Procedure of Peer Review of Teaching

A. Purpose of the review: Please see the University of Minnesota Evaluation Of Teaching Policy for a full description of the purpose of peer.

http://policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/TEACHINGEVALUATION.html#100

This document outlines the process utilized in the Center for Allied Programs for peer review of teaching as required in item B. 1 of the University Of Minnesota Evaluation Of Teaching Policy.

B. Conduct of Reviews.

1. The University of Minnesota requires peer review of teaching for:
   a. All tenure-track faculty.
   b. Faculty being considered for promotion

2. In addition, the Center for Allied Programs recommends that the following personnel be reviewed regularly as outlined in the procedure below. This includes:
   a. Tenured faculty
   b. Full-time P&A faculty
   c. P&A faculty who are course directors.

3. Anyone involved in teaching that does not fit into any of the above categories may have their teaching reviewed if the program director determines that the review would be beneficial and feasible.

Reviews should occur regularly and in a timeframe that allows for completion of the review prior to the next annual performance review.

C. Selection of Peer Reviewers. The utilization of personnel as peer reviewers is managed by Program Directors as a part of workload. All qualified personnel may be asked to serve as a peer reviewer.

1. The reviewer must have at least 2 years of teaching experience that includes both face to face and online instruction, regardless of their rank or the rank of the instructor being reviewed.

2. No more than one ‘Year1’ review per year can be required of any reviewer.

3. Staff from the Center for Teaching and Learning may be used as reviewers in lieu of review by personnel in the Center for Allied Programs.

4. Instructors due for a peer review must submit names of three potential reviewers to their program director/center director (for program directors). When possible, the program director will select one of these submitted names. When not possible, or if the instructor does not agree with the choice of a peer reviewer by their program director, staff from the Center for Teaching and Learning will be used for the review.
5. Program directors must be reviewed by either qualified reviewers from a different department or staff from the Center for Teaching and Learning via the same selection process noted above.

D. Process of Peer Review:

1. Unless otherwise specified, only one of an instructor’s courses will be reviewed within a year.

2. Selection of a course for review should be a collaborative process between the instructor and the Program Director.

3. The procedure for review of a course (course content, Quality Matters) is not included in the Peer Review of Teaching.

4. Timeline for peer reviews:

   A. For Tenure-track faculty, a five year cycle will be used starting with the first year on track.
      1. In year 1 the reviewer will:
         a. Meet with the instructor to discuss the course and the instructor’s history with the course.
         b. Review the course syllabus.
         c. Attend at least one face-to-face classroom session, if available for that course.
         d. Access the online course to assess student/instructor interactions and methods of communication.
         e. Review assessments, course evaluations, and student performance records.
         f. At the end of Year 1, the reviewer will write the report with input from the instructor; the report then goes to the Program Director and the Instructor for use in the development of the action plan/Form F that will be implemented during the following years (Years 2 and 3). This report will be included in the annual review.
      2. In year 2 the instructor will meet with the reviewer to discuss changes that have been implemented and progress that has been made and new issues that have arisen.
      3. Year 3 will be a repeat of year 1.
      4. Year 4 will be a review of student performance and the instructor’s professional development plan, including when possible student performance on national certification examinations (depending on professional program). Professional development is defined as activities undertaken by an instructor to improve his/her teaching. These activities can include, but are not limited to, participation in conferences or workshops, consultation with staff from the Center for Teaching and Learning, or trying new approaches to teaching.
      5. Year 5 will include a Year 1 review of two courses by two different peer reviewers.
B. For P&A faculty, P & A course directors, non-tenure track faculty, and tenured faculty a three year cycle will be used.

1. In year 1 the reviewer will:
   a. Meet with the instructor to discuss the course and the instructor’s history with the course.
   b. Review the course syllabus.
   c. Attend at least one face-to-face classroom session.
   d. Access the online course to assess student/instructor interactions and methods of communication.
   e. Review assessments, course evaluations, and student performance records.
   f. At the end of Year 1, the instructor and the reviewer will write the action plan that will be implemented during the following year. A copy of the action plan will be sent to the Program Director for inclusion in the annual review.

2. In year 2 the instructor will meet with the reviewer to discuss changes that have been implemented and progress that has been made and new issues that have arisen.

3. Year 3 will be a repeat of year 2.
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