

1 **Department of Applied Engineering and Technology Management**

2 **Peer Evaluation of Teaching Policy**

3 Effective February 25, 2019

4 **Rationale and Principles**

5 The understanding of a colleague's teaching performance grows primarily from informal collegial
6 interaction.

7 Peer evaluation is central to faculty primary authority regarding promotion, tenure, and evaluation. Peer
8 evaluation is important for collegiality and disciplinary coherence. Peer evaluation promotes the
9 advancement of knowledge and promotes the faculty primary domains of teaching, scholarship, and
10 service. Peer evaluation promotes quality, identifies individuals for meritorious recognition, and guides
11 faculty development.

12 Peer evaluation of teaching is one aspect of the evaluation of the teaching domain. This policy seeks to
13 provide both (a) the recognition of exemplary teaching attributes and (b) provide formative feedback for
14 future faculty development. Exemplary performance is by definition benchmarkable, and transferable to
15 similar situations, e.g., may be utilized by other faculty members in suitable situations. The analysis of
16 performance helps guide continuing faculty development for the individual faculty member and the entire
17 faculty.

18 This policy focuses on the *Peer Evaluation* portion of the Department's *Promotion, Tenure, and*
19 *Evaluation Policy* (PT&E). Though there will be communality with other items in the PT&E *Enumerated*
20 *Value of Teaching Accomplishments* table, this policy focuses on attributes not directly addressed by other
21 items in the table.

22 **Procedure**

23 The personnel committee will meet with the department chairperson early in the fall semester to
24 determine who needs to be evaluated and the timeline for completing the evaluation. Each faculty
25 member shall have a peer evaluation of teaching completed by the personnel committee for each
26 evaluation period, e.g. annually for instructors and tenure-track, and biennially for those on biennial
27 review. Each member of the personnel committee shall complete the accompanying table. A summary of
28 the table will be provided to the faculty member and the department chairperson along with a vote of the
29 overall rating assigned. This rating determines the enumerated peer evaluation value in the PT&E policy.
30 All faculty are reminded that much of the information required for completing the accompanying table
31 should be available to the personnel committee through the FAD.

32 **Evaluation table.** The following table conceptually displays the attribute groupings and the evaluation
33 intents. *Exemplars* are exemplary teaching attributes and best practices that other faculty members can
34 emulate. *Development Opportunities* are attributes and practices where the faculty member could benefit
35 from further development and from benchmarking others. Non-numerical, descriptive statements are to be
36 made for each cell of the table.

37

Attribute Groups	Exemplars	Development Opportunities
Content: Alignment of program/course description, objectives, and performance indicators. Appropriate level (freshman-doctorate) and rigor.		
Instruction: Methods and conditions appropriate to content, objectives, and performance indicators. Appropriate detail, clarity, and sequencing.		
Evaluation: Evaluation methods, weighting, and rigor aligned with content and instruction. Appropriate nature of feedback and timeliness of feedback to students.		
Student Success: Student performance and other success metrics. Student involvement in professional and student organizations and with the community.		
Materials: appropriate content and use of text, web site, and other instructional materials and aids.		
Student relations: Appropriate demeanor and interaction with students (in class, in office, via email, etc.).		
Management: Appropriate course management and procedures. Instructional schedule and due dates. Office hours and availability.		

38

39 **Peer evaluation.** Based on the statements in the table, an overall peer evaluation rating will be
40 assigned. The ratings and their descriptions follow.

- 41 • Sustained: Best practices have not been appropriately applied to all attribute groups. For the
42 majority of attribute groups, significant development is recommended.
- 43 • Substantial: The faculty member applies best practices across all attribute groups. For some
44 attribute groups, there are exemplars to be shared with other faculty members; for other
45 groups, further development is recommended.
- 46 • Excellent: Across all attribute groups, there is a long-term consistent trend of development.
47 There are many exemplars to be shared with others. Most development opportunities concern
48 fine-tuning.