# **PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING Policy Example: Department of X Emphasizing Inclusive Teaching**

*The Department of X defined a student achievement goal that includes increasing the equity index in their courses, so they are putting special emphasis on Inclusive teaching in their reviews. Accordingly, they decided to use the* [*Protocol for Advancing Inclusive Teaching Efforts (PAITE)*](https://inclusiveteachingvisualization.com/observation-protocol-paite/) *instrument in their observations. This requires some practice to use, so the “peers” conducting the reviews will be members of a Peer Review committee (which counts toward the faculty member’s service) whose membership is drawn from within the department. The department has decided that committee members must be mid- or senior-level faculty (already-promoted), and no relationship is required between the ranks of the reviewer and reviewee. Thus, all faculty may benefit from career faculty members’ extensive teaching experience and expertise.*

*.*

1. *Substance of reviews: Professional, Inclusive, Engaged, and Research-Informed criteria; special focus on inclusive teaching.*
	1. *Instrument:* [*PAITE*](https://inclusiveteachingvisualization.com/observation-protocol-paite/)
	2. *Adaptations: Add instruction to note professional, inclusive, and research-informed practices during observation.*
	3. *Scope: Instructor questions, UO Teaching Practices Inventory, syllabus, LMS site, class observation.*
2. *Personnel:*
	1. *Management: Chair of Peer Review Committee*
	2. *Who serves as reviewers?*
		1. *Peer Review Committee: Yes; no junior faculty*
		2. *Relative ranks: No restrictions*
		3. *Inter-unit cooperation: No*
	3. *Reviewer assignment: Peer Review Committee*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit |  |
| Previous version approval date |  |
| Faculty approved date |  |
| Dean’s revision received by OTP |  |
| Date of OTP approval |  |

**[Note: Text in [blue and brackets] indicates where units should develop and insert language specific to their unit practices, standards, and criteria. Other text is directly from the CBA or university policy and should not be altered. In this example, elements of the “department-created” policy are in italics.**

*Red, italicized* **text is sample language generated for the purpose of this example policy.]**

1. **PREAMBLE**

Peer review of teaching at the University of Oregon is the written assessment by a faculty peer of how an instructor enacts professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed teaching (and other unit standards that are part of the unit’s Teaching Evaluation Rubric) based on, for example, a class observation, contextual materials like the syllabus and Canvas site, a conversation between the instructor and the reviewer, and an instructor’s answer to standard questions devised by the unit. Peer review frequency should align with the CBA for Career Faculty and the Provost’s recommendations for CF and TTF peer reviews:

* Pro Tem Faculty: one peer review per contract period
* Unpromoted Career and TTF: one peer review of teaching per year for three years, then one during each of the three years preceding promotion
* Promoted CF and TTF: one peer review of teaching every three years; three peer reviews from the review period required for further promotion
1. **THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING**
	1. **Criteria for review**

The criteria for review are professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed university-wide standards and any additional standards or modifications made by the unit. Peer review should gather evidence related to the standards in the unit’s Teaching Evaluation Rubric so that peer review is meaningful in the evaluation of teaching. Criteria must match the unit's Teaching Evaluation Rubric and Review and Promotion policies.

* 1. **Template for review**

[Units may use the sample [Peer Review Template](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/resources/peer-review-teaching)as is or with modifications aligned to their own established teaching evaluation rubric. Whatever units decide, the review template should be submitted as an appendix to this document.]

*A number of documents will be used during the peer review process; some offered by TEP and others created or adapted by the Department of X. The documents are listed below and included in the Appendix.*

* + 1. [*TEP Peer Review - Instructor Questions form*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-instructor-questions_0.docx)
		2. [*UO Teaching Practices Inventory*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-teaching-practices-inventory-v-jan-4-2024.docx)
		3. [*Department of X modified PAITE observation instrument*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/paite-observation-template-form-modified-for-departmental-peer-review-dec-2023.xlsx)
		4. [*Department of X Peer Review Report Template*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/inclusive-focus-example-peer-review-of-teaching-report-template.docx)
	1. **Scope of review**

[Units should establish the content of reviews (will the reviewer consider the class syllabus, the Canvas site for a particular duration, class observations, post-observations discussion, etc.)]

* + 1. *Course syllabus*
		2. *Instructor Question form*
		3. *UO Teaching Practices Inventory*
		4. *LMS site (reviewer granted Teaching Assistant role for a period of two weeks)*
		5. *One class session observation (for in-person courses)*
		6. *Post-observation discussion: A synchronous meeting lasting at least twenty minutes.*
1. **THE REVIEW PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF REVIEWS**
	1. **Organization**

[Units should name those responsible for keeping track of the regular review schedule; notifying faculty up for review; assigning reviewers; and maintaining archiving reviews. Units should state the date that faculty undergoing peer review should expect to be contacted.]

*The department will establish and maintain a Peer Review committee whose duty will be to manage and carry out the peer reviews for the department. The committee will consist of five faculty members holding the rank of Senior Instructor I or II or Associate or Full Professor. Before carrying out any summative reviews, they will work to enhance inter-rater reliability either by reviewing a recorded class session or visiting a live session, completing the peer review template, and discussing the results.*

***Review Process Table:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Task*** | ***Time frame/ deadline*** | ***Person responsible*** | ***Notes*** |
| *Determine who to review that academic year.* | *Beginning of academic year* | *Peer Review committee chair* | *Follow schedules described in Section I of this document.* |
| *Notify faculty to be reviewed* | *On or before Friday of Week 2* | *Peer Review committee chair* | *Email faculty in question that they will be reviewed that year. In the same message, ask reviewee for preferences regarding course and term. See Section III D.* |
| *Preferences regarding timing due to Peer Review Committee chair* | *On or before Friday of Week 3* | *Reviewee* |  |
| *Assign reviews among committee* | *During Week 4* | *Peer review committee* | *Divide cases approximately equally among committee members. Note that it is desirable to vary the type of course for which a faculty member is reviewed. For example, if the faculty member commonly teaches courses for non-majors, 2nd-year majors, and graduate courses, all the reviews should not be of graduate courses.* |
| *Notify reviewee which term, course, and reviewer.* | *On or before Friday of Week 4* | *Reviewer* |  |
| *Coordinate timing of review and share materials* | *On or before Friday of Week 5 if review is scheduled for Fall term. On or before Friday of Week 2 of review’s scheduled term is not Fall.* | *Reviewer initiates* | *Reviewer sends:** *Instructor Question form*
* *UO Teaching Practices Inventory*

*Reviewee shares:* * *Syllabus*
* *Any other important course documents.*

*Schedule:* * *LMS course access window (2 weeks)*
* *Class observation date (in-person classes only)*
* *Post-observation meeting*
 |
| *Reviewee completes PIERs Inventory, sends it to reviewer* | *One week before class observation* | *Reviewee* |  |
| *Conduct review* | *On or before Tuesday of Week 9 of review term* | *Reviewer* | *Review course materials, LMS, instructor questions, UO Teaching Practices Inventory, and observe a class session or explore the online course environment.*  |
| *Send draft report to reviewee* | *At least two days prior to post-observation meeting* | *Reviewer* | *Use the Peer Review Report Template in writing the report.*  |
| *Post-observation meeting* | *On or before Friday of Week 9 of review term* | *Reviewer and reviewee* | *Discuss draft review report and recommendations, make any needed changes.* |
| *Send completed and reviewer-signed review report to reviewee* | *On or before Friday of Week 10 of review term* | *Reviewer* |  |
| *Reviewee signs completed review, sends to reviewer and head of peer review committee*  | *On or before Wednesday of Finals Week of review term* | *Reviewee* |  |
| *Review filed on department server* | *On or before Friday of Finals Week of review term* | *Peer Review committee chair* | *Report to be placed in a password-protected file on the department server. The reviewee, the head of the Peer Review committee and the department head will have access to a reviewee’s file, which will be supplied to others (e.g. the department’s Personnel Committee) as required by their duties.* |
| *Reviewee response to review report* | *One month after signing review report* | *Reviewee* | *Optional. If written, electronic copies of the response should be submitted via email to the chair of the Peer Review committee and the department head. The chair of the Peer Review committee will place the document on the department server in a folder also containing the review report.* |

* 1. **Personnel**

[Units should name the qualifications reviewers must hold (e.g., rank or training, or membership in unit or cross-unit partner, etc.).]

*Reviewers should be members of the Peer Review committee. No relationship is required between the ranks of the reviewer and reviewee. This decision was made so that all faculty have the opportunity to benefit from career faculty members’ extensive teaching experience and expertise, and because members of the Peer Review Committee have training in the review process.*

*The reviewer must review a course the reviewee is teaching in that same department. If the reviewee is teaching outside their home department, both the reviewer and a faculty member from the host department should perform class observations. The extra-department faculty member should provide written feedback to the reviewer and reviewee to supplement the Peer Review.*

* 1. **FERPA**

In establishing the scope of peer reviews, units may wish to include Canvas-based teaching—for example, peer reviewers might consider the organization of Canvas site, or how faculty interact with students on discussion fora or respond to student assignments using Speed Grader. UO considers peer review a legitimate educational reason to access colleagues’ Canvas courses and therefore for their incidental access to students’ educational records, under the Federal Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA).

* 1. **Role of Reviewee**

[Units should state what role the reviewee plays in the selection of reviewer, if any. Also state by what process reviews will be shared with and signed by reviewees; how reviewees may respond to a review in writing if they choose; and whether the unit has a process for requesting a formative review (not to be part of the record).]

*Reviewees will indicate their preference of course and term for the review by ranking the various possibilities. Reviewees should understand that the committee might not be able to accommodate their preferences.*

*The reviewee will be responsible for completing the Instructor Questions and the UO Teaching Practices Inventory before the class observation according to the schedule in the Review Process Table in Section III A. The reviewee will also be responsible for signing, electronically or by signing a hard copy and then scanning, the completed review report emailed to them by the reviewer. In turn, the reviewee will email copies of the signed document to the reviewer and the chair of the Peer Review committee, as described in Section III A of this policy.*

*The reviewee may submit electronic copies of a written response to the review to the chair of the Peer Review committee and the department head. The chair of the Peer Review committee will place the document on the department server in the folder that also contains the review report.*

*The department encourages faculty who are interested in obtaining formative feedback about their teaching to participate in a Teaching Triangle, which is a group of three faculty who perform formative reviews of each other’s courses and meet to discuss the results. Triangles can be organized at any time, but the department sends out a call for participants early in the academic year.*