A good system (practice) of peer review should be organized around

- **Multiple Sources**
  - Instructors
  - Colleagues
  - Administrators
  - Students

- **Multiple Methods**
  - Narrative documents (teaching philosophy, letters of recommendation)
  - Course Materials/Student work
  - Ratings/rankings (course evals, observation checklists)
  - Observations
  - Counts (numbers of theses)
  - Interviews

- **Multiple Points in Time**

- **Constructive Alignment**
  - “Identification of the teaching practice we wish to see should be aligned with the ways in which we try to develop teaching and the ways we assess it”¹

---

Model 1: Department-based Mentorship

**Overview:** Department of Underwater Surgery has developed a peer mentoring program for new tenure-track faculty (TTF).

TTF are assigned a mentorship team (MT) upon hire. Mentorship team consists of:
- 2 members selected by department chair
- 1 member selected by TTF

The mentorship team is responsible for guiding the faculty member through the process of achieving tenure and promotion by focusing primarily on teaching
- MTs observe TTF twice/semester until T & P (6 observations/semester)
- observation process includes
  - 2-way sharing of the goals of the class period between the mentor and new faculty member
  - follow-up discussion
  - written report for TTF portfolio
- Dept. Chair to observe once each semester
  - Observations should be formative (a sharing of exemplary teaching processes as well as ideas/suggestions for improvement)
  - summative (a report of the progress toward exemplary teaching of each new faculty member)
- Includes informal and collegial opportunities to discuss successes and challenges
- Includes formal feedback annually that synthesizes all above considerations
Peer Mentoring Models

Model 2: FAS-Track (Faculty Achieving Success)

Overview: New faculty (including clinical and adjunct) enter a college-wide community designed to

- foster success
- develop a support system, and
- acclimate the new professoriate to life at BigTimeU.

Program description:
New faculty (adjuncts to full professors) enter the program upon hire. Process will be slightly different for different types of faculty, but have the following common characteristics:

- All faculty are invited to 2 social events per semester.
- All incoming faculty are assigned a mentor team (of at least 2).
  - Primary mentor is within the department and meets with mentee at least once monthly.
  - Secondary mentor is from within the college, but outside the discipline. For instance, the incoming research instructor for Supply Chain Management will be paired with the research instructor in Economics, perhaps.
- Department chair observes three times in the first semester – all informal and non-evaluative. All non-evaluative observations are “drop-in” observations without a discussion of the class period in advance (true for mentor team as well). Discussion occurs following, but no write-up. There is one formal evaluation in the second semester.
- College hosts a series of elective workshops the week prior to the beginning of classes each semester designed to attract a mix of faculty from various discipline but may be tailored to specific faculty types (e.g., clinical, pre-tenure)
- College hosts 2 “brown bag” discussions designed to spark discussion around areas of research interest and provide means for collaborative ventures.

Variable component

- Tenure track faculty have an additional mentor who serves on tenure committee.
  - Mentor team will remain with the mentee throughout the tenure/promotion process.
  - Mentor team observes the mentee teach – but this is non-evaluative for the first 2 years.
  - First evaluation comes during the mid-tenure review process of the third year.
Peer Mentoring Models

Model 3: Self-regulated Program

Overview: This program allows faculty freedom to explore options and possibilities regarding the topics they find most interesting and necessary. Neither expectations nor support in this program are specific, rather they are loosely defined and fluid.

Absolutes:

• Through negotiation with department chair and dean, faculty have a voice in how much time is spent in research, teaching, and service each academic year.
• Each aspect (research, teaching, service) will have a unique set of defined expectations at the end of the academic year.
• All TTF experience a third year review with department chair – where teaching, research, and service are evaluated.

Other details:

• Teaching is based solely student evaluations because there is no formal mentoring committee.
• Faculty are encouraged to participate in teaching squares: 4 faculty members from different disciplines (all volunteers) observe other faculty within the square twice each semester for a year. Focus is on how people are interacting with each other – not on content.
• Faculty are encouraged to visit the Center for Teaching and Learning throughout their career, but especially during the tenure process.
• Faculty are encouraged to participate in Faculty Writing Circles to help increase publication output.
Table 3.1  Possible Categories and Characteristics to be Assessed in Peer Review of Teaching Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Content Knowledge      | * Mastery/accuracy  
* Appropriate selection  
* Currency  
* Breadth—knowledgeable of other fields and perspectives  
* Tolerance of diverse points of view                           |
| Course Design          | * Appropriate challenge  
* Clarity of goals and objectives  
* Alignment with unit curriculum  
* Inclusive of motivational considerations                           |
| Teaching Methods       | * Worthwhile activities  
* Variety of approaches  
* Clarity and organization  
* Effective speaking skills  
* Effective student interaction skills  
* Accommodating of disabilities                           |
| Student Communication  | * Accessibility to students  
* Clarity  
* Responsiveness                           |
| Assessment             | * Appropriate design of tests, performance tasks  
* Alignment of assessment and goals  
* High level of cognitive challenge  
* Clear, appropriate grading criteria  
* High overall standards                           |
| Materials              | * Suitability  
* Appropriateness  
* Currency  
* Alignment with course goals  
* Thoroughness, depth  
* Creativity  
* Editing                           |
| Use of Technology      | * Appropriate use of medium  
* Technological functionality  
* Interactivity  
* Attractiveness of design  
* Alignment with course goals                           |
| Student Learning Results| * Performance  
* Impact  
* Engagement                           |

continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Department/School/Nation</td>
<td>* Quality of contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Quantity of contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>* Based on important problems or issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Appropriateness of research methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Quality of data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Clarity of presentation of findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Development</td>
<td>* Reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Extent of participation in activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring, Advising</td>
<td>* Accessibility to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Quality of advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Knowledge of options and resources for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contexts (field-based teaching, service-learning, team teaching)</td>
<td>* Modeling of rapport with patients/clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Quality of relationship with onsite preceptor/supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Collaboration with co-teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3  Possible Sources of Evidence for Assessing Selected Categories of Teaching Performance in Peer Review of Teaching Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Possible Source of Peer Review Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>• Examination of syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examination of course materials and tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom observation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scholarly record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Design</td>
<td>• Examination of syllabus and materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philosophy of teaching statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>• Classroom observation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examination of course materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examination of student ratings scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Record of teaching awards or honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Communication</td>
<td>• Examination of student ratings scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Classroom observation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Samples of emails, letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>• Examination of tests or performance tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Samples of comments on graded work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student ratings scores on assessment items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>• Examination of materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Technology</td>
<td>• Examination of electronic components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student ratings scores on these components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Results</td>
<td>• Examination of graded work or products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Comparisons on normed scales, if available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reports of instructors in related areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student ratings scores on related items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership in Department/School/Nation</td>
<td>• CV documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Awards or testimony of colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>• CV documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Print products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Honors or awards for this work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Development</td>
<td>• Philosophy of teaching statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other reflective documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CV record of participation in development activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring, Advising</td>
<td>• Documentation of advising record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sample of communications with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student ratings scores on related items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Records of advisee achievements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Contexts (field-based teaching, service-learning, team teaching)</td>
<td>• Sample of communications with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site observation records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Examination of materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Review of the Syllabus:  
The Course Described by the Document

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.  
For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currency of content</th>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit within the curriculum</th>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of challenge</th>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pacing

- Is the course calendar realistic?
- Has the instructor selected a reasonable amount of content for the time allotted?
- Are the due dates for assignments distributed well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Testing and grading

- Do students receive frequent feedback?
- Are grading policies fair and appropriate for the goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Student-centeredness

- Do office hours or other information portray that the instructor is accessible for help?
- Are other resources available to the student?
- Do activities show a concern for active student engagement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceeds level of expected qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on all qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on most qualities</th>
<th>Meets level on some qualities</th>
<th>Meets no/few expected qualities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Other

---