



Peer Review of DRC Specialist

Specialist: _____

Peer Reviewer: _____

Reviewer's Relationship to Specialist:

InSTITUTE Peer

External Colleague
Position _____

Setting of Observation:

DRC Office

Other (describe) _____

Portfolio of Individual Accommodation Plans:

Yes

No

Date/Time of Observation: _____

Directions:

Thank you for agreeing to carry out this peer review of service provision to students with disabilities. The results of this review will be used to provide valuable feedback to the specialist who will use it to identify any areas where skills and expertise may be further developed.

The review focuses on the specialist's knowledge of the field and the specialist's interactions with students. Each item is to be assessed according to the following scale:

S	SR	U	
Satisfactory	Satisfactory with Reservations	Unsatisfactory	No Opinion

No Opinion is the appropriate response where you have insufficient data or you are otherwise unable to assess the item. Items indicated by an asterisk are to be left blank if you are not qualified to make an assessment. Please note that reviewer comments are welcome when particularly effective or otherwise noteworthy performance is observed.

Satisfactory with Reservations or **Unsatisfactory** are appropriate responses where you cannot rate the counsellor as **Satisfactory** on the item. When choosing either of these options, you must clearly explain why a rating of **Satisfactory** could not be given. If no explanation is provided the response will be scored as **No Opinion**.

Content Currency

- *1. The specialist demonstrated knowledge of DRC policies and procedures. S SR U No Opinion
- *2. The specialist's recommendations were consistent with relevant provisions of provincial and BCIT disability policies. S SR U No Opinion
- *3. The specialist indicated an awareness of currently available learning assistance technology. S SR U No Opinion

Depth and Breadth of Knowledge

- *4. The specialist demonstrated an adequate depth of knowledge of current disability matters. S SR U No Opinion
5. The specialist demonstrated an adequate breadth of knowledge of current disability matters. S SR U No Opinion

**Asterisked items are to be left blank if the reviewer is unqualified to judge.*

Interactive Skills

6. The specialist appeared at ease during the interview. S SR U No Opinion

7. The specialist made efforts to put the student at ease during the interview. S SR U No Opinion

8. The specialist explained the purpose of the interview. S SR U No Opinion

9. The specialist demonstrated “active listening” during the interview. S SR U No Opinion

10. The specialist was non-judgemental in discussions with the student. S SR U No Opinion

Interactive (cont'd)

11. The specialist was supportive in discussions with the student. S SR U No Opinion

12. The specialist demonstrated good time-management skills during the interview. S SR U No Opinion

Student Interactions

13. The information provided by the specialist seemed matched to student comprehension levels. S SR U No Opinion

14. The specialist established good rapport with the student. S SR U No Opinion

15. The specialist provided opportunities for student questions. S SR U No Opinion

Student Interactions (cont'd)

16. The specialist's responses to student questions were appropriate. S SR U No Opinion

17. The specialist demonstrated knowledge of available funding options. S SR U No Opinion

18. The specialist explained how to request support from external agencies as required. S SR U No Opinion

19. The accommodations recommended by the Specialist were appropriate to the student's disability. S SR U No Opinion

20. The IAP suggested utilization of appropriate learning technologies. S SR U No Opinion

Student Interactions (cont'd)

22. The IAP's accommodation recommendations were consistent with the educational standards and requirements of the applicable program.

S SR U No Opinion