

Peer Evaluation of Teaching Policy

Goal: To establish a policy for peer reviews of teaching in the LCB, such that we adopt a uniform evaluation form and process across all reviews in the LCB. These reviews should be in compliance with the CBA and with Academic Affairs policies on promotion and tenure procedures.

Frequency of Reviews:

TTF: Assistant Professor: One before mid-term review; One every year in the three years before tenure review;
Associate Professor: One every other year
Full Professor: One every three years

Career NTTF: One per contract period

Reviewer Qualifications:

Evaluators of tenure-track faculty should be tenured and of the same or higher academic rank than the faculty member being evaluated, and should be chosen by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty member. Evaluators of non-tenure-track faculty are recommended to be at the same or a higher rank than the faculty member being evaluated, and should be chosen by the Department Head in consultation with the faculty member.

Procedure for conducting Evaluative Peer Reviews of Teaching for TTF and Career NTTF:

1. The Dean's office sends Department Heads a list of faculty needing reviews in the coming academic year, along with the most recent peer review on file.
2. The Department Head initiates a request to a faculty member (reviewer) of the appropriate rank to conduct a peer review of teaching for another faculty member (reviewee), and sends both reviewer and reviewee a copy of the form and previous review. *In the case of online courses, where possible departments are encouraged to have faculty who have previously taught online review online courses.*
3. The reviewee and reviewer should choose a mutually agreeable date for classroom observation.

In the case of an online course, the reviewee may either:

- a. *Add the reviewer as a grader to the Canvas course site and set a date for course access.*
- b. *Create a sandbox site, add the reviewer as a grader, set a date for course access, and add the following to the sandbox site:*
 - i. *the specific module(s) or equivalent portion(s) of the course they would like to be reviewed,*
 - ii. *the course home page,*
 - iii. *the Start Here or other module(s) used to orient students to the course,*
 - iv. *a sample of course announcements or other evidence of engagement with students such as a welcome video, sample replies to discussions, etc.*
 - v. *For assistance creating a sandbox site or adding the specified content, contact [George Reese](#), the Lundquist College Instructional Designer.*

4. The reviewee should supply the following before the scheduled observation date: 1) developmental activities completed since last review 2) areas of focus for feedback during current review [see peer review form for 1) and 2)] 3) course materials (syllabus required; additional materials might include lecture slides, sample assignment, sample exam, access to external sites used, etc. Note that providing access to their course on Canvas can substitute for providing materials.)
5. For face to face courses, the classroom observation should occur on the scheduled date. An entire class period is preferred, but should not be shorter than one hour. Reviewers might use any form they wish that aids them in organizing their observations (two examples of forms that provide checklists as “worksheets” are provided), but these should not be turned in. Please turn in the standardized peer review form titled “Peer Evaluation Official Form.” The review should fill in all fields, including an assessment of the course materials and overall comments and recommendations for improvement.
6. For online courses, the course review should occur on the scheduled date or within a specified week. Faculty can indicate which specific module(s) or equivalent portion(s) of the course, they would like to be reviewed. Reviewers should limit their review to the indicated content which should be approximately equivalent to one face to face class session. Reviewers might use any form they wish that aids them in organizing their observations, but these should not be turned in. Please turn in the standardized peer review form titled “Peer Evaluation Official Form for ONLINE.” The review should fill in all fields, including an assessment of the course materials and overall comments and recommendations for improvement.
7. After the review is completed, the reviewer should provide a copy to the reviewee and meet to discuss the content of the evaluation. A review signed and dated by the reviewer and reviewee should be turned in to the Dean’s office (Cindy Ferguson) in either electronic or paper form to be archived in the faculty member’s personnel file. Note that the written review should not change after the meeting to discuss the evaluation and prior to submission to the Dean’s office, unless the change is simply correcting a factual error. The faculty member could submit their own addendum for the filed report if they feel a need to respond to the report in writing. This addendum will also be included in the faculty member’s personnel file and promotion materials.

Note, all peer reviews using this procedure are considered evaluative and appropriate for consideration in promotion files, periodic faculty reviews, and contract renewals. Any additional peer reviews conducted solely for the purpose of constructive and helpful feedback to the instructor (developmental review) can be requested by the faculty member and should be arranged and conducted separately. Developmental reviews will not be part of the faculty member’s personnel file or be used in promotion packets. From the perspective of the reviewer, conducting either evaluative or developmental reviews will be considered service to the Department and College.