



Peer Review Tool Kit

Purpose

In the myPICCS portal's "Peer Review Web Group" library, you will find a folder entitled "Peer Review Tool Kit." Included in the tool kit are all of the main documents that teachers and Peer Review Coordinators need to prepare for first and second level peer reviews.

Contents

The tool kit includes the following:

- **Peer Review Workflow** – This PowerPoint document follows the "life" of a peer reviewed unit of instruction from the initial concept through documentation, school level (1st level) peer review, network level (2nd level) peer review and posting as "ready for replication".
- **PR Protocol – School Level** (dated with most recent version date) - This document explains all aspects of a peer review at the school level, including how to document a unit of instruction as well as how to conduct an actual peer review meeting.
- **PR Protocol – Network Level** (dated with most recent version date) - This document explains all aspects of a peer review at the network level, including how to document a unit of instruction as well as how to conduct an actual peer review meeting.
- **PR Preparation Checklist** - Use this form to prepare a unit of instruction for the peer review process. Consult with your school's Peer Review Coordinator for assistance in preparing your documentation.
- **PRC Checklist to Launch a Peer Review** - This checklist is for Peer Review Coordinators. It helps you ensure that the teacher has all of the required elements documented for the unit of instruction to be peer reviewed. It also helps you identify members of the peer review team and the roles they will play in the peer review (e.g. facilitator, recorder).
- **PR Sentence Stems** - Use these sentence stems to help formulate warm and cool comments during a peer review.
- **PR Rubric Level 1** - This rubric provides peer reviewers with guidelines on how to rate a unit of instruction during a School Level (Level 1) peer review.
- **PR Feedback Form – School Level** - Use this form to provide feedback during a School (Level 1) Peer Review.
- **PR Feedback Form – Network Level** - Use this form to provide feedback during a Network (Level 2) Peer Review.



Peer Review Protocol

School-Level Review

PURPOSES of Peer Review

- To foster a collaborative environment for sharing instructional practices in order to raise overall school performance.
- To support colleagues' instructional planning underway.
- To support colleagues preparing "suitable-for-replication" units of instruction for incentive-based compensation.
- To recommend high-quality units of instruction for network-level review.

DESCRIPTION of Unit of Instruction

Teachers prepare a detailed description of a unit of instruction. The unit must include the following elements:

- **Data:** Data that situates the unit and the students for whom it was developed within a classroom and school context – in terms of relevant demographics (e.g., poverty, ELL, or IEP status), ELA and math achievement data, diagnostic assessment, interim assessments, etc.
- **Standards:** The specific New York State Learning Standard(s) and performance indicator(s) that the unit addresses (refer to: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/Documents/learnstandards.htm>).
- **Map or narrative description:** An overview of the unit including the following:
 - Grade level and subject
 - Focus (essential questions, content and skills addressed, real-world connections)
 - A timeline with key events (lessons and assignments, etc.) presented in a visual format
- **Instructional highlights:** Including the following:
 - At least two lesson plans from the unit – bringing it to life for the reviewers and illustrating characteristic instructional strategies.
 - Information and strategies regarding how the unit is suitable for differentiating instruction.
 - Information about special instructional supports or materials and experiences required (for example, field trips, speakers, films)
- **Assessment:** Including the following:
 - A list of methods used in the unit with brief descriptions (e.g. observation with checklist, written, oral, performance, etc.)
 - Rubric(s) used in the unit
 - Three samples of actual student work assessed (for example, with scored rubrics or comments attached)
- **Reflection:** A brief reflection addressed to other teachers of what works especially well in the unit, what teaching challenges are involved, and what adaptations are possible.

SET UP for Peer Review Session

Three (or more) teacher reviewers are present (including at least one teaching in the same content area), plus one person acting as facilitator and another as recorder.

All present sit around a table, with the facilitator seated beside the presenter, and the recorder at the other end of the table. Where needed, name plates (for example, folded index cards) identify participants.

Duration: approximately 50-60 minutes, or as otherwise planned.

STEPS to Conduct Peer Review

1. *Preparation.* The school encourages teachers to present, provides peer coaching for those preparing to present, and ensures that presenters are well briefed on the protocol. The facilitator meets with the presenter prior to the review, outlines the process, encourages him or her to trust it, and ensures that he or she prepares all required elements for the presentation. The facilitator takes responsibility during the presentation itself for ensuring that the process is safe – for example, that “warm” and “cool” responses are kept in balance, and that the protocol is maintained.
2. *Introduction.* The facilitator offers an overview of the protocol, and in the process, sets a tone for the review. This is one that encourages balance of appreciation and critique, and situates the review in the context of the school’s effort to create a supportive community of practice. (2-5 minutes)
3. *Presentation.* The presenter provides context for the unit of instruction presented, calling attention to the data he or she provides. The presenter also articulates the focus of the unit, identifies its targeted learning standards and performance indicators, and presents the visual timeline. He or she may also articulate a question that he or she hopes the reviewers will especially address. Following this introduction, the presenter distributes copies of all the additional materials he or she has prepared (for example, the lesson plans, the assessed student work, and the reflection) . During the presentation, the reviewers remain silent. (15 minutes)
4. *Reading time.* The reviewers read the material presented, referring as they do to the PICCS Peer Review Rubric. They may use post-It notes to flag evidence in the material relevant to the Rubric’s criteria:
 - Relation to targeted learning standards
 - Degree of intellectual challenge
 - Quality of assessment plan
 - Power of engagement
 - Usefulness for network learning

During this time, the presenter also reads the material, and remains silent. (10 minutes).

5. *Review.* Reviewers respond to the unit of instruction in balanced but separate *warm* and *cool* comments (warm is empathetic and appreciative, while cool is distancing and critical). Comments typically zero in on particular elements of the unit, though they are

sometimes global. Often cool comments in particular are expressed as questions, though they may also be phrased as statements. The facilitator and recorder may offer comments too. The facilitator does this sparingly – and generally to redress an imbalance between warm and cool, or soften an unusually harsh cool comment. The recorder keeps a running record of warm and cool comments. (10 minutes)

6. *Response.* Presenter responds to any of the comments that he or she chooses to respond to – saving others for private consideration. Recorder records these responses. Reviewers remain silent. (5 minutes)
7. *Conversation.* Facilitator allows ordinary conversation, offering all participants a chance to join in. This is also an opportunity for the group to comment on the process. It is suggested that the first 5 minutes be devoted to conversation around the unit itself, while the last 5 minutes are devoted to a debrief of the Peer Review Protocol and process. Recorder continues recording. (5 minutes)
8. *Reflection period.* At this time, the reviewers record impressions they wish to share with the presenter, and pass these to the recorder. (2 minutes)
9. *Consultation.* Reviewers leave. Facilitator, presenter, and recorder meet to debrief. Recorder offers a summary of feedback with the criteria in mind. All three look at the rubrics the reviewers have provided. They then decide upon next steps. These may include consideration of additional peer or school support needed, plans for revision of the unit, or plans for network review. (5-10 minutes)



Peer Review Protocol Network Level

Purpose of Network-Level Review

To identify and share exemplary instructional practices across the PICCS network of charter schools. To recognize with special compensation the work of exemplary practitioners. To serve the network as a forum for exploring and developing best practices.

Requirements for a Unit of Instruction

Teachers prepare a detailed description of a unit of instruction. The unit must include the following elements:

- **Cover Page:** Since this will be the first page readers will see, it is strongly suggested that the cover page be formatted in an eye-catching way, e.g., with a graphic, photo, or illustration; attractive and readable font; and on school letter head. Be sure to include:
 1. Title of unit
 2. Name of presenter
 3. Email address (optional)
 4. Name of school
 5. Grade level of unit
 6. Subject
 7. Date reviewed at the school level
 8. Date scheduled for review at network level
- **Data:** Data that situates the unit and the students for whom it was developed within a classroom and school context – in terms of relevant demographics (e.g., poverty, ELL, or IEP status), ELA and math achievement data, diagnostic assessment, interim assessments, etc.
- **Standards:** The specific New York State Learning Standard(s) and performance indicator(s) that the unit addresses (refer to: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/Documents/learnstandards.htm>).
- **Map or narrative description:** An overview of the unit including the following:
 1. Grade level and subject
 2. Focus (essential questions, content and skills addressed, real-world connections)
 3. A timeline with key events (lessons and assignments, etc.) presented in a visual format
- **Instructional highlights:** Including the following:
 1. At least two lesson plans from the unit – bringing it to life for the reviewers and illustrating characteristic instructional strategies.
 2. Information and strategies regarding how the unit is suitable for differentiating instruction.

3. Information about special instructional supports or materials and experiences required (for example, field trips, speakers, films)
- **Assessment:** Including the following:
 1. A list of methods used in the unit with brief descriptions (e. g., observation with checklist, written, oral, performance)
 2. Rubric(s) used in the unit
 3. Three samples of actual student work assessed (for example, with scored rubrics or other feedback to the students)
 - **Reflection:** A brief reflection addressed to other teachers of what works especially well in the unit, what teaching challenges are involved, and what adaptations are possible.

The unit of instruction must have been previously presented for review at the school level, and recommended by the reviewers for advancement to the network level.

Design of the Protocol

Three (or more) reviewers are present (including at least one experienced at the standards level or content area of the presentation), plus one person acting as facilitator and another as recorder.

All present sit around a table, with the facilitator seated beside the presenter, and the recorder at the other end of the table. Name plates (for example, folded index cards) identify participants.

Duration: Approximately 50 minutes for the review, plus 20-30 minutes for the follow-up conversation by the reviewers.

Steps

1. *Preparation.* The school's Peer Review Coordinator (PRC) certifies to the PICCS Network Peer Review Coordinator that the unit of instruction has been presented successfully at the school level, and that the presenter has been coached in preparation for the network review. The coaching should especially include use of the Peer Review Presentation Checklist, the Network-Level Protocol, and the Criteria for Review. The facilitator takes responsibility during the presentation itself for ensuring that the process is safe – that “warm” and “cool” responses are kept in balance, that the protocol is maintained, and that (regardless of the outcome) the presenter has a rich learning experience.
2. *Introduction.* The facilitator offers an overview of the protocol, and in the process, sets a tone for the review. This is one that encourages balance of appreciation and critique, and situates the review in the context of the network's efforts to create a supportive community of rich and rigorous instructional practice. (5 minutes)

3. *Presentation.* The presenter provides context for the unit of instruction, calling particular attention to the data he or she provides. The reviewer also articulates the focus and purpose of the unit, and identifies its targeted learning standards and performance indicators. The presenter also presents visually the “narrative” structure or “map” of the unit – that is, the threads that hold its elements together and that lend it coherence. The presenter also distributes copies of all the materials that the reviewers need for the next step (including a timeline for the unit, two sample lesson plans, an assessment plan and rubric, and assessed student work samples). If the unit is judged suitable for network replication, these written materials will be the basis for the development of a PICCS Portal presentation – so it is very important that they are as clear as the presenter can make them. During the presentation, the reviewers remain silent. (12 minutes)
4. *Reading time.* The reviewers read the material, referring as they do to the PICCS Peer Review Rubric.

During this time, the presenter also reads the material, and remains silent. (10 minutes).

5. *Review.* Reviewers respond to the unit of instruction in balanced but separate *warm* and *cool* comments (warm is empathetic and appreciative, while cool is distancing and critical or challenging). Comments typically zero in on particular elements of the unit of instruction, though they are sometimes global. Often cool comments are expressed as questions, though they may also be phrased as statements. The facilitator and recorder may offer comments also. The facilitator does this sparingly – and generally to redress an imbalance between warm and cool, or to soften an unusually harsh cool comment. The recorder keeps a running record of warm and cool comments. (10 minutes)
6. *Response.* Presenter responds to any of the comments that he or she chooses to respond to – saving others for private consideration. Recorder records these responses. Reviewers remain silent. (5 minutes)
7. *Conversation.* Facilitator allows ordinary conversation, offering all participants a chance to join in. This provides an opportunity for the reviewers to probe for additional information if needed. It also affords the whole group an opportunity to comment on the process. Recorder continues recording. (5 minutes)
8. *Conclusion of the Review.* At this time, the facilitator thanks the presenter for the opportunity to review his or her work, and asks if the presenter has any final comments. The facilitator commits to preparing a detailed response to the unit of instruction based on a careful review of the recorder’s notes and a follow-up conversation by the reviewers. The presenter leaves. (2 minutes)

9. *Follow-up Conversation by the Reviewers.* The Facilitator begins by reminding the reviewers of their charge. They are charged with promoting and protecting the instructional standards of the PICCS network by adding favorably reviewed units of instruction to the PICCS portal– ones that are interesting and replicable, and that clearly exemplify the highest level of the PICCS criteria for review. Next the facilitator asks the recorder to read his or her notes. Following the reading, the facilitator asks if reviewers have additions or corrections they would like to make to the record. He or she then invites open conversation about the unit of instruction, its fit with the criteria, and the adequacy of the written materials in describing the unit. At a certain point during this conversation, the facilitator (or any reviewer) may call the question: Is this ready for replication? When the question is called, the facilitator asks for a show of hands: “How many of us [including facilitator and reviewer] believe that the unit presented should be accepted for posting on the portal, and that the presenter’s school should be notified that the presenter has earned compensation?” If there is no consensus, the facilitator continues the conversation at least briefly to afford an opportunity for a consensus to be reached or a minority perspective to be further aired. Within the next ten minutes (10), however, the facilitator asks for a final vote. (15 – 20 minutes)
10. Within 15 business days, the facilitator sends an email message to the presenter and the school’s PRC notifying them of the outcome of the vote, and detailing in both warm and cool terms the reviewers’ response to the unit of instruction. The tone of the message should be supportive and collegial even if the outcome is negative. For example, it might suggest ways in which the presentation could be revised for later network-level review.

Follow-up

If the unit of instruction is recommended for replication, the following steps are required:

1. The presenter makes any revisions that have been suggested in the Network Level Peer Review notification letter.
2. **The second page of the unit of instruction should be an abstract providing a brief summary of the unit in no more than 100 words. The abstract should describe key information for potential readers, including: subject; grade level; focus; how long the unit took to complete; and how students were assessed. (The abstract should be consistent with, though briefer than, the map or narrative description of the unit of instruction.)**
3. The presenter creates a single PDF file with the final version of the unit of instruction (including all attachments). This document must be **paginated and ordered in the following segments** (which correspond to the presentation format):
 1. Cover Page
 2. Abstract
 3. Table of Contents
 4. Data
 5. Standards
 6. Map/Narrative Description
 7. Instructional Highlights
 8. Assessment
 9. Reflection.
4. The presenter, in consultation with his/her school's PRC, submits the PDF file to the PICCS Project Coordinator. (Contact PICCS Project Coordinator if you encounter technical difficulties in creating or submitting PDF file.)
5. As soon as PICCS posts the unit of instruction on the portal, the presenter and his or her PRC will be notified.



Peer Review Checklist

To initiate a peer review, teachers prepare a detailed description of a unit of instruction. The unit must include the elements listed below. Before you present a unit of instruction for peer review, be sure that you have prepared every required element of the presentation. If any of the elements below are missing (as evidenced by a check in the “No” column), the peer review presentation is not ready to take place. Work with your Peer Review Coordinator to identify next steps in order to prepare that element.

Presentation Element	Complete		Next Steps
	Yes	No	
<p>Cover Page: Since this will be the first page readers will see, it is strongly suggested that the cover page be formatted in an eye-catching way, e.g., with a graphic, photo, or illustration; attractive and readable font; and on school letter head. Be sure to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title of unit • Name of presenter • Email address (optional) • Name of school • Grade level of unit • Subject • Date reviewed at the school level • Date scheduled for review at network level 			
<p>Data: Data that situates the unit and the students for whom it was developed within a classroom and school context – in terms of relevant demographics (e.g., poverty, ELL, or IEP status), ELA and math achievement data, diagnostic assessment, interim assessments, etc.</p>			
<p>Standards: The specific New York State Learning Standard(s) and performance indicator(s) that the <u>unit</u> addresses (refer to: http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/deputy/Documents/learnstandards.htm).</p>			
<p>Map or narrative description: An overview of the unit including the following: Grade level and subject Focus (essential questions, content and skills addressed, real-world connections) A timeline with key events (lessons and assignments, etc.) presented in a visual format</p>			

Presentation Element	Complete		Next Steps
	Yes	No	
<p>Instructional highlights: Including the following: At least two lesson plans from the unit – bringing it to life for the reviewers and illustrating it with characteristic instructional strategies. Information and strategies regarding how the unit is suitable for differentiating instruction. Information about special instructional supports or materials and experiences required (for example, field trips, speakers, films)</p>			
<p>Assessment: Including the following: A list of methods used in the unit with brief descriptions (e.g. observation with checklist, written, oral, performance, etc.) Rubric(s) used in the unit Three samples of actual student work assessed (for example, with scored rubrics or comments attached)</p>			
<p>Reflection: A brief reflection addressed to other teachers of what works especially well in the unit, what teaching challenges are involved, and what adaptations are possible.</p>			



PICCS PEER REVIEW COORDINATOR CHECKLIST

Date of Presentation _____

Facilitator _____

Presenter _____

Recorder _____

Reviewer's Name	Content area	Grade

Logistics

1. Schedule turnkey training session for team _____
2. Date for presentation _____
3. Time _____
4. Place _____
5. Time designated for presenting teacher preparation with/without PRC _____

Materials needed for presentation

1. Protocol
2. Rubric
3. Sentence stems
4. Feedback form
5. Presenting teacher's checklist
6. Post Its



Peer Review Protocol Sentence Stems

Warm comments vs. Cool comments - What are they, how are they used?

Warm comments are supportive, empathetic, and appreciative. Cool comments are comparative and challenging. The feedback generally begins with a few minutes of warm feedback, moves onto a few minutes of cool feedback (sometimes phrased in the form of a reflective question) and then moves back and forth between warm and cool feedback. Reviewers may not combine warm and cool in the same comment, as the presenter will only focus on the cool feedback. Reviewers and the facilitator (who may participate in the review) must maintain an overall balance of warm and cool.

WARM FEEDBACK STEMS

The place(s) in the student work where I see the clearest evidence of the presenter's learning goals for students is/are...

The part(s) of the assignment/task that seems to support students most effectively in achieving [presenter's goals] is/are...

The place(s) the rubric/scoring criteria connects most clearly to the presenter's learning goals/student work samples is/are....

COOL FEEDBACK STEMS

The evidence in this student's work/these students' work makes me wonder if they understood that the presenter wanted them to do/understand _____.

It's not clear to me how this aspect of the rubric, _____, relates to the presenter's goals/students' work.

Some students seem to have been able to do _____. How could the assignment/task be organized so that other students will be able to do that too?

PICCS Peer Review Protocol Rubric

Criteria		Still Under Development	Not Yet Ready For Replication	Suitable For Replication
Relation to the Targeted Learning Standards (Coherent & Aligned)	Presentation <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Reviewer Response	The coherence of the Learning Experience- in terms of the connections among materials, activities, and learning standards- seem weak or unarticulated. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by pressing for clarity of intention, and looking for evidence of the targeted learning in student work.	The Learning Experience seems coherent in most respects, but not well aligned with the targeted learning standards. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by discussing their sense of the demands inherent in the targeted learning standards, and by exploring and discussing the student work presented.	The Learning Experience seems fully coherent, and clearly aligned with the targeted outcomes. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by identifying what they take to be the learning power of the Learning Experience, and by discussing any presentation improvements they would advise in this area.
Intellectual Challenge (Grade-appropriate & differentiated for diverse learners)	Presentation <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Reviewer Response	The intellectual in the Learning Experience as presented seems inappropriate for many or most of the learners it is meant to serve. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer Reviewers help by suggesting changes or additions to materials or strategies.	The intellectual challenge in the Learning Experience as presented seems inappropriate for some of the learners it is meant to serve. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by suggesting differentiation strategies	The intellectual challenge in the Learning Experience as presented seems appropriate for the full range of students it is meant to serve. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by imagining adaptations presenter might suggest in network-level review.
Quality of Assessment Plan (Measurement of learning outcomes & learning process)	Presentation <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Reviewer Response	The assessment plan as presented seems inadequate to measure targeted learning standards. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by suggesting assessment strategies and measures that might be incorporated in the Learning Experience.	The assessment plan as presented adequately measures learning outcomes, but has few or no measures of learning process to guide learning and teaching <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by suggesting formative assessment strategies and tools compatible with the Learning Experience.	The assessment plan clearly measures targeted learning outcomes, and also measures learning process to guide learning and teaching. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by highlighting the strengths of the assessment plan which the presenter can feature in the network review.
Power of Engagement (Likely to attract and hold learners' interest)	Presentation <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Reviewer Response	The content, activities, and materials of the Learning Experience as presented seem unlikely to engage most students <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by offering concrete suggestions for enhancing power of engagement.	The Learning Experience as presented seems less engaging that it might be, or too narrow in the range of students likely to become engaged. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by suggesting specific modifications to enhance power of engagement, or by suggesting differentiation strategies that may broaden engagement.	The content, materials, and activities of the Learning Experience as presented are evidently engaging for a reasonable range of students. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by articulating why they regard the Learning Experience as high in its power of engagement. Their explanations help the presenter prepare for network review.
Adaptability to Other Teaching Contexts (Worth publishing)	Presentation <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Reviewer Response	Adaptability of the Learning Experience to other contexts, as presented, seems highly limited for reasons related to content, materials, activities, or other factors. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by exploring with the presenter how this overall limitation might be mitigated- especially through changes in the presentation.	Adaptability of the Learning Experience to other contexts seems somewhat limited as presented- for reasons related to context, materials, activities, or other factors. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by exploring with the presenter how this perceived limitation might be mitigated- especially through changes in the presentation.	Adaptability of the Learning Experience to other contexts is clearly evident. <hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/> Peer reviewers help by articulating the factors in their view that enhance adaptability, and which the presenter might refer to in a network presentation.



School Level Peer Review Feedback Form

Presenter:

Date:

Relation to the Learning Standards	
<u>Warm</u>	<u>Cool</u>

Degree of Intellectual Challenge	
<u>Warm</u>	<u>Cool</u>

Quality of Assessment Plan

Warm

Cool

Power of Engagement

Warm

Cool

Replication Potential

Warm

Cool



Network Level

Peer Review Feedback Form

Presenter:

Date:

Relation to the Learning Standards	
<u>Warm</u>	<u>Cool</u>

Degree of Intellectual Challenge	
<u>Warm</u>	<u>Cool</u>

Quality of Assessment Plan	
<u><i>Warm</i></u>	<u><i>Cool</i></u>
Power of Engagement	
<u><i>Warm</i></u>	<u><i>Cool</i></u>
Replication Potential	
<u><i>Warm</i></u>	<u><i>Cool</i></u>