Purpose and policy

Peer review of teaching is required under College of Environment & Design procedures for promotion and tenure and post-tenure review. It may also be requested at other times by individual faculty members.

This document establishes procedures for initiation and conduct of peer reviews, when they are required or requested. This document replaces “Proposal for Peer Review of Teaching in the College of Environment & Design” approved by faculty April 24, 1998. It will go into effect at the end of the 2005-2006 academic year.

The purposes of peer reviews are both to evaluate teaching and its effects on learning, and to develop suggestions for future improvement. Although the purposes of peer review overlap with those of student class evaluations, a peer review and its findings are separate from and independent of student class evaluations.

Peer teaching review consists of review of a single faculty member in a single course, by a single reviewer. Eligible peer reviewers include all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College of Environment & Design. Additional potential reviewers, such as tenured and tenure-track faculty in other units of the university, may be made eligible by petition of the reviewee to the Associate Dean of the college, and the agreement of the reviewer.

A review must be conducted at a time during the semester when representative teaching activities are taking place. It must be completed in time for its use in any applicable scheduled procedure such as promotion and tenure review or post-tenure review. A review completed by mid-semester could immediately be beneficially used in the remainder of the semester.

Initiation of review

For a required review, at the necessary time, the Associate Dean of the College of Environment & Design informs the reviewee of the requirement for, purpose of, and deadline for the review. The Associate Dean gives the reviewee a list of eligible faculty reviewers, and a copy of this document. The reviewee chooses the course to be reviewed and the reviewer, and informs the Associate Dean. This choice constitutes the assignment of the reviewer, unless the reviewer is unavailable due to schedule or other circumstances. The Associate Dean confirms the reviewer’s availability and informs the reviewer of the assignment, the purpose, and the deadline, and provides a copy of this document.

For review that is not required but for which the reviewee wishes to follow these procedures, the reviewee initiates the review by informing the Associate Dean of the wish to be reviewed, the course to be reviewed, and the selected reviewer. The Associate Dean confirms the reviewer’s availability and informs the reviewer of the assignment, the purpose, and the deadline, and provides a copy of this document.
**Conduct of the review**

The review consists of review of course documents, classroom observation, and student interviews. The reviewee should explain to the class the review that is about to happen and why it is important. The reviewee should arrange times for classroom observation with the reviewer. The reviewee should provide to the reviewer a copy of the course syllabus, all course handouts and other related material, and three to five questions to be included in the student interview.

Classroom sessions should be observed for at least one hour on at least two occasions, to evaluate such aspects as delivery of information, relationship with students, organization, and effective use of class time.

Course documents can be appraised for such aspects of the reviewee as organization, clarity, preparedness, and scholarship in the discipline.

Interviews may be conducted with all students in the class, with a randomly selected sample of students, or with a group of students elected by the class as a whole. They may take place during the regular class meeting time, or at a different time agreed to by the students and the reviewer. If it is proposed to conduct the interview during class time, the reviewee must be informed in advance and agree to the schedule. An interview ordinarily lasts about one hour. The course documents and the students’ graded work may be discussed. An interview may include an open discussion or may be limited to a fixed number of specific questions; in either case it must include the specific questions submitted by the reviewee. The following interview questions are suggestions only; other questions may also be appropriate.

1. Were the course objectives made clear to the class?
2. Does the instructor appreciate the level of understanding of the students regarding the subject of the course? Does the instructor speak at that level?
3. What characteristics of the instructor’s teaching style do you like most? Why?
4. What could be done to make the learning environment in your class more positive?
5. Do you like the organization of the course?
6. Has the instructor stimulated the class to learn more outside of the classroom? How does your instructor handle class discussion? Are all students encouraged to participate in class? How does the instructor stimulate — or inhibit — class discussion?
7. Does the instructor relate the material covered in this course to material covered in previous courses in the curriculum?
8. Does the instructor use supplemental materials to effectively augment the text?
9. Are the tests fair? Do they cover the important material of the course?
10. Does the instructor encourage creativity and original thinking?
11. Is the instructor accessible to students for consultation outside of the classroom? Should the instructor do anything to encourage students to make more use of the office hours?
12. Are the evaluations of work fair? Has the instructor made it clear to the class how the work is evaluated and graded?

13. Does the instructor provide constructive comments on the projects when they are returned? Are the projects returned in a timely manner that allows the students to benefit from comments? 16. Do the assigned projects further your understanding of the subject of the course?

14. Compared to other instructors you have had, how would you rate this instructor’s effectiveness at this point in the course?

**Report**
The reviewer meets with the reviewee to discuss the review’s findings and suggestions for improvement, submits a brief written summary (approximately two pages) to the reviewee, and reports to the Associate Dean that the review has been completed. The report should be specific and substantive, including to the extent possible specific student comments from the interviews, and specific observations made in the classroom or in consideration of the course documents. It must include responses to specific questions submitted by the reviewee.