

Peer Review Policy
Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya



Approvals:

Faculty Quality Assurance Cell :

Faculty Board FCMS :

University Quality Assurance Center :

Table of Contents

1. Policy Title	3
2. Policy Number.....	3
3. Effective Date of the Policy	3
4. Policy Functional Area.....	3
5. Purpose	4
6. Background.....	4
7. Scope	4
8. Policy Application and Timeline.....	4
9. Confidentiality	4
10. Procedure	5
11. Duties and responsibilities of the Reviewer	5
12. Timeline for the Peer Review Process:	6
Annexure 01:.....	7
Prepared By:.....	9

PEER REVIEW POLICY

1. Policy Title	Peer Review Policy, Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies, University of Kelaniya
2. Policy Number	KLN/FCMS/QA/P/23/4
3. Effective Date of the Policy	1 st of January 2024
4. Policy Functional Area	All academic of FCMS

5. Purpose

The purpose of this section is to outline the procedures for peer review of teaching and learning in the Faculty of Commerce and Management Studies (FCMS), University of Kelaniya. Thus, the peer review proposed for the FCMS is based on the concept of summative assessment/review.

6. Background

In the absence of policy guidelines on conducting peer review in FCMS, this policy and the proposed guidelines are intended to be an internal best practice and shall not be used at any given time by the Heads of the Departments (HoDs), any other individual member of the FCMS or any other higher decision-making authority as a legal document or in such context.

7. Scope

This peer review policy applies to all academic staff engaged with teaching at FCMS including all Assistant Lecturers.

8. Policy Application and Timeline

This shall only be applied to the academic staff of the FCMS and shall be administered by the HoD and Department Coordinator for QA in the respective Department in the FCMS in consultation with the academic staff. Peer review in the faculty shall be conducted in phases/cycles. During an academic year (first phase/cycle), peer reviews shall be conducted for each lecturer for one particular course unit. During the next academic year peer reviews shall be conducted for each lecturer for another course unit avoiding the repetitions. Thus, all the course units taught by one lecturer shall be reviewed. The duration of the cycle shall be decided by the respective department depending on the number of academic staff members and subject to the maximum of two academic years.

9. Confidentiality

The HoD and the QA Coordinator are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of the peer review documents and at all times shall maintain them in a strict manner. Other than the HoD and coordinator for QA, an academic staff member shall not have access to peer review document(s) belonging to other academic staff members. However, any academic can see his or her peer review document report with the permission of the HoD.

10. Procedure

- i. FCMS shall adopt a peer review form introduced/developed by the FCMS Quality Assurance Cell (Annexure 03). It is required to use the peer review form developed by FCMS Quality Assurance Cell by all the Departments in the FCMS.
- ii. QA Coordinator in the department shall develop a list of peer reviewers for the course units taught by academic staff under the supervision of the HoD. It is at the discretion of the individual academic staff member to raise any concern with regard to the peer reviewer of the course unit with the HoD.
- iii. After obtaining the consent of the academic staff, the peer reviewer list and schedule shall be published.
- iv. Peer reviewers are required to conduct the peer review by participating in a teaching and learning session of the assigned academic staff. Each peer reviewer shall arrange the date and time for the peer review with the assigned academic staff and perform the peer review objectively. The completed peer review form shall be submitted to the QA Coordinator or HoD of the respective Department.
- v. The HoD is responsible for delivering the completed peer review form for each academic staff member. The HoD shall discuss any matters arising from the completed peer review forms with the relevant academic staff member and/or shall request the academic staff member to provide the steps undertaken to address issues arising from the peer review.
- vi. If an academic staff member feels that the peer review comments were unacceptable, he/she shall table her complaint with the HoD with justifiable evidence(s). The HoD is responsible for addressing such complaints received from the grievant academic staff.
- vii. QA coordinator is responsible for distributing the appreciation letters for the reviewers who have successfully completed the peer review.

11. Duties and Responsibilities of the Peer reviewer

- Actively observe the teaching methods, techniques, and interactions of the colleague being reviewed during lecture session
- Provide constructive feedback based on observations, focusing on strengths and areas for improvement in teaching effectiveness, communication, engagement, and overall classroom management.

- Document observations and feedback in a structured and professional manner through Peer review forms provided by the QA coordinator.
- Conduct peer observations with professionalism, confidentiality, and respect for the colleague's autonomy and expertise, maintaining a supportive and collaborative approach.

12. Timeline for the Peer Review Process:

	Week 01	Week 02	Week 03	Week 04	Week 05	Week 06	Week 07	Week 08	Week 09	Week 10	Week 11	Week 12	Week 13	Week 14	Week 15
Step1: Preparation of Peer review schedule and appointment of Peer reviewers															
Step 2: Sending Appointment letters to peer reviewers															
Step 3: Getting verbal confirmation for the availability															
Step 4: Conducting Peer reviews															
Step 5: Collection of Peer review forms															
Step 6: Reporting to the Head of the Department															
Step 7: Distribution of Peer review forms															
Step 8: One -to -One discussion															
Step 9: Monitoring and reporting progress															

Annexure 01:

FACULTY OF COMMERCE AND MANAGEMENT STUDIES

PEER REVIEW FORM

Academic Year:Semester:

Course Code:Course Unit:

Lecturer:Topic of the lesson:

Reviewer:Date & Time:

The following statements provide the reviewer to conduct an objective assessment of his/her peer under each 6 headings as stated below.

No	Indicator	Very Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory	Neutral	Satisfactory	Very Satisfactory
Learning outcomes						
01	Was it made clear to the students what they were expected to learn by the end of the session ?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning and organizing the session						
02	Introduced the session properly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
03	Moved clearly through stages	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
04	Emphasized the key points	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
05	Summarized the session	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Delivery (pace, quality of voice, speech habits, use of non - verbal cues)						
06	Maintained appropriate pace/speed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
07	Used gestures face/hands/body movements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
08	Could the lecturer be clearly heard: Voice/ repetition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Use of Examples						

09	Were examples or illustrations used whenever helpful to students to grab key points?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interaction						
10	Did the lecturer find scope for interacting with students e.g. by giving opportunities for questions or comments, or by drawing upon student interest, concerns or experiences?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Handouts, other materials and audio-visual aids						
11	Did the lecturer make appropriate use of handouts or other study materials? Accurate/relevant/ appropriate for the level	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12	Were audio-visual aids used wherever needed in conveying the subject matter?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Signature:

Date:

Name:

Designation:

Department:

Prepared By:

Professor H.A.K.N.S. Surangi

Ms. Deepani Wijetunge

Ms. Viduni Udovita

