



Portfolio Peer Review Guidelines: Round Two

This second stage of review is intended to help each other find a level within a framework of scholarship assessment – a framework parallel to research assessment.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 License.

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. *Really*. Give the person you're reviewing the courtesy of taking their work seriously, and not just thinking about it the night before. Use the blank grid from the webpage as a template, if it helps.
5. Bring your written review to the April 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 method/quality pass. Your review should focus on (but is not limited to):
 - *What level of quality does the work demonstrate?* Is it equal across the six categories? (Context, content, instructional design, delivery, assessment, evaluation) Can you suggest ways in which it might be enhanced?
 - *What features of the “establishing excellence” criteria does the work display?*
 - i. Qualities of Surprise and Delight
 - ii. Transparency of Argument and Evidence
 - iii. Commitment to Rigor and Peer Review
 - iv. Communication and Dissemination of Standards and Examples



Master Grid

	Threshold	Advanced	Exemplary
Goals of the project ("Clear goals")	Well-articulated and intentional	Move well beyond existing work in the field and represent innovations	Articulates new goals that will advance the work of other scholars
Preparation for scholar's work ("Adequate preparation")	Based upon prior scholarship in its area	Includes broad synthesis of prior work	Scholar acquires new knowledge and skills that enhance quality of the work
Methods used to conduct work ("Appropriate Methods")	Follows conventions of scholarly efforts within its domain	Takes full advantage of methods available to make its impact	Generates new methods that enable others to enhance their scholarship
Evidence gathered to demonstrate impact of work ("Significant results")	Evidence appropriate to the scholar's field to evaluate proposed practices or ideas	Evidence suggests that the scholar's ideas or practices are worth implementing	Evidence suggests practices or ideas have had great impact on other scholars
Reflection on work ("Reflective Critique")	Scholar has articulated lessons learned	Scholar has made adjustments in practice based on reflection	Scholar can report enhanced achievement of goals resulting from lessons learned
Communication of results to others ("Effective Communication")	Work is publicly accessible for others to use, build upon, and review critically	Scholar's reflective work has been cited by others	Work has had broad impact on practices and inquiry of many others interested in the same questions



Feedback Template (optional)

	Threshold	Advanced	Exemplary
Goals of the project (“Clear goals”)			
Preparation for scholar’s work (“Adequate preparation”)			
Methods used to conduct work (“Appropriate Methods”)			
Evidence gathered to demonstrate impact of work (“Significant results”)			
Reflection on work (“Reflective Critique”)			
Communication of results to others (“Effective Communication”)			



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 2.5 License.