

**DATA LINK INSTITUTE
OF BUSINESS AND TECHNOLOGY
(DLIBT)**



**PEER AND PROFESSIONAL REVIEW
POLICY**

(2021)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Data Link Institute of Business and Technology (DLIBT) is committed to high-quality teaching that supports and encourages student learning and experience. Student rating scores and evaluative narrative comments are important components of this evaluation process. In addition, peer review of teaching provides a valuable professional assessment of a colleague's teaching effectiveness.

Faculty colleagues and Administrative Staff are uniquely qualified to assess a faculty member's knowledge, of course, content; the appropriateness of course objectives, assignments, examinations, learning environments, and teaching strategies; and the assessment of student achievement.

2.0 PEER REVIEW POLICY RATIONALE

Peer review is a development activity that focuses on improving, developing and sharing aspects of performance through non-judgmental peer input or advice.

The review focuses on practice (i.e. what is observed) rather than the individual (i.e. the person).

The benefits of this process:

- Help Faculty examines their teaching for purposes of self-improvement
- Recognition of aspects of teaching/assessing that is working well
- Identification by individual staff/teams of their development needs
- Dissemination of good practice amongst colleagues through dialogue on teaching practice
- Development of a supportive environment for the development of teaching skills
- Adding on to expertise, in addition, staff may wish to use evidence from their peer review when applying for promotion.

2.1 PEER REVIEW PROCESS

The guidelines to be adopted in the peer review process are as follows; two primary methods used by faculty colleagues and Administrative Staff when undertaking peer review:

- (1) Course material review and
- (2) Direct observation of instruction.

In evaluating teaching contributions and effectiveness, peer and professional evaluators may want to consider the range of courses taught, courses and programs developed, students advise, undergraduate research projects supervised, statement of teaching philosophy, and descriptions

of teaching innovations. Departments are encouraged to adjust their peer evaluation process to reflect the varying nature of course delivery systems (such as lab, seminar, online courses etc.)

3.0 COURSE MATERIAL REVIEW

A. Teaching Materials and Resources

Syllabus; textbooks; handouts; reading and reference lists; online materials and other supporting resources such as videotapes, CD-ROMS, computer software, and multimedia materials.

- Are learning objectives clear and appropriate?
- Are grading criteria clear and appropriate?
- Are course materials current and appropriate for meeting the learning objectives?
- Are course materials at an appropriate level of difficulty?
- Is the course well designed to meet the learning objectives?

B. Assignments, Projects, and Exams

- Are they appropriate for the learning objectives and course level?
- Do they coordinate with other course materials?
- Is there evidence that students gained an understanding of course content?
- Do the examinations assess an appropriate range of skills and knowledge?
- If electronic communication is used, is its use appropriate for the learning objectives and course level?

C. Samples of Student Work

- Does student work reflect a clear understanding of the assignments and course content?
- Is there evidence that students attained the desired learning objectives?
- Is instructor feedback clear and instructive?

4.0. DIRECT OBSERVATION OF INSTRUCTION

A. Policy for Peer Classroom Evaluation of Probationary Faculty

1. Each probationary faculty member (hereafter called “candidate”) shall be evaluated in the area of teaching effectiveness at least once a year.

2. At least two faculty members shall evaluate a candidate's teaching during each two year review period. Each department will develop a policy and procedure, specifying the frequency of evaluation and the process for selecting and assigning the evaluator.
3. Departments will determine the policy for setting observation visits which should be scheduled to assure that the visits occur on days where substantive teaching will occur not exams or review sessions.
4. Evaluations should take place during the 5th week or later in a semester to assure that the candidate has had an opportunity to establish rapport and that her/his students have had an adequate opportunity to become familiar with the candidates' standards and expectations, teaching style, etc.
5. Before each visitation, the candidate and the evaluator shall meet to (a) inform the evaluator of the candidate's objective(s) for the day and provide a copy of the syllabus and other relevant materials (b) provide the candidate with a copy of the Peer Observation Form to be used?
6. Evaluators are encouraged to compile descriptions of both content and process (i.e. Pedagogy) related to the stated objectives and to provide constructive suggestions. Evaluations should not infringe on the candidate's academic freedom or imply that there may be only one best way to teach.
7. Following each evaluation, the evaluator shall meet for a debriefing and informal feedback session. At this time, the candidate may decide that the class visited was atypical and wish it to be ignored, in which case s/he and the evaluator should mutually agree upon another visit. The follow-up visit must be documented and reported to the department.
8. The evaluator shall prepare a draft evaluation in narrative form. The narrative should include: (a) a review of course material; (b) an evaluation of how well the candidate achieved the objectives for the class; and (c) specific observations of effective classroom performance as outlined on the Peer Observation Form. In addition, the evaluator should provide constructive suggestions for improvement, if the evaluator thinks improvement is needed.

9. The evaluator shall provide the candidate with the draft so the candidate may react to it. The evaluator may, but need not, decide to revise the draft and review it again with the candidate. The final draft shall be signed by both the evaluator and the candidate, attesting that the latter has been provided with the evaluation and understands it. In addition, if the candidate disagrees with the evaluation s/he must indicate why s/he disagrees.
10. The signed evaluation shall be submitted to the Department for placement in the candidate's personnel file and use in reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions. The Peer Observation Form will be returned to the candidate who has the option of including it as part of the formal record.

4.1 POSSIBILITIES TO CONSIDER:

1. Prior to the classroom observation, the evaluator may wish to ask the candidate whether he or she would be open to the possibility of having the evaluator meet with the students in the class without the candidate present to gather additional feedback.
2. Departments may wish to ask a colleague from another department to participate in the classroom observation.
3. The candidate may wish to videotape classes and include the videotapes as part of the teaching portfolio.