

Guidelines for peer evaluation of teaching (8/15/18)

1. For those going up for **promotion and/or tenure**:
 - a. Existing policy is that at least 3 teaching peer evaluations (total) from at least two reviewers need to be made and entered into the P&T dossier.
 - b. Proposal is that such P&T evaluations would be made by someone of equal or higher in rank and tenure status than person being reviewed (regardless of track). However, efforts would be made to avoid other conflicts of interest. For example, assistant professors would not be asked to conduct official evaluations of other assistant professors who are likely to go up for promotion before they (the potential evaluator) do.
2. For **5-year post-tenure reviews**:
 - a. A minimum of 2 evaluations should be performed during the 5-year-period considered in the review, and entered into the faculty member's personnel file.
 - b. These should all be performed by faculty of equal or higher rank than those being evaluated.
3. Consistent with the minimum levels described above, in most cases **assistant professors** should be evaluated at least **annually**, and **associate and full** professors should be evaluated at least **every other year**.
4. Logistics
 - a. Evaluations should generally be for the **entire** class period (e.g., for the entire period for 50- and 80-minute class periods; for at least half of the period for class periods longer than 80 minutes).
 - b. The course syllabus and course handouts should be made **available** to the reviewer, to give the context of the session that is being observed.
 - c. A review of all of the course materials is **beyond the scope** of this evaluation policy, as it would likely cause undue burden. However, this may have its place, e.g., it could be done by DCG subcommittee at time of P&T, or as part of a program's curriculum review.
 - d. Faculty should have **advanced notice**, and some choice, on the reviewer and when the reviewer visits.
 - e. Timely **feedback** should be given to the faculty member, based on a standardized review form. Reviews are not anonymous.
 - f. Faculty and their DEOs will consult to ensure that reviews are performed by the appropriate peers at the appropriate frequency. The DEO may also determine when/if evaluations should be made at a higher frequency than the minimum. When deemed appropriate, reviewers may be solicited from other departments.
5. Evaluations should be made on faculty teaching both traditional and non-traditional courses (such as web-based/distance courses), as well as courses taught jointly with other faculty, as appropriate to their teaching assignments.
6. In addition to evaluations that are the focus of this policy, "**observational**" visits may also be conducted. These would be internal documents that are aimed at process improvement and collaboration, but would **not** become part of the faculty member's **personnel** file and hence would not be materials consulted at the time of formal reviews (P&T, reappointment, probationary, post-tenure annual, or 5-year reviews).
7. Faculty should be aware of university resources to improve teaching, such as those available through the UI Center for Teaching (<https://teach.its.uiowa.edu/>) and are encouraged to document activities undertaken.