

**APPROVED**

by the RISEBA Methodological Council on 04.02.2025,  
Minutes No. 25/1.1-20/1

**PROCEDURES FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING**

The peer review <sup>1</sup> (observation and analysis) of a lecture, seminar, etc. (hereafter - lecture) of a lecturer is one of the tools for evaluation and monitoring of the quality of studies. Peer review stipulates learning from one another and ensures the exchange of information and experience. The procedure is designed to improve the quality of teaching and content of study programmes at RISEBA. All lecturers are involved in improving the quality of studies, both as reviewers and the reviewed.

**1. Principal Provisions of Peer Review**

- 1.1. Any RISEBA lecturer can be peer reviewed. A mandatory peer review procedure must be provided to any lecturer who is seeking election or re-election to an academic position.
- 1.2. A reviewer may be a member of staff elected to an academic post or visiting faculty or adjunct of a study programme within a field of study.
- 1.3. Visiting faculty and adjunct are recommended to participate as reviewer.
- 1.4. The reviewer visits and carries out the peer review of teaching at least two lectures of other lecturers in the course of the academic year (or one class per semester).
- 1.5. Peer review is carried out by using the peer review form approved by the Methodological Council.

**2. Peer Review Monitoring**

- 2.1. The Head of the Study field shall monitor the progress of peer review in the courses of study programmes implemented within the study field and shall organise peer review of a particular lecturer on his/her own initiative, on the initiative of the Programme Director (including if the Programme Director has received the initiative from the Student Council or the student group leaders) or on the initiative of the Head of Quality.
- 2.2. If a faculty is elected to an academic post for the first time, the Head of the field of study shall organise a peer review of the lesson led by the faculty and shall acquaint the faculty with the peer review procedure and the evaluation criteria at least two weeks in advance.
- 2.3. Prior to the first peer-review class, the reviewer contacts the lecturer to be reviewed and informs him/her about his/her presence in the class. The recommended notification time is one week prior to the planned class, but not less than one day before.
- 2.4. The lecturer to be reviewed does not have to prepare a special class or special materials.

---

<sup>1</sup> **For information:** In the explanatory dictionary of pedagogy terms, the term 'peer review' means the following: "Observance of a class or lesson to control or exchange experience" (Beļickis, Blūma et al., 2000, 60).

I.Beļickis describes the peer review of teaching as "active methodological assistance to a teacher to realize his/her style of teaching" (Beļickis, 2000, 202).

V.Zelmenis also considers the "mutual attendance of classes" by pedagogues to be the peer review of teaching (Zelmenis, 2000, 169). Reviewers learn from each other's experience and mistakes. By summarising all of the aforementioned, it can be concluded that **peer review means attending classes, and being present in order to control or exchange experience.**

- 2.5. The reviewer visits the class, bringing the peer review form, wherein he/she makes notes on what is seen and heard during the class.
- 2.6. After the class, the reviewer and the lecturer orally discuss the content of the completed form, the lesson experience and recommendations, if any.
- 2.7. The peer review form is signed by the reviewer who participated in the class and completed the form and the reviewed lecturer, who certifies with his/her signature that the results specified in the form have been discussed after the class and the lecturer has been acquainted with the content of the form.
- 2.8. The reviewer submits the completed peer review form (with signatures) to the Head of the study field within the framework of which the course of the study programme was reviewed.
- 2.9. The Head of the study field discusses the results of the peer review with the lecturer and keeps the completed peer review forms.

### **3. Peer Review results**

- 3.1. The Head of the study field shall evaluate, collect and store the submitted peer review forms, as well as, at the request of the Dean of the Faculty, provide information on the results of peer review of study courses of study programmes implemented within the study field.
- 3.2. The results of the peer review can be discussed in the meetings organised by RISEBA collegial bodies (e.g. faculty meeting, Methodological council meeting, study programme Council meeting or meeting organised within the study field) only in an aggregated form.
- 3.3. Completed peer review forms are handed in and kept by the Head of study field until the time of the lecturer's annual evaluation, after which they are handed in to the Human Resources Department for storage in the personal file. The individual results of the lecturer's peer review are available to the Dean of the faculty concerned, the RISEBA management team member, the staff of the Human Resources Department, the study programme directors and the staff of the Quality Department.
- 3.4. The results of peer review are used for decision-making, including:
  - 3.4.1. questions about the quality of the study content or the quality of the delivery of the study content;
  - 3.4.2. identifying and solving or eliminating major problems (e.g. technical, pedagogical, organisational);
  - 3.4.3. monitoring specific trends and taking appropriate action (e.g. by organising methodological seminars on topical issues, professional development for lecturers, training or other support mechanisms);
  - 3.4.4. for the evaluation of the quality of the lecturer's work.

Attached:

Peer review form