A. Introduction

This document establishes guidelines for peer reviews of teaching for the Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI. Peer-review guidelines are established for two principal reasons:

- formative peer reviews support faculty members in becoming more effective in instruction, both in classroom or online delivery and in preparation for such delivery;
- summative peer reviews establish, in part, evidence of teaching performance so that the primary, unit, campus, and university committees can evaluate that performance in the promotion and tenure process.

These peer review guidelines must be considered as a flexible course of action to be carried out by individual departments. Results should be submitted to the school and other levels as required. An individual case may require alternate procedures as deemed necessary jointly by the faculty member and the department.

B. Rationale

• Peer review plays a critical role in promotion, tenure, and professional development.

Peer review is endemic in our academic careers. Faculty members often informally seek feedback from peers on their course topics, their teaching methods, and their outcomes. These requests are voluntary and not subject to evaluation for promotion, tenure, or financial compensation purposes.

The need for a more formal peer review process arises when a candidate applies for reappointment, promotion and/or tenure. At those times, the candidate’s teaching performance needs to be evaluated at the department, school, campus, and/or university levels.

According to the IUPUI P&T Guidelines, “Evidence of the quality of teaching and advising as evaluated by peers must be included” in such considerations (Reference: IUPUI Promotion and Tenure Dossiers Guidelines, current edition). It is in the interests of a candidate to receive peer reviews in order to document teaching performance. The department chair is responsible to facilitate this process and provide adequate orientation and guidance for faculty members.

C. Guidelines

• Peer review should be available to those who ask for it. It is encouraged for first- to third-year faculty members and candidates seeking promotion and/or tenure.

Peer review is helpful to all who teach, especially for new faculty members. Peer review is most productive when the faculty member requests it early in a teaching career. For this reason, it is recommended but not required that a formative peer review process take place within the first year of the faculty member’s teaching career. Both on-line and classroom performance and course materials must be fully reviewed, and the faculty member should receive feedback based on the peer reviewer's opinion. By starting the process in the first year, the faculty member has an opportunity to evaluate his/her performance, decide if the evaluation justifies further development, and if so, request a second-year evaluation. These first- and second-year evaluations are confidential and the property of the faculty
member unless the faculty member wishes to share them with the department for his/her annual review or other similar purposes.

The third-year peer review is summative so that the department can evaluate teaching performance in order to determine a recommendation for reappointment. Likewise, the peer review in support of promotion and/or tenure is summative. Final reports from summative reviews will be shared with the faculty member as well as the department and the school.

• **The School encourages development of departmental peer review guidelines.**

Departments should develop guidelines for reviewing teaching performance in both classroom-based and online courses. These guidelines should include:

- A definition of peer review
- A statement of the purposes for peer reviews
- A description of how the guidelines fit with school, campus, and university guidelines
- Information on methods and procedures including:
  - Number of times/semester peer review is required
  - Number of people involved in the peer review
  - Uses of outside observers (such as those from the Center for Teaching and Learning)
  - Establishment of clear criteria for evaluation
  - How reports of reviews will be used and shared with the faculty member, the department, the school, the campus, and the university.

In these guidelines, departments should also clarify that reviewers should typically hold a higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, although there may be occasions when the reviewer will hold the same rank.

• **The School supports and encourages peer review of faculty members for the purposes of self-development and for promotion and tenure.**

While taking into account departmentally developed guidelines, an individual faculty member and his/her chair shall mutually determine the procedure for the peer reviews. For improving teaching, external offices such as the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and the Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching (FACET) may be used. The IUPUI P&T Guidelines can serve as a resource for the faculty member and chair for initiating and continuing peer reviews.

• **Peer-reviews shall be initiated by the faculty member with a written description supplied to the department for comment.**

The department needs to be aware of the kinds and forms of ongoing peer review that may support promotion and tenure. Each formal peer review that could potentially be submitted in this process should be disclosed and recognized by the department.

**C. Summary**

This document provides School of Engineering and Technology guidelines for peer review for the purpose of promoting teaching enhancement and assisting in the promotion and tenure process. This document shall become effective upon the date adopted by the School Senate.
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