

Suggested Peer Review Process*

Issues to be discussed within academic departments include:

- Which department members will be conducting the peer reviews? Per the new procedures, peer reviewers must be tenured, although departments might elect to involve untenured faculty in the process by conducting reviews in pairs, e.g., incorporating one tenured and one untenured faculty member.
- What peer review form(s) will be adopted? The CTL website offers peer review resources as well as possible choices. Departments are free to edit forms to better fit their norms and values, but ideally the same forms will be adopted by all peer reviewers within a given department unless there is a compelling reason not to do so.
- How many peer reviews will take place? The new procedures require that every faculty member be peer reviewed at least once per academic year, but departments are free to build in additional reviews, e.g., in the case of faculty members applying for reappointment or promotion.
- Are there opportunities for formative review? The new procedures strongly encourage establishing formative (i.e., non-evaluative) peer review opportunities, which are especially helpful for new and junior faculty members. Formative peer review would ideally precede “official” summative peer review.

Once departmental guidelines have been established, we envision the following process:

Faculty members will:

1. Clarify with their chair early in the fall semester who will be conducting their peer review and during which semester.
2. Choose a class for review. Over time, different types and levels of classes should be reviewed, as the faculty member’s teaching schedule allows.
3. Create a packet of materials for the peer reviewer in advance of any classroom observation. We recommend that the packet include, at minimum, the relevant course syllabus and reading list, and the guidelines and rubric for a sample assignment. Faculty members are encouraged to share materials they believe will give the peer reviewer information a clear sense of their course goals, teaching philosophy, and conscientiousness, e.g., handouts, multimedia presentation slides, classroom exercises, project instructions, tests, or instructor feedback on student work. Faculty members may also wish to grant access to course management system pages.
4. Schedule a pre-review conference meeting with the peer reviewer and a mutually acceptable date for classroom observation. The meeting is an opportunity for discussion about the faculty member’s overall course design and goals as well as specific teaching objectives for the class that will be observed. Discussion of the peer review forms(s) that will be used for the evaluation should also be clarified at this meeting.

Following the review of materials and classroom observation, the peer reviewer will:

1. Write a report summarizing the review, following agreed-upon department guidelines for criteria and format.
2. Meet with the reviewed faculty member to provide a copy of the report. The report should also be submitted to the department chair.

***New Peer Review Procedures, Faculty Handbook (3.3.3.1.2 Peer Review of Teaching), August, 2013**

Peer review of teaching is an essential component of faculty evaluation. It contributes to evidence of teaching effectiveness through the observations of peers with an understanding of effective pedagogy and complements student ratings of instruction. All full-time faculty should be peer reviewed by at least one tenured faculty member in their academic department or program area at least once per academic year. Peer reviews should be submitted to both the faculty member and Department Chair or Program Director who will incorporate the peer review into their annual evaluation (see section 3.4). Peer reviews should be conducted according to the following guidelines.

1. Peer reviews of teaching should incorporate both evaluation of course materials and classroom observation. Reviewers should set up a pre-review conference to request relevant course materials and schedule a classroom observation. The reviewer and faculty member should discuss the plan and objectives of the class to be observed and the guidelines that will be used for the review. Reviewers should also meet with faculty members after the review of materials and classroom observation have been completed to provide prompt feedback and a copy of the resulting evaluation.
2. Evaluation of course materials may include examination of course syllabi, reading assignments, course management system pages, handouts, project guidelines, tests, rubrics, or instructor feedback on student work. If the faculty member

maintains a teaching portfolio, portions relevant to the course being evaluated may be submitted. Such materials can provide valuable information about a faculty member's teaching philosophy, expertise, dedication, and creativity.

3. In the effort to enhance the reliability of classroom observations, reviewers should make use of standardized rating forms or checklists in their evaluations. Such forms should be adopted by departments in accordance with their disciplinary goals and accepted teaching practices. In selecting or adapting rating criteria, departments and program areas are encouraged to consult the Center for Teaching and Learning for relevant resources.

4. Faculty who teach regularly or substantially outside of their home departments (e.g., in humanities or arts) may opt for peer review in these areas instead of one within their departments. Peer review in this case should follow the procedures of the relevant department or program area.

5. Where possible over the course of a faculty member's career, peer reviews should be rotated among multiple observers, including observers outside their department. In addition, a range of classes taught by the faculty member should be observed.

6. Departments are encouraged to expand peer review activities beyond the aforementioned summative review procedures, incorporating formative peer review opportunities as a regular practice. Such experiences may be helpful for junior faculty, faculty teaching new courses, or faculty experimenting with new pedagogies.