

Developing a Peer Review of Teaching Process

Who will be reviewed in this department? (Should it be restricted to pretenure faculty, or should senior faculty be included as well? Should it include lecturers and adjuncts?)

Who will conduct the review? (Senior faculty? A committee? A reciprocal system?)

What areas of teaching will we assess? (Classroom performance as well as course materials such as syllabi, assignments and evaluated student work?)

What will our guidelines be for submitting course materials? Will we limit the number of pages or the types of documents submitted?

What are our guidelines for classroom observation? How many visits will be included? Will there be more than one observer?

How do we view the relation between the two purposes of evaluation? (Improvement purposes versus documentation for personnel decisions such as tenure and promotion, contract renewal, merit pay)

Should we set separate systems or blend them?

How will we document the review? (A completed form, checklist or letter?)

Will each observation include a pre and post conversation between observer and teacher?

How will we train or ensure consistency in rating?

How will we document and communicate our protocols for peer review?

How will we monitor our protocols?

How often should we revise our protocols?

References:

Chism, N. (1999). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*

American Association for Higher Education. (1995). *From idea to prototype: The Peer review of teaching (a project workbook)*.