

## PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

**Unit:** Lundquist College of Business

**Previous version approved:** November 2022

**Faculty approved:** May 22, 2024

**Dean's revision received by OtP:** June 10, 2024

**Date of OtP approval:** December 10, 2024

*Note: Black text in this document indicates policy template language. Blue text indicates text added by the unit.*

### I. 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 are not required to have annual peer reviews. Peer reviews may be conducted for Pro Tem faculty when warranted at the unit's discretion. For instance, a Pro Tem peer review might be warranted if there are specific concerns or when a longer-term appointment is being considered.
- 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.

### II. THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

#### A. 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.

## **B. Template for review**

The College has adopted a peer review template that should be used for all official reviews for the purpose of evaluation of teaching for personnel and promotion files. This template is available as an appendix to this document.

## **C. Scope of review**

A mutually agreed upon date for one class observation during the term should be arranged between the reviewer and reviewee. Before the scheduled observation date, the reviewee should supply the following: 1) *a list of developmental activities completed since the last peer review*; 2) *suggested areas of focus for feedback during the current review*; 3) course materials, which must include the syllabus. Additional materials may include but are not limited to lecture slides for the observation day, a sample assignment, a sample exam, and access to external sites used. Alternatively, providing access to the course on Canvas, clearly labelled and easily identifiable, may substitute for the provision of these materials.

For online classes, the observation should focus on the equivalent of one class session (see section III.D.2d).

# **III. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF REVIEWS**

## **A. Organization**

At the beginning of Fall term, the Dean's office provides Department Heads with a list of faculty members who require reviews during the upcoming academic year, based on the UO policy for review frequency outlined in the preamble of this document. For each faculty member listed, the Department Head or a designated representative selects an appropriate reviewer, considering the reviewer's relative rank (see IIIB below) and subject matter expertise.

Faculty members should be notified at the beginning of the term whether they will undergo a peer review and who the appointed reviewer will be. If the reviewer identifies serious teaching quality issues during the observation, they are required to report these findings immediately to the Department Head. This enables the Department Head to intervene in a timely manner to address the concerns.

Each department head or designee is responsible for ensuring that the review is conducted within the academic year and that the results, along with any interventions, are documented and submitted to the Dean's Office.

The Dean's Office maintains an updated record of all required reviews for the academic year and archives completed reviews. These records are used for subsequent faculty evaluations and considerations in promotion cases.

## **B. Personnel**

Evaluators of tenure-track faculty should be tenured and hold the same or higher academic rank as the faculty member being evaluated. For non-tenure-track faculty, it is recommended that evaluators possess the same or a higher rank than the faculty member being evaluated.

## **C. 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).

## **D. Role of Reviewee**

- 1. Procedure for Conducting Evaluative Peer Reviews of Teaching for Tenure-Track Faculty (TTF) and Career Faculty (In-Person Classes):**
  - a) **Initiation:** At the beginning of fall term, the Dean's Office sends each Department Head a list of faculty members requiring reviews for the coming academic year.
  - b) **Assignment of Reviewers:** The Department Head or designee, in consultation with the reviewee, assigns a reviewer of the appropriate rank for each listed faculty member. The list of assigned reviewers is then submitted to the Dean's Office.
  - c) **Notification and Preparation:** The Department Head or designee notifies both the reviewee and the reviewer about the requirement for a peer review and provides them with a copy of the peer review template.
  - d) **Scheduling Observation:** The reviewee and reviewer set a mutually agreeable date for the classroom observation.
  - e) **Conducting Observation:** For face-to-face courses, the observation should occur on the scheduled date. An entire class period is preferred, but the observation should not be shorter than one hour. Reviewers may use any form to organize their observations, but only the "Lundquist College Peer Evaluation Official Form" found in the appendix should be submitted.
  - f) **Preparation by Reviewee:** Prior to the observation, the reviewee should provide: *1) a list of developmental activities completed since last review; 2) areas of focus for feedback during current review; 3) course materials, including the syllabus and possibly additional materials such as lecture slides, sample assignments, sample exams, or access to external sites used.* Note: Providing access to the course on Canvas can substitute for physical materials if the session is clearly labelled and easy to identify.

- g) **Review Completion and Discussion:** After the review, the reviewer provides a copy to the reviewee and arranges a meeting to discuss the evaluation. The review should be signed and dated by both parties, or the reviewer can cc: the reviewee in an email submitting the review to the Dean's Office ([LundquistHR@uoregon.edu](mailto:LundquistHR@uoregon.edu)). The review will then be archived in the reviewee's personnel file. Note: Any factual errors may be corrected post-discussion, but the content should otherwise remain unchanged.
- h) **Additional Note:** All peer reviews conducted using this procedure are considered evaluative, in conjunction with other materials as sources of teaching quality, and appropriate for consideration in promotion files, periodic faculty reviews, and contract renewals.

2. **Differences in Procedure when Conducting Evaluative Peer Reviews of Teaching for TTF and Career (online courses):**

Below are the steps specific to peer reviews of online courses. All other steps remain identical to the in-person review procedure.

- a) **Online Course Review (replaces 1e from in-person procedure):** The course review should be conducted on a scheduled date agreed on by the reviewer and reviewee, or within a designated week. Reviewee should specify which module(s) or equivalent sections of the course they wish to have reviewed. Reviewers should limit their assessment to the designated content, which should approximate the content covered in one face-to-face class session.

Although reviewers may use any form to organize their observations, only the "Lundquist College Peer Evaluation Official Form," available in the appendix should be submitted.

- b) **Preparation by Reviewee (replaces 1f from in-person procedure):** Prior to the scheduled observation date, the reviewee has two options:
- i) Add the reviewer as a "Learning Assistant" to the Canvas course site and set a date for course access.
- ii) Create a sandbox site, add the reviewer as a grader, set a date for course access, and add the following to the sandbox site: i) syllabus; ii) the specific module(s) or equivalent portion(s) of the course they would like to be reviewed; iii) the course home page; iv) the "Start Here" or other module(s) used to orient students to the course; v) samples of course announcements or other evidence of engagement with students such as a welcome video or sample replies to discussions.

- c) For assistance creating a sandbox site or adding the specified content, contact George Reese ([greese@uoregon.edu](mailto:greese@uoregon.edu)), the Lundquist College Instructional Designer.

### 3. Developmental Peer Reviews of Teaching for TTF and Career

Faculty members may request additional peer reviews that are conducted solely for the purpose of constructive and helpful feedback to the instructor (developmental reviews). Such reviews should be arranged and conducted separately from evaluative reviews. Importantly, while developmental reviews will not be part of the reviewee's personnel file nor used directly in promotion packets, the reviewee may use evidence from these reviews to demonstrate engaged teaching during the promotion and annual review process.

From the perspective of the reviewer, conducting either evaluative or developmental reviews will be recognized as a service to the Department and College.

## APPENDIX

### Peer Review Template 2024-2025

Reviewers: Please turn in the completed form to LundquistHR@uoregon.edu. In your email attaching the completed form, please indicate that you have discussed the review with the reviewee and cc: them on the email. Thank you!

#### Instructions

Please populate the blank column at the right-hand side of the template and in the boxes labelled “Examples Observed” and “Recommendations”.

#### Canvas Use:

Because Canvas use is an expectation of the Academic Council, we recommend that every peer reviewer scan the course’s Canvas site. Prompts of what to look for are below. To accomplish this the faculty member under review should add their reviewer to the site in the role “Admin Staff” and unenroll them when the review is submitted.

#### Face to face:

For face-to-face, classroom-based courses, reviewers will need to ensure that their physical presence in the classroom complies with the room’s maximum occupancy.

#### Remote:

Remote courses meet during their scheduled class meeting times and at least half of that time must be spent in structured, planned content delivery and discussion. Faculty under review should supply reviewers a Zoom link to a live session. Reviewers should be introduced or introduce themselves. (For example, “Professor X is joining us today because UO faculty have regular occasions to get feedback from our colleagues. Welcome Professor X! When we split into Breakout Rooms, you may find Professor X in yours—I want to ensure she sees all parts of this meeting. I hope you can proceed as normal.”) Reviewers ideally would be camera on at least for this introduction.

#### Online:

Online courses do not require students to attend live, synchronous meetings. Lectures are typically pre-recorded and “chunked” into small media components. Student engagement is built into the Canvas course site with elements such as discussions forums, group work, peer review, projects, presentations, formative assessments, and assignments, following [UOCC guidelines for online classes](#) and the [additional guidelines for graduate online courses](#). Review of an online course should focus on one module (or the equivalent of one class session’s activities) within the Canvas course site, along with organizational and context-setting elements of the course, such as Announcements, Discussions, and the Welcome module. The course announcement feature may be used to introduce the reviewer (for example, “Please welcome Professor X who will join us this week as we work through Module Y.”)

#### Professional, Inclusive, Engaged, and Research-Informed Practices:

Many teaching practices are examples of UO’s broad standards of teaching quality. For a long list of practices you might consider for each standard, visit: <https://teaching.uoregon.edu/resources/professional-inclusive-engaged-and-research-informed-teaching-uo>

## COURSE OBSERVATION CONTEXT

### BASIC INFORMATION

Instructor Name	
Reviewer Name	
Date of Review	

### COURSE CONTEXT

<b>Course Details</b>	Course Name and Number	
	Course Type ( <i>Elective, Required</i> )	
	Student Level and Major ( <i>First-year majors, Senior non-majors</i> )	
<b>Course Design</b>	Did the instructor design the course themselves? <i>Yes / No</i>	
	Is it a shared syllabus/curriculum used across multiple sections? <i>Yes / No</i>	
<b>Teaching Modality</b>	Face-to-face, Remote, Online/Asynchronous	
<b>Attendance</b>	# of students in attendance ( <i>if in person or remote</i> )	
<b>Enrollment</b>	# of students enrolled	
<b>Pre-Observation Conversation</b>	If you had a conversation with the instructor prior to the observation, what did they ask for feedback about or note that they were working on?	

The University of Oregon defines teaching excellence as professional, inclusive, research informed, and engaged in reflective practice.

This template defines these broad standards through lettered “conditions” and provides an abbreviated list of teaching practices as examples of each condition (For more information on the origins of these definitions, please visit the Provost’s “[Revising UO’s Teaching Evaluations](#)” webpage.) We hope these examples draw attention to concrete practices, even as we know there are many more examples than what’s listed.

You can use this template to “check off” practices you observe, add in any notes you wish to make, and use the reflective questions after each table to convey feedback.

Find out more about using this Peer Review Template as part of the peer observation process by visiting the [Peer Review of Teaching webpage](#).

## PROFESSIONAL TEACHING

### Professional Teaching Standard used by evaluators (e.g., department heads)

A. Readily available, coherently organized, and high-quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading, and class policy expectations.

- Course materials are readily available and easily accessible.**
- Course materials are organized into an obvious, explicit, and logical framework.**  
*For example:*
  - *Canvas is organized using modules or pages, with the beginning of each module or page outlining the learning objectives, activities to complete, and content to engage.*
  - *Lesson outlines (learning objectives, key topics, etc.) are given at the beginning of class, verbally and visually.*
- Course syllabus is on Canvas and details:**
  - *Learning objectives.*
  - *Grade and absence policies.*
- Instructions and guidelines are transparent**, explaining the *criteria for success in the course*.
  - *Syllabus*
  - *Canvas modules and pages*
  - *Class slides and handouts*

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.

*Where to look: Canvas Modules or Pages, Syllabus*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.

B. Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback.

The instructor:

**Invites student questions and participation through multiple modes.**

*For example:*

- In class*
- Canvas discussion boards*
- Canvas assignments*

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.

*Where to look: Canvas Announcements, Class Observations*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.

C. Students' activities in and out of class are designed and organized to maximize student learning.

The instructor:

**Employs methods (activities, examples, audio-visual aids) broken down into steps to “scaffold” student learning.**

*For example:*

- In class.*
- Canvas discussion boards.*
- Canvas assignments.*

**Provides necessary materials and adequate time for completion of activities.**

*For example:*

- In class.*
- Canvas discussion boards.*
- Canvas assignments.*

**Uses students' time (before, during, and after 'live' class time) effectively to maximize learning.**

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.</p> <p><i>Where to look: Canvas Assignments, Class Observation, Asynchronous Recordings</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.</p>
---	---

## INCLUSIVE TEACHING

### Inclusive Teaching Standard used by evaluators (e.g., department heads)

A. Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation is valued.

The instructor:

- Has designed the course materials to be accessible and welcoming.**

*For example:*

- *Photos, examples, and other representations reflect diverse social identities and experiences.*
  - *There are multiple ways to access materials, such as audio and/or visual media, and/or text.*

- Has designed multiple options for student engagement.**

*For example, there are opportunities for student:*

- *Choice.*
  - *Connection to course goals.*
  - *Self-assessment and reflection.*

- Has designed multiple options for students to demonstrate their learning.**

*For example, students might communicate learning through their choice of:*

- *Audio.*
  - *Visual.*
  - *Text.*

- Encourages and facilitates respectful dialogue, discussion, and student-student interaction for all students.**

*For example:*

- *Structures activities with clear tasks that promote equal participation.*
  - *Helps people find partners or create groups.*
  - *Ensures there are explicit expectations or guidelines for interaction.*

- Formats materials (Canvas, slides, documents, etc.) accessibly** using:
  - *Headings.*
  - *Readable fonts.*
  - *Alt-text.*
- Uses captions and/or transcripts for videos and audio clips.**

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards. In particular, provide specific examples for how the instructor helps all students participate fully and expresses the value of that participation.

*Where to look: Class Observation, Asynchronous Recordings, Canvas Discussion Forums*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.

B. The content of the course reflects the diversity of the field's practitioners, the contested and evolving status of knowledge, the value of academic questions beyond the academy and of lived experience as evidence, and/or other efforts to help students see themselves in the work of the course.

The instructor:

- Has chosen course content that reflects diversity in the field or discipline.**

*Including:*

  - *In the identities of the scholars/practitioners/creators included on the syllabus*
  - *Different perspectives on or approaches to issues/methods*
- Connects class content...**
  - *To students' prior knowledge or experience*
  - *To current events.*
  - *To real-world phenomena*
  - *To other disciplines.*
  - *To prior class lessons, assignments, or readings*

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Please provide specific example of how the course content reflects the diversity of the field and how the instructor helps students see themselves in the work of the course.</p> <p><i>Where to look: Syllabus, Assignments, Class Observation, Asynchronous Recordings</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.</p>
---	---

#### Other aspects of inclusive teaching

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies inclusive teaching standards.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote inclusive teaching.</p>
--	--

## ENGAGED TEACHING

### Engaged Teaching Standard used by evaluators (e.g., department heads)

Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of course content and pedagogy.

The instructor:

- Regularly revises the course**
- Participates in professional teaching development workshops or other activities**
- Engages in workshops and/or conferences on teaching and learning**

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies engaged teaching standards.

*How to Assess: Discussion with instructor*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will help them meaningfully deepen their teaching engagement as it relates to the course.

## RESEARCH-INFORMED TEACHING

### Research-Informed Teaching Standard used by evaluators (e.g., department heads)

A. Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.

The instructor:

**Has developed course content:**

*By drawing on:*

- Relevant scholarly works.*
- Current research/developments.*

**Invites students into the subject matter.**

*For example, through:*

- Storytelling.*
- Compelling case studies.*
- Explicit commentary about the skills, values, or formation of the field/discipline.*

**Shows how disciplinary experts approach problems:**

*Either by:*

- modeling the process.*
- explicitly guiding students through it.*

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.

*Where to look: Canvas; Course Observation, Asynchronous recordings*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.

B. Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; these goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students.

The instructor:

**Aligns course content (knowledge, skills, or abilities) and engagement activities with relevant learning objectives.**

*For example, through:*

- Assignments.*
- Class sessions or modules.*
- The overall course.*
- Relevant department or university core education objectives.*

**Evaluates students based on these objectives**

**Examples observed:** Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.

*Where to look: Discussion with instructor; course observation; assignments*

**Recommendations:** Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.

C. Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course.

The instructor:

**Incorporates low-stakes assessment to help students gauge their learning.**

*For example, through:*

- Polling questions.*
- Short Canvas quizzes.*
- One-minute papers.*
- Muddiest point statements.*
- Questions embedded in lecture content.*
- End of week or module metacognitive reflections.*

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.</p> <p><i>Where to look: Discussion with instructor; Canvas</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.</p>
---	---

D. Instruction engages, challenges, and supports students.

The instructor:

- Asks a variety of types of questions (factual, application, critical, etc.).**
- Allots time for students to respond to/discuss questions in class or in postings such as discussion boards.**
- Teaches the class at a level appropriate for most students.**
- Actively engages students in the learning process.**
- Challenges students.**
- Supports students' learning.**

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies these standards.</p> <p><i>Where to look: Discussion with instructor; course observation; assignments</i></p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote this standard.</p>
--	---

Other aspects of research-informed teaching

<p><b>Examples observed:</b> Provide specific examples of how the instructor satisfies research-informed teaching standards.</p>	<p><b>Recommendations:</b> Provide specific recommendations to the instructor being reviewed that will promote research-informed teaching.</p>
--	--

#### REVIEW MATERIALS AND INTERACTION

<b>Review Materials</b>	What materials, beyond the in-class observation and Canvas site, did you consider? (e.g., additional course material, assignment, previous peer review of teaching)	
<b>Canvas Site Review</b>	What parts of the Canvas class site did you review? (Select all that apply: Welcome Module, Home Page, Syllabus, Discussion Board, Announcements, Assignments, Videos, Weekly Modules, etc.)	
<b>Faculty Interaction</b>	When did you meet with the faculty member to discuss this review?	

#### REVIEW FEEDBACK AND FOLLOW-UP

<b>Instructor's Feedback Opportunity</b>	Has the instructor under review had an opportunity to review, discuss, and suggest possible revisions to this report? <i>Yes / No</i>	
<b>Prioritized Issues for Discussion</b>	What issues raised in this report would the instructor being reviewed prioritize for discussion at their next review?	

#### ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

<b>Observations on Teaching and Learning</b>	Please provide detailed observations on the instructor's teaching methods, student engagement, and learning outcomes observed.	
<b>Recommendations for Improvement</b>	Based on your review, what specific recommendations can you make for the instructor to improve their teaching?	
<b>Overall Impression and Summary</b>	Provide a brief overall impression of the course and the teaching effectiveness of the instructor.	

#### REVIEW SIGNATURES

<b>Reviewer's signature confirming the accuracy and completeness of the review</b>	
<b>Date of Signature</b>	

<b>Reviewee's signature acknowledging they have seen the final version of the review</b>	
<b>Date of Signature</b>	