**\*\*\*OFFICE OF THE PROVOST UNIT POLICY TEMPLATE\*\*\***

**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Unit | College of Education (COE) |
| Previous version approval date | n/a |
| Faculty approved date | May 27 2024 |
| Dean’s revision received by OTP |  |
| Date of OTP approval |  |

**[Note: Shaded text areas indicate where text is directly from the CBA or university policy and may not be altered in unit policies.]**

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 should have approximately one peer review per year
* Career Instructional Faculty: one peer review of teaching per review period
* Assistant Professor: at least one peer review before the first mid-term review, and at least two peer reviews during the three years preceding the faculty member’s tenure review. Three peer reviews are necessary for the promotion and tenure dossier.
* Associate Professor: at least one every other year. Three peer reviews are necessary for the promotion to full dossier.
* Professor: one every three years. NB: Two peer reviews are necessary for 6th-year post-tenure review.

COE clinical supervisors and professors of practice are career instructional faculty and should receive one peer review of teaching or supervision per review period. Research faculty who are assigned instructional responsibilities within their position description or regular workload (i.e., not overload) should receive at least one peer review of teaching per review period. When research faculty teach on overload to fill programmatic needs, they should receive one peer review of teaching for every three courses taught.

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**

The Teaching Engagement Program (TEP) Peer Review Template (see appendix A) will be completed by reviewers to document peer reviews of teaching. The criteria on the TEP Peer Review Template are aligned to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards and the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. Implementation guidance will provide examples to illustrate how the UO teaching evaluation standards may be operationalized across COE instructional contexts (e.g., online classes, clinic-based supervision, pK-12 school-based supervision). If/when the Teaching Evaluation Rubric is modified, the Peer Review Template shall be updated as needed to align with criteria on the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

1. **Scope of review**

A peer review will consist of (i) pre-observation communication, (ii) a review of class materials, (iii) observation of instruction, and (iv) post-observation communication.

1. Pre-observation communication: Prior to the observation, the reviewer will provide an opportunity (e.g., email, discussion) for the reviewee to share relevant contextual information about the class, their goals for the instruction to be observed, any aspects of their teaching they have been developing in relation to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards, and/or any areas of teaching in which they may be seeking suggestions for improvement.
2. Review of class materials: Prior to the observation, the reviewee will provide the reviewer a copy of the class syllabus, access to the full Canvas site, and any materials that will be used by students during the observation of instruction (e.g., presentation slides, readings, in-class activities, clinical supervision rubrics).
3. Observation of instruction: The reviewer will observe instruction for 60 minutes (or equivalent), as appropriate to the class and setting.
   1. For in-person and synchronous online courses, the reviewer will observe a minimum of 60 minutes of instruction.
   2. For asynchronous courses, a specific observation period and instructional activities to be observed will be identified in the pre-observation communication. The peer reviewer should spend approximately 60 minutes observing course materials and asynchronous content delivery. For example, the reviewer may observe a subset of instructional activities occurring during Week 5 (e.g., announcements, a recorded lecture, discussion boards, an assignment).
   3. When the observed instruction involves clinical supervision of university students, the peer reviewer will observe approximately 60 minutes of group or individual supervision. The observation may consist of a single supervision session or two shorter supervision sessions. To the maximum extent possible, observation of supervision should occur in group or individual supervision settings on the UO campus where clients are not present. When the observation of supervision can only be conducted by including the viewing of clients or identifiable client information (e.g., video of sessions, case notes), the peer reviewer will be carefully selected to ensure they hold appropriate professional licensure and permission to observe in the identified setting (e.g., work in the same clinic, HIPAA considerations).
4. Post-observation communication: After the observation, the reviewer will initiate a post-observation debrief, in writing and/or through a follow-up discussion. The reviewer will provide an opportunity for the reviewee to share reflections about the observed instruction and respond to any reviewer questions. The reviewer will share feedback in relation to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards. Upon completion of the peer review, the COE peer reviewer will provide a copy of the peer review evaluation to the reviewee to review and sign. At the request of the reviewee, a meeting will be held between the reviewee and peer reviewer to discuss the review prior to signing the Peer Review Template. The reviewee may submit a written response to the peer review to be retained as an attachment to the peer review evaluation.
5. **THE REVIEW PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF REVIEWS**
6. **Organization**

A faculty personnel coordinator will be responsible for tracking peer reviews and notifying Department Heads of the faculty in need of review in the upcoming year. The HR Coordinator will maintain centralized records of peer reviews. The frequency of peer reviews will align with the CBA for Career Faculty and the Provost’s recommendations for CF and TTF peer reviews. Faculty needing a peer review of teaching will be notified by their Department Head by June 15th of the academic year prior to the review. Faculty hired after that date who need a peer review of teaching will be notified during fall term of their first year.

By the end of spring term, Department Heads will nominate faculty from their departments to serve as peer reviewers in the upcoming academic year and the Dean will appoint faculty to serve up to a 2-year term as a COE Peer Teaching Reviewer. The number of anticipated peer reviews will be considered when determining the service responsibilities in the upcoming academic year for faculty who serve as COE Peer Teaching Reviewers.

Once peer reviewers are appointed, an Associate Dean for Faculty Development will be responsible for prompting Department Heads to match and notify reviewer-reviewee pairs, coordinating an annual training for peer reviewers, coordinating the upcoming year’s peer review schedule, and providing support to peer reviewers throughout the year as needed. Training for peer reviewers will occur annually during fall term and will minimally include an overview of the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards, the COE Peer Review of Teaching Policy and implementation guidance, and instructions for completing the TEP Peer Review Template.

Department Heads are responsible for matching peer reviewers and reviewees, and identifying the courses to be observed, with a goal of rotating the courses observed for any given faculty member. By the start of fall term, Department Heads will match peer reviewers to faculty in their department needing a review in the upcoming academic year. They will also collaborate to match reviewers and reviewees across departments, when applicable (e.g., faculty who teach classes outside their home department; to access a peer reviewer with online teaching experience; to access a peer reviewer with relevant professional/clinical experience), and to match reviewers to faculty needing reviews who are not assigned to an academic department (e.g., EDUC faculty, research faculty with appointments in research units). When matching reviewers and reviewees, Department Heads will account for potential conflicts of interest. It is recommended that over time, faculty receive peer reviews from colleagues who hold a range of classifications and ranks (i.e., TTF/CF, above/below rank of the reviewee).

1. **Personnel**

All faculty who hold a Tenure-Track Faculty appointment or a Career-Instructional Faculty appointment (i.e., Instructor, Lecturer, or Clinical Professor classification) at any rank within the College of Education are eligible to serve as COE peer reviewers. In some instances, faculty who hold a Career Research Faculty appointment with teaching responsibilities may be nominated and appointed to serve as COE peer reviewers, with approval of their direct supervisor and research unit director.

When nominating peer reviewers, Department Heads will consider faculty from all ranks who have a demonstrated record of quality teaching in one or more of the UO teaching pillars of *professional, inclusive, engaged, and research informed.* Eligible faculty are encouraged to inform their Department Head of their interest in serving as a COE peer reviewer as part of annual workload planning activities.

When the teaching assignment for a faculty member undergoing review consists of clinical supervision, the peer review of teaching may involve an observation of clinical supervision. In this case, the COE peer reviewer will either hold a faculty appointment in the Clinical Professor classification (any rank), have clinical teaching/supervision as a part of their assigned professional responsibilities, or have experience or knowledge in the delivery of clinical supervision.

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**

Department Heads will provide faculty undergoing review with an opportunity to identify potential conflicts of interest with assigned reviewers (e.g., family member, in a close personal relationship, reviewer has a student in the program, etc.). When a conflict of interest exists, a different peer reviewer will be assigned.

The reviewee will be provided the opportunity to review and/or discuss their feedback with their peer reviewer, and to provide a written response to the peer review evaluation. See section II.C.iv. of this policy for detail.

Faculty who would like formative feedback on their teaching outside of the formal peer review of teaching process are encouraged to request individual consultation through the UO Teaching Engagement Program.

APPENDIX A. TEACHING ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM (TEP) PEER REVIEW TEMPLATE