

Tickle College of Engineering

Peer Teaching Review Procedure

The purpose of this document is to facilitate the implementation of the peer teaching review policy developed by the Department Heads of the Tickle College of Engineering in consultation with the College Dean's Office staff during the Spring 2015 semester. The goal of this policy is to broaden teaching review beyond the University-administered student-review process and provide faculty members and department heads direct feedback about teaching in the context of departmental curricula, learning outcomes, methods of evaluation of student performance, and methods of instruction. Achieving this goal should enrich the student learning experience, relate faculty teaching more strongly to departmental curricula and learning goals, and enable faculty members to more efficiently use their time to develop their teaching effectiveness.

College-wide process:

A key element of the new policy is the establishment of a pool of faculty members supplied by the departments to the College. The expectation is that these faculty members are respected and knowledgeable teachers that will bring value and perspective to the teaching-review process. To enable the greatest success for the contribution of these pool members to peer teaching review, the procedures for teaching review are to be the same for all departments in the College.

Peer Teaching Review Team Composition:

The peer teaching review team should consist of three faculty members. The chair of the team is selected by the department head. The faculty member being reviewed will have the opportunity to select a team member if they wish. The third team member is provided by the Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs from the College pool of reviewers. This third reviewer must not have a faculty appointment in the department of the faculty member who is being reviewed. For the review of tenure-line faculty members, team members must be tenured faculty members of the same rank or above. For the review of non-tenure-line faculty members, team members may be tenure-line or not but must be of the same rank or above.

Timing of Reviews:

Reviews may occur as regularly planned events during the promotion progression of a faculty member or after reaching the senior rank for her/his type of faculty appointment. Reviews may also occur as part of a faculty improvement plan or cumulative performance review, and as such would be added into the set of needed reviews for a given academic year with the previously planned reviews. The recommended frequency of the planned reviews is:

- Lecturer - twice during the period for progression to senior lecturer
- Senior lecturer - twice during period for progression to distinguished lecturer
- Assistant professor of practice - twice during period for progression to associate professor of practice
- Associate professor of practice - twice during period for progression to full professor of practice
- Assistant professor - twice during period for progression to associate professor
- Associate professor - twice during period for progression to full professor
- Distinguished lecturers, Full professors of practice and Full professors - periodically after appointment to rank

Events for a Peer Review Team:

Each peer teaching review team will follow a consistent pattern of events that engages both the department head and the faculty member being reviewed while using consistent inputs for the review process. The events are:

- Meet with the Department Head.
- Meet with the faculty member being reviewed.
- Receive course materials prior to the start of the semester or as they become available, including course syllabus, example tests, homework and/or other tools for evaluating student performance, access to Blackboard site for a course, etc. Materials related to courses taught in previous semesters may also be provided to represent the diversity of teaching contributions of a faculty member. The faculty member being reviewed has the option to supply a teaching philosophy or teaching self-assessment document to the team.
- Each team member attends at least two class meetings; no less than four different class meetings will be attended collectively by members of a team. During one of the class visits, at least two of the team members will visit with students (for about 15 minutes, without the presence of the faculty instructor) to discuss their experiences in the class. The faculty member being reviewed will be consulted and informed of when these visits are to occur.
- Meet with faculty member being reviewed to discuss key observations from the review about strengths and areas for improvement with respect to teaching.
- Draft team report prior to the end of the semester of the review.
- Meet with the Department Head to discuss draft report.
- Finalize report and submit to the Department Head at the end of the semester with a copy to the faculty member being reviewed.

Review Criteria:

A key advantage of the process for the peer review of teaching is the involvement of faculty colleagues who understand the curriculum, the learning goals for the department and college, have experience teaching and evaluating students, and may be familiar with innovations in teaching methods for engineering students. Therefore, the peer teaching review will focus on:

- Appropriateness of course content to departmental expectations for the course and its position in the curriculum for appropriate degree programs
- Appropriateness of course content and expected skill development with respect to course goals and objectives
- Consistency of course evaluation techniques for achieving expected student learning outcomes
- Teaching methodologies
- Recognition of innovative pedagogical approaches by faculty member if applicable

Review Document:

The review document submitted by the peer teaching review team addresses the review criteria and includes a closing overall summary statement, taking into account the curriculum and learning goals for the department, the materials submitted as part of the review, observations from classroom visits, and inputs from meetings with the faculty member being reviewed. The document will not include any rating or evaluation score but serves as an assessment that is provided to the department head with a copy to the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member will be given the opportunity to respond to the department head about the review if desired. The department head will use the document as part of her/his considerations with respect to teaching performance as part of the appropriate annual review processes for the faculty member being reviewed.