# **PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING Policy Example: Basic**

*The Department of Y’s reviews address the professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed aspects of teaching defined by the University and do not add any discipline-specific criteria. They use TEP’s Peer Review Template without modification, and gather the information required to fill it out from an Instructor Questions form and by reviewing the course syllabus and LMS site, and by performing a class observation. There is no special Peer Review committee; any faculty member of equivalent or higher rank than the reviewee can perform the review, though the unit has decided that junior faculty should not perform reviews. A non-faculty administrative professional in the department, the Peer Review Manager, keeps track of the review schedule and archives review reports.*

1. *Substance of reviews: Professional, Inclusive, Engaged, and Research-Informed criteria with no additions.*
	1. *Instrument: TEP’s Peer Review Template*
	2. *Adaptations: None*
	3. *Scope: TEP Peer Review - Instructor Questions, course syllabus, LMS site, class observation.*
2. *Personnel:*
	1. *Management: Administrative professional with title, Peer Review Manager*
	2. *Who serves as reviewers?*
		1. *Peer Review Committee: No*
		2. *Relative ranks: Reviewer holds equivalent or higher rank. Junior faculty do not serve as reviewers.*
		3. *Inter-unit cooperation: No*
	3. *Reviewer assignment: Peer Review Manager*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 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**
2. **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.]

*The materials the Department of Y uses for peer review are available in the Appendix. They include:*

* [*TEP Peer Review - Instructor Questions*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-instructor-questions_0.docx)
* *TEP Peer Review Template (*[*with tickable boxes*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-template-with-tickable-boxes-v-jan-4-2024_0.docx)*,* [*accessible version*](https://teaching.uoregon.edu/sites/default/files/2024-01/tep-peer-review-template-with-bullet-list-v-jan-4-2024_0.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.)]

*The review will gather information about professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed teaching through appraisal of the Instructor Questions form, course syllabus, the course LMS site, and at least one class visit or survey of materials for an online course. The review will also include a meeting in which the reviewer and reviewee discuss a draft of the Peer Review Report.*

1. **THE REVIEW PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF REVIEWS**
2. **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 of Y’s Faculty Support administrative professional will be designated the Peer Review Manager. The Peer Review Manager will maintain a spreadsheet to keep track of the timing of faculty reviews, determining which faculty are due for review each year, assigning reviewers, and notifying reviewees, and sending to both reviewer and reviewee copies of this Peer Review Policy and all associated documents. The Peer Review Manager will maintain an archive of completed reviews accessible to the reviewer, reviewee, and the department’s Personnel Committee.*

*Overall Review Process*

1. *Week 1 of Fall term: The Peer Review Manager:*
	1. *Determines who needs to be reviewed during the upcoming academic year*
	2. *Assigns a reviewer by taking the next name from the list of faculty who meet the requirements listed in Section III B below.*
	3. *Notifies reviewer and reviewee of their pairing via email and sends the required documents listed in Section II B above. This message also lists the courses examined in the reviewee’s last three reviews.*
2. *Week 2 of Fall term: Reviewer and reviewee:*
	1. *Work together to decide which term and course would be best for the review, keeping in mind that the types of courses selected for review over the course of a faculty member’s career should be representative of the full range of courses they teach.*
	2. *Communicate to the Peer Review Manager their choice of which term to do the review, and which course will be reviewed. If they have chosen a term other than Fall, the Manager will send a reminder in Week 1 of the relevant term.*
3. *By Week 3 of the term in which the review will take place, reviewer and reviewee:*
	1. *Schedule the date of the class observation, if the class meets in person. The observation should take place on or before Wednesday of Week 9 of the term.*
	2. *Schedule a two-week window in which the reviewee will give the reviewer access to the course LMS site.*
	3. *Schedule the Peer Review Report discussion meeting.*
4. *One week prior to the class visit or the LMS site access, the reviewee completes the Instructor Questions forms and emails it, the syllabus, and any other relevant course materials to the reviewer.*
5. *During the class observation, the reviewer uses the table in the (Department of Y) Peer Review Report Template form to record what the instructor is doing, what the students are doing, and any other observations that will be helpful in completing the rest of the form.*
6. *By one week after the class observation, the reviewer completes a draft of the Peer Review Report and emails it to the reviewee.*
7. *On or before Friday of Week 10 of the review term, the reviewer and reviewee meet to discuss the Peer Review Report and agree on focal areas for improvement of teaching as well as any other changes to the report.*
8. *On or before Tuesday of Finals week of the review term, the reviewer:*
	1. *Completes the final draft of the Peer Review Report, signs it, electronically or by printing a hard copy, then signing and scanning it.*
	2. *Emails the final, signed report to the reviewee.*
9. *On or before Thursday of Finals week of the review term, the reviewee:*
	1. *Signs the final draft of the Peer Review Report, either electronically or by printing, signing, and scanning a hard copy.*
	2. *Emails copies of the signed report to the reviewer and the Peer Review Manager.*
10. *On or before Friday of Finals week of the review term, the Peer Review Manager archives a pdf of the Peer Review Report in a cloud folder (for example in OneDrive) labeled with the reviewee’s name, the term and year of the review. The folder should be accessible to the Department of Y’s Personnel Committee, the reviewer, and the reviewee.*
11. *By Week 4 of the term following the review, the reviewee may submit to the Peer Review Manager a written response to the Peer Review Report. The manager will then archive the response in the folder discussed above, so that the Personnel Committee will find it along with the report itself.*
12. **Personnel**

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

*Reviewers are drawn from a pool consisting of all non-junior teaching faculty in the Department of Y; a reviewer must hold a rank equivalent to or higher than that of the reviewee.*

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).]

*Reviewer/reviewee pairs are assigned randomly by the Department of Y’s Peer Review Manager.*

*Reviewees are responsible for completing and sending the Department of Y completed Instructor Questions form to the assigned reviewer, along with relevant course documents, such as the syllabus. They will also work with the reviewer to schedule a class visit, limited-time access to the course LMS site, and a post-observation meeting.*

*After the Peer Review report is finalized, the reviewer will send a signed copy to the reviewee, who will sign it in turn and send copies to the reviewer and the department’s Peer Review Manager.*

*Reviewees may submit a written response to the Peer Review, as detailed in section III A 11 above.*

*Because all non-entry-level faculty are eligible to act as reviewers in our department, it is important for all those faculty to practice and become familiar with the review process. To facilitate this practice, the department runs a Feedback Festival each year, in which each faculty member either: opens their classroom for a day, inviting colleagues to observe and provide feedback; makes their course documents available for comment; or arranges for interested colleagues to provide feedback on the course Canvas site. Each faculty member eligible to act as a reviewer is required to sign up for at least one of these activities. Entry level faculty are also encouraged to provide feedback to colleagues through the Feedback Festival. Participation in the Feedback Festival counts toward engaged teaching in peer review.*