complete all aspects of this second assignment.

2. Do you intend to use the peer review as evidence of your teaching?
Please circle the appropriate response:
- For an annual performance and planning discussion? NO
- For promotion? NO • For a teaching award or other form of recognition? YES

If so, please provide your reviewer with a copy of any relevant criteria for which this peer review could provide evidence.

I am putting together an application for a Teaching Award.
1. Approaches to teaching and learning and/or to teaching and learning support that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn
2. Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field
3. Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning
4. Scholarly activities and service innovations that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching

3. Subject and Context for the Peer Review
- I have attached a copy of the Subject Outline. YES

- Please briefly describe anything else that is not covered by the Subject Outline, but which you think a peer reviewer needs to know about the context of your teaching in this subject? For example, the level of the subject; the number of students; any particular issues relevant to the subject this semester

The student population is diverse in a number of ways:
- *Undergrad (largely 2nd year)/post graduate*
- *Core subject for some students / elective for the Faculty*
- *Often there are students from other Faculties that enrol as well*
- *Usually between 40 to 60 students enrolled (subject runs once per year)..*

4. Statement of focus for the Peer Review
- Now briefly outline the aspects of the subject or teaching have you selected for the peer reviewer to focus on? (*This could be: the overall structure and design of the subject, use of an online subject site, assessment approaches, a face-to-face teaching session, particular online activities*)

*I would like to have the wiki discussions and the assignment criteria related to **collaboration and discussion reviewed to see how the criteria align to my objectives for the subject** and to see **if student participation & collaboration reflects the subject goals but not necessarily the assignment criteria.** Following on from discussion in Item 1 above, one of the concerns I have is that I may be privileging the quantifiable evidence*

available for assessing online activity (that is, the number of posts a student makes) over qualitative elements which are often more challenging to examine for 'evidence' when assessing an assignment against the established criteria. Because this assignment acts in many ways as a cornerstone for the subject overall (running for most of the semester), it is important that my marking of the student work adequately support the subject objectives. I want the students to do well and want to work out how to encourage them to participate actively – active participate is a make or break for the dynamics and quality of the online discussion. It also appears that there is a challenge in terms of documenting the "blend" of f2f and online that is embedded throughout all learning activities and assessments in this subject.

• Which components will your reviewer need to examine?
(Examples could include: Subject outlines; face to face classes; marked assignments etc)
If the aspects are components of an online site, please attach screenshots or provide a description that enables the peer reviewer to locate these components.

Subject outline, assignments, lecture materials and tutorial handouts, online material in wikis related to the emerging technologies the student teams explored, and discussion boards.

5. Any Additional Comments

(continue over the page if you wish)

III: Reflecting on your Teaching: Using the Framework

This table gives the opportunity for teachers to consider the criteria for reviewing good teaching that have been developed (left hand column) and some explanatory questions about each of these (middle column). The last column provides spaces for them to respond. This process seems to help teachers to clarify their intentions for teaching and for this review, and in turn give reviewers valuable insights if it is shared with them before or during a Pre-Meeting Discussion.

Teachers Framework		
Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	**Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:**	**Teachers Comments for Reviewer (use these prompting questions, or create your own)**
1. Clear Goals: For students' learning and for design of the learning environment	o Clarity of goals for students' learning and understanding how those goals are meaningful and appropriate for the students, the course and the context o Clarity and quality of rationale for the design of the blended learning environment in the subject and/or clear rationale for why the reviewed aspect(s) have been designed o Consideration of the broader goals of the course, university, professional/disciplinary context etc	What are your intentions for student learning in this aspect of the subject/teaching? What role do these aspects play in the overall context of the subject design? *As I have communicated in earlier reviews of this subject, I am interested in encouraging online collaboration and discussion throughout the semester – using this assignment as a way to support their work in this direction.*
2. Current & Relevant Preparation: Of the content and processes of teaching and learning; informed by scholarship, and consideration of likely student starting points and needs	o The content of the subject reflects current and relevant scholarship in the field o The teaching and learning practices are informed by current awareness and relevant scholarship o Teaching materials and resources for students are organised well and in timely ways. The learning environment is thoughtfully structured with consideration of how students will navigate pathways and options o **Preparation takes students' expected prior knowledge and preparation for learning into account.** o **There is appropriate support and preparation for students to learn in less-familiar ways.**	How have you prepared for this aspect of teaching? What did you consider? *See my Book Chapter (submitted earlier) which outlines the philosophical and pedagogical underpinnings of this subject and this particular assignment* *NOTE: the two points highlighted are of particular concern for me in this assignment. I feel that it is challenging to use the existing assignment criteria (which may be in some ways too rigid or out-dated but which are, for procedural reasons) difficult to amend without sufficient reason for doing so.*

Teachers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Teachers Comments for Reviewer (use these prompting questions, or create your own)
3. Appropriate Methods and Implementation: Thoughtfully chosen , considering the students, subject, context and available resources; also applied effectively, modified in response to students' ideas and understandings, to feedback and to changing situations	o There is coherence between learning and teaching methods, learning objectives and assessment o There are opportunities for students to develop a range of graduate attributes appropriate for the subject/learning activity o Teaching and learning practices foster students' active engagement in learning o Teaching and learning practices foster student interaction and collaboration with others o There is an appropriate level of intellectual challenge o There are opportunities for student independence, choice and control over learning, for example flexibility of learning modes and/or choices of content or focus o There are opportunities for students to see what they are learning in relation to broader contexts.	Are there any particular methods you would like the reviewer to give feedback on? *I am particularly interested in feedback about the Assignment 2 wikis and the nature of student collaboration and participation in these online sites. I would like to know how someone other than the subject coordinator/tutor views the collaboration – what participation is evident to an 'outsider'?; is there a sufficient link between stated goals and the way the work is assessed?* Is there anything that you do not want feedback about (for example because you already intend to make changes)?
4. Effective Communication: Presentation to various potential groups: always communication with students, may also include communication with teaching team members and other colleagues	o Clarity of explanations and guidance for students o Motivating student interest and perceived relevance o Clear communication with students about expectations, including clarity about requirements, choices and optional pathways in blended learning environments o Responsiveness to students' understandings, ideas and progress in learning o Responsiveness to students' communications and questions o Effectiveness of co-ordination/communication with other staff teaching in the subject.	Are there any particular aspects of your communication that you would like feedback about? *Communication requirements related to the participation and collaboration elements of the assessment. I am trying to use a 'carrot' rather than a 'stick' in terms of encouraging students to participate and collaborate.*

Teachers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Teachers Comments for Reviewer (use these prompting questions, or create your own)
5. Important Outcomes: Strongly focused on student learning, and then achievement of additional intentions. Further outcomes may include Scholarly communication of teaching (eg via seminars or publications).	o Evidence of student engagement o Evidence of student learning, relating to both desired outcomes and unexpected learning outcomes o Evidence of other outcomes related to any other intentions of the learning activity (for example evidence of the effectiveness of a learning innovation in achieving particular goals, evidence of effective collaboration with colleagues/tutors) o Evidence of broader significance – eg potential for the adaptation and scaling-up of an innovation o Presentation of scholarly reports of practice to colleagues and others.	Are there forms of engagement or intended outcomes that you would like the reviewer to give feedback about? *I am very interested in learning how I might **sustainably** assess the quality of student wikis and individual work on the assignment (e.g.: participation, collaboration and the qualities of these)*
6. Reflective Critique Includes how the teacher critically reflects on teaching and learning, makes use of a variety of forms of evidence and acts on the findings	o Learning from students and adapting teaching in response, during teaching and afterwards o Seeking and acting on feedback – showing evidence of how previous feedback has been built in to improve o Reflective practice informed by self, literature, students, peers and other sources (see Brookfield, 1995).	How has previous reflection and feedback informed this aspect of your teaching? ***Work in developing an online teaching program for University of [USA}, action research on this subject and meetings with IML and UW educational development staff have all informed the subject.***

THE REVIEW PROCESS

IV: Framework for Reviewers
This version of the framework was used by the peer reviewer to evaluate the teaching according to the framework criteria that have been developed.

Reviewers Framework		
Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	**Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:**	**Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review**
1. Clear Goals: For students' learning and for design of the learning environment	o Clarity of goals for students' learning and understanding how those goals are meaningful and appropriate for the students, the course and the context o Clarity and quality of rationale for the design of the blended learning environment in the subject and/or clear rationale for why the reviewed aspect(s) have been designed o Consideration of the broader goals of the course, university, professional/disciplinary context etc	As mentioned in 1ˢᵗ Round the Subject Outline (SO) does not reflect adequately [Name]'s intentions for her students as stated in the Overview above and our discussions. The Subject Objectives do not mention online collaboration and participation, rather they focus on being able to *"critically examine the interplay…have an advanced understanding of issues"* etc. So these seem to be reflecting broader goals of course perhaps? Need linking more closely to [Name]'s intentions (which are valuable contributions to the course/ university goals, in terms of content and faculty graduate attributes). Perhaps making more explicit how students might "see" this particular Subject Objective getting done would help in this regard. T & L strategies (p. 2) statement *"contributions to tutorial discussion is valued and expected…active involvement …keep up to date on current debates"* does not foreground the blended nature of this discussion and that it is the platform for learning about & learning how in the whole subject. Looking at the assignment *"will be individual, group and written"* again does not highlight the innovative and interesting blended nature – it does not engender excitement about collaboratories. The 'Content' section of the Subject Outline has an entry for "Reflective writing skill development" but not for teamwork and this does not appear in the contribution to Graduate Profile. In this GP section the objectives numbered are hard to link to anything? The online elements of the learning activities needs to be more explicitly documented in the subject outline. Currently, skills which are an important part of the assignment under review are getting lost in the documentation – which has not kept up with pedagogical developments in the subject/weekly program. The Assignment Outline itself is much more specific but could more clearly lay out the assignment task and the importance of participation and collaboration. I know a lot of this is covered in class but the documentation could be strengthened in this regard – if this is possible within administrative constraints? For instance, the assessment criteria more specific and distinct in relation to '[Subject]' themes and practices. The only Assignment Objective that seems to explicitly mention these priorities is *"An ability to work effectively in team"* which again does not reveal the breadth and depth of intentions and the objectives expressed in this review. Assignment Criteria are clearly separated into Collaboratory and Report which strongly signals there are 2 components, however, I am not sure the linkage of these 2 aspects is made clear here. EG Would a wonderful analysis and evaluation of collaboratory work that synthesises the literature really well and links to the students experiences, but without fantastic participation evident online be rewarded? Conversely, would fabulous collaboration and participation, which [Name] is wanting to encourage and reward be enough for a good mark without substantial written evidence in the report (Criteria 3-7). The wording of the criteria also does not seem to emphasise the active nature of participation. I understood that Criteria 1 is about the groundwork for the collaboratory itself but it is also about sustaining it over the 2 weeks that each collaboratory activity is run. It is worth considering whether or not there is too much expressed within the two criteria written to target the collaboratory activity (as opposed to the contents of the written report). This may be creating an awkward and unsustainable divide in terms of ways that "evidence" of collaboration and teamwork may be manifested in this assignment. The rationale for the blend [Name] has developed in this subject and the focus Assignment is laid out in other sources she has cited in this review but again not tackled in the SO. Teamwork is about collaborating and the collaboratories require teamwork. Students and student reflection and meta cognition.

Reviewers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review
2. Current & Relevant Preparation: Of the content and processes of teaching and learning; informed by scholarship, and consideration of likely student starting points and needs	o The content of the subject current and relevant scholarship in the field o The teaching and learning practices are informed by current awareness and relevant scholarship o Teaching materials and resources for students are organised well and in timely ways. The learning environment is thoughtfully structured with consideration of how students will navigate pathways and options o Preparation takes students' expected prior knowledge and preparation for learning into account. o There is appropriate support and preparation for students to learn in less-familiar ways.	The currency and scholarship are set out in the chapter cited. Perhaps more impressive is the reflective and iterative nature of the subject and assignments development. [There is a wealth of materials for students provided it this subject and associated with the tutorials that were the preparation for the Collaboratory work and assignment. The pathways through materials are perhaps too numerous and not clearly structured to a 'new eyes' of a student coming into the subject. There seems to be less materials provided electronically than often provided by [Name] and these seem to focus on themes of subject – this may be due to the second year nature of the subject and smaller cohort? Has this been provided in class? Tutorial? There are reading suggestions provided in the weekly tutorial handouts, so perhaps links to these could be provided in the UTSOnline "Learning Support" section that currently exists [e.g. for topics like teamwork, collaboration, communication (f2f, online)]. Yellow bits – [Name] saw these as important but was not sure how to demonstrate them? How can I judge this? Did the minute papers happen – what were they about? Learning in less familiar ways is what a collaboratory is so the focus of this assignment and review. Tutorial activities that are constantly under development and improvement seem to be the main vehicle here? Readings? Lectures? The subject documentation does not always reflect the activity.

Reviewers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review
3. Appropriate Methods and Implementation: Thoughtfully chosen , considering the students, subject, context and available resources; also applied effectively, modified in response to students' ideas and understandings, to feedback and to changing situations	o There is coherence between learning and teaching methods, learning objectives and assessment o There are opportunities for students to develop a range of graduate attributes appropriate for the subject/learning activity o Teaching and learning practices foster students' active engagement in learning o Teaching and learning practices foster student interaction and collaboration with others o There is an appropriate level of intellectual challenge o There are opportunities for student independence, choice and control over learning, for example flexibility of learning modes and/or choices of content or focus O There are opportunities for students to see what they are learning in relation to broader contexts.	Coherence of objectives and intentions is addressed in goals (see 1 above) and the same applies to methods. Although they are not explicitly elaborated upon in the various objectives and this needs to be addressed, the innovative and engaging teaching & learning activities that [Name] employs in this subject are of contribute to the scholarship of teaching in terms of methods and blend mode (collaboratories) at UTS at Teaching & Learning Fora and internationally in the discipline of [Subject]. Looking at the sample assignments, assignment criteria, subject goals etc these seem like they could be more cohesive and the structure of the assignments changed so that the importance of skilled participation as a learning and professional tool is highlighted both for the students and for the academic marking (or indeed reviewing) the assignments. This is one of the aims of this review for [Name] to assess and explore the sustainability of marking a complex, blended assignment. Collaboratories as a T & L activity demonstrably foster student interactions and collaboration. This has been discussed by T in papers and the chapter but how to make it more specific and measurable for this review?? Just say yes? Wikis are their work – students start with a blank slate on an emerging technology and create amazingly rich artefacts about these. The level of intellectual challenge in the content of social informatics and use of emerging technologies to foster skills of collaboration are obvious. This is an important field of research and is appropriately introduced and discussed with students. There is challenge too in working in collaboration and linking this to theorising in the literature. Challenge for students that is also doable and a powerful learning experience. Student have choice and control of topic for, and role within collaboratory. Similarities and differences of face to face and online experiences of collaborating are addressed in the assignment – is this explicit in documentation? In terms of opportunities for students, this is a strength of [Name] approach to teaching and built into Ass 2 in terms of consideration of case studies and other uses for collaboratories that is required BUT how to make this concrete and explicit in the teaching and learning strategies (cf Case study Q needs to be clarified in the Subject Outline for Assignment 2 (add case study and other uses as they are packed into the last clause (e.g.: "two or more social/work contexts", "other uses" and alternative possibilities needs fleshing out)

Reviewers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review
4. Effective Communication: Presentation to various potential groups: always communication with students, may also include communication with teaching team members and other colleagues	o Clarity of explanations and guidance for students o Motivating student interest and perceived relevance o Clear communication with students about expectations, including clarity about requirements, choices and optional pathways in blended learning environments o Responsiveness to students' understandings, ideas and progress in learning o Responsiveness to students' communications and questions o Effectiveness of co-ordination/communication with other staff teaching in the subject.	Lots of bits for the students and lots of wonderful guidance that provides rich examples and explanations for students in class has been observed in [Name]'a presentation of this subject in the classroom. However, the subject doesn't clearly hang together as a whole on paper and this could be improved. Although this is how she adds value in the classroom, having more clarity in the documentation and online material would be helpful for students, tutors and others. Discussion Board has been used to both seed info and tackle questions and misunderstandings in the past but in this cohort seemed to be very little used (5 TA posts on one and 8 with students in another) so this does not seem to have been a feature of M 2008, although there was reference to virtual classroom. The Q & A was possible in the virtual classroom due to smaller numbers. Inherent in the tasks students undertake in this subject both in class and for assessment and in [Name]'s approach to teaching in general. I am a bit confused about this so could perhaps be clearer to students. As above [Name] provides sensitive and through exploration of requirements and ways to do things and there are choices available and made clear to students. However, clarity about what is to be done and what is most important may take time to emerge for students new to this innovative subject and approach – this is hard to judge without having been in the classroom this time around! Online space is useful and clear. Some of the tags in UTSOnline were really good (eg "what you will find here…here is a space dedicated solely to…this shared space will provide us with…"etc). However, I was surprised to find there was less supporting material for students available online than I have seen in your other subjects – is this because it is a 2nd year subject? Perhaps, as mentioned earlier, it would be useful to ensure that the advice and suggestions provided in the weekly tutorial handouts could be provided in the UTSOnline "Learning Support" zone that currently exists. This would flesh out this part of the site and provide useful and ready reference for students in need of this information.

Reviewers Framework		
Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	**Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:**	**Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review**
5. Important Outcomes: Strongly focused on student learning, and then achievement of additional intentions. Further outcomes may include Scholarly communication of teaching (eg via seminars or publications).	o Evidence of student engagement o Evidence of student learning, relating to both desired outcomes and unexpected learning outcomes o Evidence of other outcomes related to any other intentions of the learning activity (for example evidence of the effectiveness of a learning innovation in achieving particular goals, evidence of effective collaboration with colleagues/tutors) o Evidence of broader significance – eg potential for the adaptation and scaling-up of an innovation o Presentation of scholarly reports of practice to colleagues and others.	The collaboratories themselves and the assignments (which analyse, synthesise the literature and evaluate the collaboratories are the main sources here all of which provide abundant evidence of engagement. Conversely it is hard to extract this as evidence here? The assignments are hard to "read' efficiently in a way that captures the quality of engagement. I was a bit confused because the Fail students had engaged in the report to a certain extent with the ideas about collaboratories (although some disagreed about their value). Report criteria versus participation criteria not matching. This is possibly due to the assignments being selected for the Peer Review. However, as indicated earlier in this Review, it is possible that the report/participation divide is unrealistic and impractical. The learning innovation of the collaboratories provide wonderful evidence of engagement and learning. Their quality of the artefacts' content, presentation and the committed work as a team evident in the management of the sites and discussions with peers is very impressive from 2nd year students. These are mixed with postgraduate in this subject. This is also impressive because [Name] has engagement and learning happening to a high level for both groups so that each is enriched by the presence of the other. It is impossible to tell by looking at the work that emerges which are the postgraduate students. Many students and other staff in the faculty are negative about mixing students in this way so this is a great achievement. As for the participation of the whole class in discussion this is numerically easy to see as being quite impressive. To evaluate SL specifically against the Assignment OR Subject criteria is tricky. Firstly, as discussed above these seem quite different? Secondly, for a reviewer to get an idea of each collaboratory member, (therefore fulfilment of roles); issues that should be discussed as part of the ET topic, capture discussion about collaboration (focus of the assignment) seems over whelming even though I have tutored this subject before? This means [Teacher] is right in thinking the subject needs to made more sustainable. One suggestion that emerged in conversation about this Review that may help make the assessment more sustainable AND help students to communicate their achievement against all criteria, would be to engage the students in the assessment of their collaboration and online activity. For example, the assignment could be revised to ask students to use their written reports as ways to showcase their own learning. Using extracts from their collaboratory postings and teamwork tasks as "quotes" in a response to the criteria. It might be advisable to revise the assignment to trial this in the forthcoming semester when a new tutorial leader will be brought on board.

Reviewers Framework

Criteria for Reviewing Good Teaching	Depending on the subject (unit) or activity consider including:	Reviewer's Comments about the Criteria Relevant to this Review
6. Reflective Critique Includes how the teacher critically reflects on teaching and learning, makes use of a variety of forms of evidence and acts on the findings	o Learning from students and adapting teaching in response, during teaching and afterwards o Seeking and acting on feedback – showing evidence of how previous feedback has been built in to improve o Reflective practice informed by self, literature, students, peers and other sources (see Brookfield, 1995).	This is an important aspect of this subject and of [Name]'s teaching but is difficult to see on paper unless we look again at the background chapter (see above), contributions to a collaborative paper prepared for an international education forum for information educators (* see Bawden et al Ref below) and presentations at the T & L Forum . However, in conversation, we find that the writing of the book chapter informed the rewriting of the "Moderating and Weaving Guidelines" distributed in Week 2. Examples of ways she is learning from students and adapting teaching in response include: • Switching from blogs to wiki's in response to student concerns about having an effective way to work collaboratively in the online spaces provided. • Learning from and with students about new Emerging Technologies every semester; preparing the students to do this through 'fabulations' (future scenarios) and adapting classroom activities to encompass what emerges. The critical reflection is verbally mentioned as responses or lack thereof of the students to the task of discussion sparked an increase in the time spent and innovations in the way this was made clear to students in a tutorial through teaching and learning activities. This as been discussed with the reviewer, but perhaps needs to be documented in specificity more by the teacher for this review perhaps? How has your university work in the US fed into this specifically (have you written about his- do you have any comments anywhere)? [Teacher] has been able to connect these through the process of learning online. Her work on M led to being offered a job teaching one subject a year fully online, remotely for UUSA. Working in collaboration with a team at an overseas university has helped this teacher to co-evolve both subjects she teaches, particularly in terms of the processes of participation in online discussion. Examples of this co-evolving relationship include the activities that have been incorporated into M about learning about online participation (Week 3 & 4 in particular) and also the use of wikis and teamwork using wikis (for instance, working with another instructor at an overseas university in a wiki in order to mimic the tasks expected of students and monitoring student work). Feedback has been sought through this review – other feedback sought through working with staff at IML and co authoring a paper about this. ? For example, work on the chapter helped to clarify the nuances of moderation and weaving in online discussion aspect and enrich the supporting material for students. Subject has not been run – indications of changes made as a result of Round 1? Involvement in the ALTC Peer Review project as part of the UTS Team and engagement with two peer reviews as reviewee and one as reviewer?

REPORTING VI: Summative Report

Peer Review Summary Report for: [TEACHER]

Subject and Semester of Review: [SUBJECT NAME], Autumn 2008

Date of Report: 17 February 2009

Peer Reviewer: Nicola Parker, IML, University of Technology, Sydney.

Aspect of Teaching or Subject Chosen for this Review: Students creation of and participation in online Collaboratories about emerging technologies and their management and participation in the discussion forums that are part of these.

Components of Teaching or Subject Reviewed: *(Please select & briefly describe):*

Subject Documents: Subject and Assignment Outline

Face to Face Class: Discussed with teacher; Lecture slides and handouts.

Discussion Board: Wiki content and discussions

Student Assessment Examples: A range of assignment grades and feedback

Other (please specify): Review of UTSOnline site..

External Criteria (promotions, awards or other) Relevant to this Review:
(Please outline the relevant criteria that this review provides supporting evidence for)
1. Approaches to teaching and learning and/or to teaching and learning support that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn
2. Development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field
3. Approaches to assessment and feedback that foster independent learning
4. Scholarly activities and service innovations that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching

Review of Teaching in Blended Learning Environments:

Criteria for Good Teaching	Peer Reviewer's Comments
1. Clear Goals: For students' learning and for the design of the learning environment	Clear intentions and extremely thoughtful design of the face to face and online learning environments creates innovative and exemplary learning activities for students. However, this is not always reflected in the documentation and written messages the students are getting about what path to follow and what to prioritise? (NB Changes to faculty procedures for subject documentation in 2008 have been a major factor and these are being addressed for 2009).
2. Current and Relevant Preparation: Of the content and processes of teaching and learning; informed by scholarship and consideration of likely student starting points and needs	Preparation is meticulous and impressive (eg excellent and extensive handouts about collaborating online). [TEACHER's] teaching in the field of [SUBJECT] is actually at the cutting edge and consequently she has been asked to contribute to the SOTL in this field internationally, as well as teach a associated subject online for a university in the US. Consideration of students needs is an integrated part of her teaching practice.
3. Appropriate Methods and Implementation: Thoughtfully chosen , considering the students, subject, context and available resources; also applied effectively, modified in response to students' ideas and understandings, to feedback and	Methods employed in [SUBJECT] have been honed over several year of reflective teaching practice and are of international interest (see above). She has continually modified her teaching in response to students' ideas. The migration of the collaboratories assignment from the blogs to the wikis is one such instance. Some of the blended nature of the subject has evolved from teaching while travelling to international conferences into a mode of teaching that is a successful and 'fully blended' experience for students. It is the way the collaboratories are taught (eg specifically targeting students' creativity) that

to changing situations	makes them a highly successful and innovative teaching and learning process for the students
4. Effective Communication: Presentation to various potential groups; always communication with students, may include communication with teaching team members and other colleagues.	[TEACHER's] communication with her students is impressive. She is a consummate presenter with a passion for her subject which she communicates to her students powerfully, whilst also responding promptly to their questions and inviting their participation. She communicates with colleagues her faculty and across the university about her subject and her teaching as well as with the international community. She has published internationally on Teaching in this field.
5. Important Outcomes: Strongly focused on student learning, and then achievement of additional intentions. Further outcomes may include Scholarly communication of teaching (eg via seminars or publications).	Powerful Student Learning occurs in this subject through student engagement in the teamwork of their collaboratories and the content.. This is evident through the complex and rich learning environments the students create for their peers and the discussions they facilitate and engage with, about emerging technologies that result in a creative learning resource for the whole group including the teachers! These resources become a platform for the whole class's essay assignments.
6. Reflective Critique Includes how the teacher critically reflects on teaching and learning, makes use of a variety of forms of evidence and acts on the findings	[TEACHER] is a highly reflective teacher who has developed this impressive subject and the innovative use of collaboratories and the associated assignment as a result. She has also reflected on the teaching of this subject with close colleagues, university community (Forums) and in her international conference presentations and book chapters.

Overall Comments

Reviewer's Overall Summary:
(Please make any overall comments you have regarding the level of quality and achievement of what you have reviewed which shows evidence of good teaching in blended learning environments, and about the fulfilment of any specific criteria provided above)
In summary, the teaching of this subject, and in particular the collaboratories, discussions and teamwork associated with these is inspiring. This Teacher has crafted a model for teaching in this area (and more widely) that has been recognised by the international leaders in the field as exciting, in terms of both its disciplinary content and student learning.
There is of course always ways to improve students experiences and these have been highlighted in the process and write-up of the full Peer Review that is summarised by this report. Through the iterative conversations about [Teacher]'s teaching of this subject in the ongoing processes of peer review, I know that these points are being addressed (Subject Outline/online elements in UTSOnline/ ReView). I have found strong evidence in the course of this review for UTS Learning and Teaching Awards Criteria 1, 2, 3 and 5.

Reviewer's Signature: *Date:*

Teacher's Response to Reviewers Comments:
I have sighted / read this report:
Teacher's Signature: *Date:*

I wish to make the following additional comments about the Criteria / Overall Comment:
It is very helpful to have an outsider/insider explore these critical aspects of the subject. The reviewer has put a tremendous amount of effort into a thoughtful examination of the many intricacies of this subject. I wish to acknowledge my appreciation of these efforts which have flagged many areas of strength as well as areas in need of improvement. It has been especially interesting to see flagged the discrepancy between my in-class practice and the documentation in place for this subject. Perhaps this is a consequence of the current documentary procedures in

place for subject development? It may also be a consequence of the challenges in terms of maintaining consistent communication for a dynamic subject like [SUBJECT].

FOLLOWING UP

Next Steps

One of the things being implemented as a result of this review, is an ongoing process of reviewing my teaching:

♦ The further **Cross-disciplinary Review** with a colleague from Nursing, Midwifery and Health who also teaches a blended subject.
♦ Possible use of one or more Summative Reviews Reports for an application
♦ Further reflection and discussion and creating a new **Action Plan** based on findings of that Review.
♦ Perhaps leading to further reviews after the Spring session of this subject.

References

Anderson, Theresa D., 2009, Teaching the Socio-Technical Practices of Tomorrow Today, in Brian Whitworth & Aldo de Moor (eds.) *Handbook of Research on Socio-Technical Design and Social Networking Systems*, IGI Global, Hershey, PA USA, pp . 748-762.

Anderson, Theresa D., 2007, Information, media, digital industries and the library and information science curriculum, Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Conceptions of Library and Information Science—"Featuring the Future". Educational Forum paper, Borås, Sweden, August 2007.

Bawden, David, Robinson, Lyn , Anderson, Theresa, Bates, Jessica, Rutkauskiene, Ugne and Vilar, Polona, 2007, Towards curriculum 2.0: Library/information education for a Web 2.0 world, Library and Information Research, Vol 31, Nr 99, pp 14-25 (available at http://www.lirg.org.uk/lir/ojs/index.php/lir/article/view/49/74)

Reviewees' Perspective of this Peer Review Process

Reflection on exploration of teaching?

This has been a really valuable engagement, allowing me to work through the process with a peer who is familiar with my intentions for the subject under review as well as with critical SOTL principles. I found it really helpful to be "guided" by the framework, as it helped to crystallise strengths and weaknesses in my approach. More importantly it provides direction for future improvements.

Why were you interested in being involved in this Peer Review?

I have always considered myself a reflective practitioner. Working within this peer-review process seemed a very natural progression from that self-reflection. It provided a mechanism for specific evaluation by someone other than myself in a manner that would allow me to convey my intentions, concerns and requests for suggestions in an iterative fashion. I also felt it could help me to articulate to others as well as myself what is good and what needs improving in relation to my teaching. Ultimately, I saw this form of review as an invaluable tool for collecting and conveying evidence about my teaching.

What were your impressions of this process and its advantages and disadvantages?

Working with an insider/outsider reviewer has been great. Not only was she familiar with the subject, she is really well informed about SOTL. I found this combination immensely helpful and supportive. The most important key to the process, however, is mutual trust and respect. Having great respect for my reviewer and knowing she was evaluating the elements we discussed in this process respectful of my intentions and concerns made this a very powerful process.

In many ways this review process has enabled me to have ongoing evaluative conversations with myself as well as will a peer in the role of "critical friend". Finding a way to articulate what is of value and what needs refinement is challenging, so the framework template has been a useful visualisation tool for review and reflection. The conversations within the review framework have been more constructive than anything I could have hoped to achieve on my own. The great advantages of this process are the depth of discussion and the quality of the feedback I've received. The only disadvantage, if you can call it that, is that I have found it hard to stop the process of review. Each stage and each conversation has been so rich with insight into my teaching that it has been a challenge to bind it within the review process at times. To that end, however, I have found the framework a really useful template.

How did you respond to the feedback provided?

As you might imagine given my response to the above question, this is an ongoing process. I will be acting on all the great feedback for some time. At present I am in the process of revising the Subject Outline, especially the assessment criteria and some elements of the task descriptions. This peer review process has been invaluable in this regard because it provides me some very helpful evidence to support some long-held concerns about the limitations of the current assessment criteria. As I prepare a revision for my Faculty's Courses Committee, the evidence of this review will be very important for supporting my requested changes.

Do you have any advice for prospective Reviewees?

A peer reviewer doesn't need to be familiar with your subject area – especially in a blended environment such as the one in this case study. It is best viewed as a partnership for evaluation. I have found that the most important element for a successful partnership is "like-mindedness" and mutual respect. I will be exploring this notion in a review I am about to undertake for someone teaching in a different Faculty, but in a similar online environment.

Reviewers Perspective of this Peer Review and the Process

Why were you interested in being involved in this Peer Review?
Because I was interested in learning more about the process of Peer Review (I was part of the project team) and had taught this subject before. I was keen to see if it would be useful to do a Peer Review with a teaching team colleague.

What were your impressions of this Peer Review process and its Advantages and Disadvantages?

Some thoughts about the Process of the Peer Review itself:
- The structure of the framework broke the review into separate bits, which made it hard not to loose sight of the whole so I could respond to that at the same time? I found it tricky to judge the appropriate amount of time that I should spend as a reviewer considering the subject, in terms of the framework, versus the 'aspect of focus' for the review. I felt that I needed to go through and address the framework for the subject overall and then go back and look at the aspect of focus in terms of each category and points over several passes of reading and looking over material. It is hard to do a review of a single aspect of a subject using the framework. I felt like I needed to do a review of the subject overall firstly. Even though I was concentrating on a particular part of the subject I'm not sure I really did that in the end?

- I had the feeling that I needed to address all elements that are on the framework, even though I actually knew this was not necessary. Prioritising what to address given the time constraints was a challenge.

- The language and register of this as an interaction with a peer, as well as a preliminary of an 'official' and potentially high stakes document made me think about how to word the review and how the language might need to be adapted (for a promotion application etc)?

- I was no sure that it was clear enough where I am finding my evidence for my comments? What weight needs to be given to providing evidence by using examples in review comments?

Challenges Encountered in this Review
In order to properly evaluate teaching reviewers need to know what is really outstanding, or just what is expected? For example the flexibility and depth of response to students' feedback week to week, links made across tutorials, staging an activity so that students have had time to reflect. For promotion how should things that seem to be outstanding be presented to be convincing but not overdone? This highlights the need for the reviewee to do a really good job of informing and explaining themselves and their teaching to the reviewer.

There was a challenge for me in reviewing an online/blended learning environment. It was hard to know what to pay attention to - given that there was not enough scope to pay lots of attention to everything – should I focus on the documents or the online environments equally? I also had a dilemma about what to print because I have difficulty thinking things through in depth and in a sustained way when they are onscreen. There was an challenging amount of added documentation (printouts, subject calendar dates, teaching sequence dates, sequencing of collaboratories, discussion boards etc) that needed to be drawn upon to do a review of a blended subject.

Doing a peer review for a close colleague means that there is a high level of trust rapport understanding and a sense of shared exploration BUT is it harder to be critical? Possibly. It is easy far too easy to generalise from other shared teaching situations (sometimes without evidence from this particular teaching episode/s).

Advantages of this Review Process
Doing a thorough review of a subject I had taught in previously was really interesting and useful to me for my understanding of teaching. The ongoing conversations the Reviewer and I had about the subject and the students learning were very stimulating and learning and teaching and gave me additional insight to the subject too.

It made me re-remember that Peer Review of Teaching, like all reflection on teaching is a process that is ongoing. I also realised how much is tacit in teaching and how communicating this to peers is very helpful for making sure we are communicating in the best possible way with students.

It was a privilege to be invited into the classroom and online spaces of this subject and to have the opportunity to ask questions about interesting aspects of the subject and the teaching, and of course as part of the project team it provided invaluable insight.

Do you have any advice for prospective Reviewers?
Think of the review as a conversation about teaching. It is important to be really clear what the focus of the review is (and this can take some time) and then to balance the focus on one aspect with the interaction between all aspects of the subject in your comments. A review is definitely a joint venture!