Tenure and Promotion Handbook

Faculty Manual §4.VII.E.5:
Peer Reviews of Teaching

[The dossier shall contain] peer reviews of the candidate's teaching. Peer reviews of teaching shall be independently prepared by three faculty members: (1) a tenured member of the candidate's department(s) selected by the candidate, (2) one other tenured member of the candidate's department(s) selected by the tenured members, and (3) a tenured member of the St. Olaf faculty, selected by the tenured members of the candidate's department(s) in consultation with the candidate. If there are not two tenured members of the department available to serve as peer reviewers, peer reviews may be prepared by tenured members of the candidate's Faculty or Faculties. In the case of a joint appointment, the initiators and the candidate shall confer in the selection of the peer reviewers to ensure that both of the candidate's departments contribute a review of the candidate's teaching. In the case of an interdisciplinary teaching assignment (identified as in Section 4.VII.F below), a designated reviewer of that assignment may be included among the peer reviewers, subject to conditions described in Section 4.VII.F below. The reviews shall address the candidate's contributions to student learning and development (Section 4.VI.B.1). Each review shall include evidence from a variety of sources, including an interview with the candidate about his or her teaching perspectives, practices and professional development; a sample of teaching materials prepared by the candidate; and at least two observations of the candidate's classroom instruction. [In cases where at least one-sixth of the candidate's teaching load is interdisciplinary, peer review <u>may</u> include peer review of the interdisciplinary teaching assignment. In cases where one-half of the load is interdisciplinary, peer review <u>must</u> include consideration of the interdisciplinary assignment] (Section 4.VII.F; see also Section 4.VII.E.5-7, 11-12).

1. Individuals who have access to this item:

- The initiator
- The candidate's Associate Dean
- The Dean of the College
- Members of the Tenure and Promotion Committee
- The President
- Members of the Board of Regents

2. Participants in preparing this item:

- *Candidate –*
  - Selects one tenured member of the department to serve as one of the three peer reviewers; in case of joint appointment, confers with initiators in the selection of the peer reviewers to ensure that both departments contribute a review of the candidate's teaching and that at least one of the peer reviewers is selected by the candidate.
  - Prepares portfolio of instructional materials for review, and is interviewed by each peer reviewer.
- *Initiator –*

  - Consults with tenured members of the department to select a tenured member of the department to serve as a second peer reviewer; consults with tenured members and with the candidate to select a tenured member of the St. Olaf faculty to serve as a third peer reviewer.
  - If there are not two tenured members of the department available to serve as peer reviewers, one or both of the peer reviewers may be selected from the candidate's Faculty or Faculties.
  - The third peer reviewer may be a member of the candidate's department (including the initiator) or may be a member of another department.
  - In cases of joint appointment, the initiators confer with one another, the tenured members, and the candidate in selecting peer reviewers that meet all the selection criteria specified in the *Faculty Manual*.
  - The initiator assists candidate and peer reviewers in determining which reviewers should observe which course(s) [see guidelines and suggestions below].
- *Peer reviewers* – Visit instructional sessions, review instructional materials, interview candidate, and prepare written reviews for dossier

3. Guidelines and suggestions:

- The arrangements for instructional observation should permit breadth in the reviewers' collective observation of the candidate's teaching, but without requiring too many visitors in any one course, lab, studio, or other setting. It is often more helpful to observe a single course or other instructional setting two or three times than to visit all settings only once. The initiator, candidate, and reviewers should consult to determine which course(s) and other instructional settings are most appropriate for each reviewer to observe, and then reviewers can schedule visits individually with the candidate.

- Peer reviewers who are also tenured members of the candidate's department may combine their statements in a single letter. addressing all categories of faculty work. However, the candidacy initiator shall write a separate statement of recommendation and rationale as described in 4.VII.E.12. If the Associate Dean is a member of the candidate's department, they shall also write a separate statement of recommendation and rationale as described in 4.VII.G.

- The content of the peer review should:
  - Begin by noting the titles of the courses visited and the dates of those visits.
  - Review the candidate's performance in relation to all five criteria within the category of "Contributions to student learning and development" (*FM* Section 4.VI.B.1.a-e).
  - Include a variety of evidence, drawn not only from the observation of instruction but also from the examination of instructional materials, interviews and conversations with the candidate, presentations or publications on teaching which the candidate may have prepared, and any other direct observations of the candidate's instructional behaviors.

Peer reviews of teaching are to be independent from student and alumni reviews of teaching. Peer reviewers who are also tenured members of the department should complete their peer reviews prior to reading the student reviews.

- The teaching observations should not provide a detailed accounting on the observed class periods.

- Recommended length: 750 – 1,000 words.

- Peer reviewers should prepare by reading the guidelines on peer reviews at http://wp.stolaf.edu/doc/t-p/