



Portfolio Peer Review Guidelines: Round One

We've accumulated a lot of material at this stage, but by and large, with little structure. So this first stage of review is intended to help each other find the "bones" of our portfolios. It will probably take more than one pass, so don't panic.

Remember the categories and common structure we're working to:

Six categories:	Context, content, instructional design, delivery, assessment, evaluation
and each category contains	
Two components:	artefact/commentary; evidence/analysis; what/why

Other than that, each portfolio should express the approach and strengths of each teacher. The sections don't have to be in the order that they appear above. I expect each one of us will find a different way to tell our story.



What to do

1. Contact the person whose work you are reviewing at this stage.
2. Ask them if there is anything they particularly want you to read/look at/comment on.
3. Go to the password-protected section of the webpage and read the appropriate documents. If the person you're reviewing has no particular preferences, then read everything that's there. If there is too much material, read the bits that seem most interesting and/or problematic to you.
4. Make written notes.
5. Bring your written review to the March meeting. We'll have a period set aside for you to give/get feedback, and give your notes to the person whose portfolio you're reviewing.
6. This is a bones/structure pass. Your review should focus on (but is not limited to):
 - *Does the artefact appropriately evidence the commentary?* (Or questions of that order. If there are no artefacts, speculate what might be interesting to see in this regard.)
 - *Does the work tell you what is distinctive about this teacher, this approach, this course?* If not, how might it be shaped to highlight that?

