

## **Procedures for Peer Review of Teaching**

**9-16**

All promotion and probationary cases (including 3<sup>rd</sup> year review) going forward will need to include peer evaluation of teaching. This includes tenure track and non-tenure track faculty at all levels of promotion. Below are the recommended guidelines and procedures for conducting these reviews in SSFD.

### **1. Schedule for peer review**

In planning the review schedule for each faculty member, selection of courses should represent the faculty member's primary teaching emphasis and context (i.e., graduate versus undergraduate courses; face-to-face versus online courses such as iCourses or ASU Online courses; seminars versus large enrollment courses). The opportunity to identify key goals, as well as demonstrate growth and improvement in teaching should be encouraged by this process.

#### ***Tenure track faculty***

Tenure and promotion to associate professor: At least one peer evaluation should be completed by the individual's 3<sup>rd</sup> year review, and at least one additional review should be conducted within the two years preceding submission of tenure and promotion materials. In consultation with the Director and/or Associate Director, the faculty member may request one additional review for purposes such as showing growth or improvement, documenting teaching success in different course formats, etc.

Promotion to full professor: At least one review should be completed within the two years preceding submission of promotion materials. In consultation with the Director and/or Associate Director, the faculty member may request one additional review for purposes such as showing growth or improvement, documenting teaching success in different course formats, etc.

#### ***Non-tenure track faculty with teaching responsibilities***

At least two peer reviews should be completed prior to the first level of promotion, with the second of these occurring within two years preceding submission of promotion materials. At least one additional review should be conducted within two years preceding submission of promotion materials for the second level of promotion. In consultation with the Director and/or Associate Director, the faculty member may request one additional review for purposes such as showing growth or improvement, documenting teaching success in different course formats, etc.

### **2. Assignment of reviewers**

The Associate Director and faculty member will meet briefly early in the academic year in which a review will be conducted to determine which course will be reviewed and to discuss appropriate reviewers for the designated course. For each peer evaluation, the Associate Director will select a qualified reviewer from the SSFD faculty with consideration of potential reviewers' expertise in teaching and in the content area of the course being evaluated. Further, reviewers will be at least one level of rank above the faculty

member whose teaching is being reviewed, drawn from the same tenure track or non-tenure track faculty pool. For non-tenure track faculty, if a reviewer of higher rank cannot be identified from this pool, a tenured faculty member may be chosen as an evaluator. In selecting reviewers, workload distribution will be taken into consideration. Reviews will not be solicited from individuals holding positions involving personnel review within SSFD or at higher levels (i.e., administrators engaged in personnel review, and college or university tenure/promotion committee members).

### **3. Conducting the peer evaluation**

The Associate Director will meet with a potential reviewer to request his/her participation and discuss the procedures for the review.

#### ***Pre-review steps:***

- 1) Faculty member completes a brief self-review (Section A of the Peer Evaluation of Teaching form), including identification of particular goals for instructional growth.
- 2) The reviewer and faculty member being evaluated have a pre-observation conference to discuss goals and procedures for the review, as well as discussing course format and materials to be reviewed.
- 3) The reviewer examines the course syllabus and examples of instructional materials provided by the instructor (e.g., presentation materials, assignments, exams, etc.), including online support.
- 4) The reviewer completes Section B of the Peer Evaluation of Teaching form—Review of Syllabus, Course Structure, and Examples of Instructional Materials.

#### ***Observation of face-to-face or online instruction:***

- 1) For face-to-face courses, the reviewer will observe live or via video-recording one mutually agreed upon instructional session (of at least 50 minutes in duration). To provide an opportunity for the faculty member's self-evaluation and/or to accommodate difficulty in scheduling a live review of class, the observed class may be video recorded if logistically feasible. For online courses, the reviewer should observe in real time one mutually agreed upon online instructional unit (approximately one week of instruction).
- 2) The reviewer examines instructional materials pertaining to the focal class session or instructional unit, including online support. For online courses, the reviewer should be given access to the course site such that the week's instructional materials and teacher-student communications (e.g., announcements, discussion board dialogue, etc.) can be observed.
- 3) The reviewer completes Section C of the Peer Evaluation of Teaching form—Review of Instruction.
- 4) Within one week, the reviewer provides the written review (with sections A, B, and C completed) to the instructor being evaluated.

#### ***Post-observation:***

- 1) In a timely fashion, the reviewer and faculty member being evaluated have a post-observation conference to share and discuss feedback.
- 2) In Section D—Instructor's Response to Evaluation and Instructional Goals, the faculty member being evaluated writes a short response to the review and defines at least two goals for ongoing development in teaching.
- 3) The reviewer and faculty member being evaluated both sign the written report.

- 4) The written report is a confidential personnel document shared between the faculty member being reviewed, the peer reviewer, SSFD administrators (i.e., the Director, Deputy Director, and Associate Director), and members of any personnel committees conducting reviews.

#### **4. Procedures for Appeal**

The faculty member being evaluated may appeal the review by petitioning the Chair(s) of the appropriate Personnel Committee within 10 business days of receiving the written report. If an appeal is made, the Chair(s) will consult with the faculty member being reviewed and the faculty member conducting the review. The Chair(s) will review the procedures followed and written documentation before rendering a decision. If the resolution is still contested, the final SSFD-level appeal proceeds to the Director who makes the final determination at the level of the unit. Any further appeals must then involve the Dean of Social Sciences in CLAS.