



# Peer Review of Instructional Development Consultant Client Interview

Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

### Reviewer's Relationship to Consultant:

Departmental Colleague

External Peer  
Position \_\_\_\_\_

### Setting of Observation:

LTC Premises

Other (describe) \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio of Needs Assessments/Project Completion Plans Reviewed?

Yes  No

Date/Time of Observation: \_\_\_\_\_

### Directions:

Thank you for agreeing to carry out this Peer Review of an Instructional Development Consultant. The results of this review will be used to provide valuable feedback to the Consultant who will use it to identify any areas where skills and expertise may be further developed.

The review focuses on the Instructional Development Consultant's knowledge of instructional and curriculum design during a meeting with institutional clients and may involve documents relevant to a given project. Each Review 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 Co-op Coordinator 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**.

## Peer Review of Instructional Development Consultant's Client Interview

1. The Consultant was prompt in starting the interview. S SR U No Opinion
  
2. The Consultant provided information on available LTC services. S SR U No Opinion
  
3. The Consultant worked to establish good rapport with the client. S SR U No Opinion
  
- \* 4. During the interview the Consultant demonstrated an adequate depth of knowledge of instructional and curriculum design. S SR U No Opinion
  
5. During the interview, the Consultant demonstrated an adequate breadth of knowledge of instructional and curriculum design. S SR U No Opinion
  
6. The Consultant worked to clarify the key elements of the client's situation. S SR U No Opinion

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

7. The Consultant offered alternate approaches to satisfy the client's needs. S SR U No Opinion
- \* 8. The Consultant's suggestions were consistent with the client's Needs Assessment. S SR U No Opinion
9. The Consultant offered sufficient time for client responses during the interview. S SR U No Opinion
10. The Consultant was non-judgemental in discussions with the client. S SR U No Opinion
11. The Consultant's responses to client questions were effective. S SR U No Opinion
12. The Consultant sought input from all interview participants. S SR U No Opinion
13. The Consultant demonstrated good time-management skills during the interview. S SR U No Opinion

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

## Needs Assessments/Project Completion Plans

*Response to the following items are to be made only after review of the Consultant's portfolio of Needs Assessments (NAs) and Projection Completion Plans (PCPs).*

\* 14. The Consultant's NA reflected the key elements of the client's requirements. S SR U No Opinion

15. The Consultant's NA was clearly stated. S SR U No Opinion

16. The Consultant's NA was concisely presented. S SR U No Opinion

17. The NA was submitted within agreed project timelines. S SR U No Opinion

18. The Consultant's PCP was completed within agreed timelines. S SR U No Opinion

19. The PCP reflected the client's input. S SR U No Opinion

\* 20. The PCP was consistent with the client's ability to implement it. S SR U No Opinion

\* 21. The PCP was consistent with the client's ability to fund it. S SR U No Opinion

22. The PCP contained provision to evaluate project results. S SR U No Opinion

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