Name _____ **Date** _____

PEER REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Under Iowa Code section 284.8(1), school districts are required to conduct annual, rather than every third year, reviews of non-probationary teacher performance. The first and second years of such reviews will be "conducted by a peer group of teachers." The Iowa General Assembly specifically prohibited peer reviews from being used as the basis for recommending that a teacher be placed in an intensive assistance program. As such, the peer review is intended for the purposes of coaching and improvement.

Peer reviews are conducted by a peer group of teachers who: incorporate continuous feedback loops focused on improving instructional practices; focus on individualized coaching and support; and engage teachers in self- and peer-reflections; teachers and peers know what information is expected of them and how the information will be used; receive adequate training on the peer review process that is fair, linked to the Iowa Teaching Standards (or subsequently developed standards), and involves authentic and open discussions about the teaching practice; confidentiality is maintained between the reviewer, the teacher, and the administrator; peer review involves multiple authentic sources of data - classroom visits, review of course materials, and a balanced inclusion of student outcomes; engages the teacher and the reviewer in an individualized and valuable discourse about the practice; incorporates the teacher's professional development plan for edits, revisions, or updates.

Practitioners develop ownership of the teaching practice and move toward making its discussion and improvement more visible within the school community.

A group of professionals are analyzing, reflecting upon, and talking about their profession in an attempt to make it better.

Teachers are assisted and supported in enhancing their effectiveness.

Collective accountability and responsibility for teaching and learning is established.

Attention is given to the art and craft of teaching and assisting the good teacher to become better.

Districts use their evaluation framework as a basis for discussion, support, and planning – but peer review is not intended to inform the summative evaluation. It is intended to be an element of coaching with a focus on improvement.

The review is reflective in nature by both the teacher and the reviewer around the teaching practice – openly sharing strengths, limitations, observations, etc. Reviewers should make thoughtful judgments about a teacher's practice and consider each educator individually.

Expectations for peer review visits and follow-up are clear. Course materials are examined (i.e., assignments, projects, assessments, etc.).

Reviewers may be of like grade range or subject where possible; however, this is not required. In some cases, cross-disciplinary or grade reviews may be beneficial. Configurations may also be within-building, across-district, or across multiple districts.

Our Goal is to provide a framework for teachers to have a conversation about teaching and student learning. Teachers are asked to focus on 2-3 areas below when thinking about the student learning. Collaboratively feedback is requested as a means to encourage conversation, enable risk taking, help improve teaching/learning, etc. Please circle 2-3 main bullets as areas of concentration.

A. Collaboration (co-working, co-creating; more than just communication)

- *Collaborators.* How are students working?
    - Alone / In pairs / In triads / In larger groups
    - If with others, with whom? (circle all that apply)
        - Students in this school / Students in another school / Adults in this school / Adults outside of this school
    - If with others, who is managing collaborative processes (planning, management, monitoring, etc.)?
        - Students / teachers / both
- *Collaborative Technologies.* Are digital technologies being used to facilitate collaborative processes?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
    - If yes, in which ways? (circle all that apply)
        - Online office suites, email, texting, wikis, blogs, videoconferencing, mindmapping, curation tools, project planning tools, other

B. Critical Thinking (HOTS + metacognition) / Creativity / Initiative / Entrepreneurship

- *Deeper Thinking.* Do student learning activities and assessments go beyond facts, procedures, and/or previously-provided ways of thinking?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
- *Creativity.* Do students have the opportunity to design, create, make, or otherwise add value that is unique to them?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
- *Initiative.* Do students have the opportunity to initiate, be entrepreneurial, be self-directed, and/or go beyond given parameters of the learning task or environment?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
- *Metacognition.* Do students have the opportunity to reflect on their planning, thinking, work, and/or progress?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
    - If yes, can students identify what they're learning, not just what they're doing?
        - Yes / No / Somewhat

C. Assessment

- *Alignment.* Are standards, learning goals, instruction, learning activities, and assessments all aligned, both topically and cognitively?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
- *Authentic Assessment.* Are students creating real-world products or performances?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat
- *Assessment Technology.* Are digital technologies being used to facilitate the assessment process?
    - Yes / No / Somewhat

Notes for the conversation between peers will be kept.

Peer Review Form

Teacher's name: _____

Teachers in peer review group: _____

_____

_____

Date(s)/times(s) of original lesson: _____

_____

Date(s)/times(s) peer review group met: _____

_____

_____

_____

General topics discussed: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Signatures of peer group teachers:

_____   _____

_____   _____

_____   _____

This form is turned into the Principal's Office after review