

Peer Evaluation Guidelines  
from old Faculty Handbook.

Still in effect 2018-2019

**APPENDIX B. PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS****(Effective Fall 2007)**

The Duquesne University tenure and promotion guidelines stress effectiveness in teaching as a criterion for retention and advancement. In the absence of solid evidence of an instructor's teaching effectiveness, publication too often becomes the only criterion for promotion. To document the effectiveness of an individual instructor's teaching, the University uses two forms of evaluation: student evaluation — Student Evaluation Survey (previously known as TEQs) — and formal peer evaluation.

***Frequency of Peer Evaluation***

1. Tenure track faculty are required to receive at least one peer review (two visits per evaluation) every academic year with a minimum of five evaluations prior to the tenure review. [Tenure track faculty applying early for tenure as a result of prior teaching experience are required to have a minimum of four evaluations prior to the tenure review.]
2. Non-tenure track faculty are required to receive at least one peer review (two visits per evaluation) each academic year.
3. Tenured faculty who are anticipating applying for promotion to professor should have at least five peer evaluations after promotion to associate professor.
4. Tenured faculty who are not anticipating applying for promotion are encouraged to receive one peer review every other academic year.
5. Faculty members may request additional peer evaluations during the academic year.
6. A formal remedial process may be initiated for instructors experiencing serious problems in teaching and posing significant problems for students. The process might be initiated by any variety of evidence, student or peer based. Upon recommendation of a Dean, the Provost will appoint not more than three members of the discipline to conduct peer evaluations for formative purposes. The evaluators will include at least one member of the instructor's school or department and two other faculty members. The members of the committee will not only visit classes, but also speak with the faculty member about problems encountered in teaching. The Provost will pursue avenues of remediation with administrators from the instructor's division.

***Procedure for Initiating Peer Reviews***

1. By September 1, the dean/chair notifies tenure track faculty members that formal peer evaluation of one course is required during the academic year. The dean/chair notifies non-tenure track faculty members that formal peer evaluation of one course is required during the academic year. The dean/chair gives the faculty members a list of the tenured or eligible non-tenure track full-time faculty members in the college/school who are available for peer review. Full-time non-tenure track faculty who have completed five consecutive years of full-time appointment, are eligible to serve as peer reviewers for other non-tenure track faculty.
2. By October 1 (for Fall term), by February 1 (for Spring term), or by May 15 (for Summer term), the faculty member identifies the particular course or courses to be evaluated. From the list provided by the dean/chair, the faculty member gives the dean/chair the names of at least three faculty members to serve as peer reviewers.
3. For third year review, the faculty member should have at least two different peer reviewers.

Peer Evaluation Guidelines  
from old Faculty Handbook.

Still in effect 2018-2019

4. For tenure review, the faculty member should have at least four different peer reviewers.
5. The candidate and dean/chair have the prerogative to expand the pool of potential reviewers to suitable full-time tenured or eligible non-tenure track faculty members from a different department or college/school to serve as a peer reviewer.

### ***Procedure for Administering Peer Reviews***

1. The faculty member being reviewed meets with the peer reviewer prior to the evaluation. During the meeting, the faculty member submits relevant course materials that should include the syllabus. Prior to the first visit, the reviewer and faculty member meet to discuss the course as a whole, and how representative sessions fit with the whole. In addition, the person being reviewed can use this opportunity to explain any unusual dimensions of the course (e.g., a syllabus to which the faculty member had no input). During the meeting, the peer reviewer and the faculty member agree on the date and time of the first visit.
2. A second visit to the same class will be unannounced. To insure that the unannounced visit is productive, the faculty member should alert the peer reviewer of inappropriate dates.
3. Each class visit should be at least 50 minutes to allow a thorough understanding of teaching activities and the learning environment.
4. The peer reviewer will refer to the evaluation letter guidelines (as specified under "Guidelines for Peer Reviewers and Structure of Review Letters" below) as categories for attention during visits.
5. The peer reviewer should not participate in the class.
6. As soon as possible, preferably within 24 hours after each visit, the peer reviewer and the candidate should meet informally to discuss the visit.
7. Within 30 days after the second visit, the peer reviewer prepares and delivers a written letter to the Chair/Dean. This report should be based on examination of course material as well as the class visits and should culminate in the structure shown in the guidelines below.
8. After reviewing peer reviews, faculty have the opportunity to write a letter in response, and that letter will be included in the faculty member's portfolio.
9. A faculty member's formal peer evaluation report is submitted with the one-page summary sheet (entitled "Student Rating Form – Results by Class") of the Student Evaluation Survey (previously known as TEQ) results to substantiate effectiveness in teaching for third-year review, tenure and promotion; peer evaluation reports and student survey results may be submitted also for decisions on advancement in rank or merit pay.

### ***Guidelines for Peer Reviewers and Structure of Review Letters***

In evaluation letters, reviewers should include two separate sections, one (I) on class visits specifically and the other (II) on the structure of the course as a whole. In cases where instructors do not contribute to course design in any way, part II should be eliminated. In cases where instructors minimally contribute to course design, part II should be weighted accordingly. The weighting should be determined in discussion between reviewer and the faculty member prior to class visits. Once weighting is determined, evaluation of course design should be judged from personal discussions with instructors, review of syllabi, and review of other pertinent documents. For both I and II, specific evidence should support conclusions. Two areas (I.9 and I.10) especially involve the intersection between

class sessions and course structure, but the letter should be integrated so that, while typically divided into two parts, the letter addresses inter-relations between the two.

For both parts, reviewers should focus on areas pertinent to specific courses. Areas in I and II are provided for guidance, not absolute requirements. In fact, reviewers are encouraged to discuss creative dimensions of teaching not listed below. Suggested areas from which reviewers can choose are shown below.

#### I. Evaluation of Class Visits

1. Preparation for the class session
2. Organization of the class session
3. Instructor's enthusiasm for the subject matter
4. Clarity of classroom communication, both oral and written
5. Facilitation of student participation appropriate to the class
6. Ability to make difficult concepts understandable
7. Facilitation of higher-order thinking
8. Mastery of the subject matter
9. Integration of the individual class with course organization as a whole
10. Selection and implementation of instructional strategies appropriate to learning goals

#### II. Evaluation of Course as a Whole

1. Thorough and clearly organized syllabus
2. Congruence between course goals, objectives, content, and activities
3. Appropriate assessment of student learning in relation to course goals and outcomes
4. Appropriate assignments for students given the course objectives and course level
5. Appropriate methods and criteria for grading
6. Appropriate use of supportive resources throughout the semester, such as handouts, web sites, or Blackboard.

### **PEER REVIEW OF CLINICAL/PRACTICUM TEACHING**

*(Effective Fall 2007)*

#### ***Instructions***

Every Duquesne employee is entitled to feedback pertaining to his or her job performance in order to improve his or her effectiveness in his or her role at the University. Most employees' jobs are comprised of several facets and it is important that an evaluation appropriately fit the unique and specific parameters of each major facet of employment.

Clinical/practicum teaching is a significant component of many faculty members' role at Duquesne University. Such teaching provides an important opportunity to address the mission of Duquesne University, as we engage in teaching students through serving the needs of the community. Clinical teaching requires a faculty member to be an experienced practitioner and an effective educator. As a consequence of the unique characteristics of clinical/practicum teaching, a specific evaluation tool is warranted. The Clinical/Practicum Teaching Effectiveness Assessment (C/PTEA) was developed to address this need.

The C/PTEA is used to evaluate a Duquesne faculty member teaching a University course in which the primary means of instruction consists of mentoring, supervising, or guiding a student in applying the knowledge and skills pertinent to his or her discipline in the dynamic interaction which is inherent in the delivery of a professional service to a patient, client, or student. Such activity typically occurs in the context of a clinical setting, educational practicum, or any situation in which skills are practiced.

While the precise nature of clinical/practicum teaching differs among Schools at Duquesne, the C/PTEA was constructed to include the core elements of clinical/practicum teaching and serves as a basis for all Schools to evaluate this facet of teaching.

### ***Procedure***

#### Guidelines for Peer Evaluations of Clinical/Practicum Teaching Effectiveness

1. By September 1, the Dean/Chair provides the names of faculty who can serve as reviewers to the faculty members being reviewed. Potential reviewers should be full time faculty members of the School or Department with relevant clinical/practicum teaching experience within the past five years.
2. By October 1 (Fall), February 1 (Spring), or June 1 (Summer), the faculty member being reviewed identifies the course to be evaluated and chooses a potential reviewer from the list provided by the Dean/Chair.
  - a) For third year review the faculty member should have been evaluated by at least two different peer reviewers (1/year).
  - b) For tenure review the faculty member should have been evaluated by at least four different peer reviewers (1/year).
  - c) Non-tenure track and adjunct faculty should be evaluated yearly.
3. The Dean/Chair chooses one reviewer to evaluate a course. The reviewer visits twice. Both visits are to be announced.
4. Prior to the first visit, the reviewer and faculty member are to meet to discuss the course as a whole. During the conference, the description of the clinical/practicum site, the course as a whole, and how the representative session fit with the Gestalt, should be discussed. The faculty member being reviewed should supply the reviewer pertinent documents including the syllabus and any other chosen educational material by the faculty member (e.g. desired learning objectives for the student, appropriateness for achieving the objectives set, syllabus and student evaluation tools, and any other significant instructional materials that would help the reviewer understand the content for observation). In addition, the person being reviewed can use the opportunity to explain any unusual dimension of the course.

During the meeting the faculty member and the reviewer agree on the dates and times of the visits.

Observations (visits) should be of sufficient length to obtain a reliable sampling of the clinical/practicum process. The peer reviewer should not participate in the clinical/practicum teaching.

5. After both clinical/practicum site visits the reviewer and faculty member being reviewed should meet for an informal discussion of the reviewer's reactions. Every attempt should be made to meet within 24 hours of each visit.
6. After both clinical/practicum site visits the reviewer and faculty member being reviewed should meet for an informal discussion. Within 30 days after the second visit, the reviewer delivers the Peer Review Letter to the faculty member being reviewed and the Dean/Chair. The letter should include two separate sections, one on the clinical/practicum site visit and the other on the structure of the course as a whole. The letter should be a comprehensive narrative focusing on the course as a whole, based on the pre-evaluation conference with examination of clinical/practicum teaching materials as well as the on-site visit.
7. It is imperative that the contract between Duquesne University and the clinical/practicum site include a provision/approval to conduct such reviews at the clinical/practicum site prior to the review being conducted. If not currently included, the Dean/Chair should contact the appropriate individual at the clinical/practicum site

for such approval and then implement the revision of such contracts to include appropriate provision/approval for such reviews.

### ***CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION***

The C/PTEA is designed for the reviewer to use in evaluating the effectiveness of the clinical faculty member as both *practitioner* in his or her field, and as *educator* of student practitioners. These two identities function symbiotically within the individual faculty member's teaching performance.

In preparing the Peer Review Letter, then, the reviewer considers and addresses, whenever applicable, the following factors relevant to the instructor's effectiveness in the evaluated clinical/practicum experience. The criteria below are offered as guidance for the letter, not as absolute requirements. Reviewers are encouraged to discuss creative dimensions of teaching not listed below.

#### **I. Evaluation of Clinical/Practicum Teaching during Visits**

##### **Practitioner Criteria:**

1. Evidences breadth and depth of clinical/practicum competence and skills.
2. Participates in life-long learning and self-reflection to demonstrate continued clinical/practicum competency.
3. Effectively guides the development of clinical/practicum problem solving.
4. Serves as a role model to students, demonstrating enthusiasm for the profession through involvement in professional organizations, advocacy, and continuing education.
5. Participates in scholarly activities such as dissemination of professional expertise through publishing, presenting, and/or development of teaching/learning tools.
6. Effectively communicates with both students and clinical/practicum site staff, and serves as an effective liaison between the university and the clinical/practicum setting.

##### **Educator Criteria:**

7. Effectively communicates clinical/practicum experience objectives to students.
8. Effectively prepares for clinical/practicum teaching sessions.
9. Implements teaching strategies based on educational theory and evidence-based teaching practices.
10. Effectively responds to individual students' learning needs and styles.
11. Evidences congruence among clinical/practicum objectives, activities, and evaluation strategies.
12. Effectively uses appropriate evaluation strategies to determine students' progress and achievement in the clinical/practicum setting.
13. Provides constructive and thoughtful feedback to students in a timely manner.
14. Utilizes feedback from self, student, peer, and supervisor evaluations to improve teaching effectiveness.

15. Participates in life-long learning and self-reflection to improve teaching and facilitate learning.
16. Serves as a role model to students, demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching, learning, and professional development through involvement in professional organizations, advocacy, and continuing education.

## **II. Evaluation of the Course as a Whole**

In considering the following criteria, the reviewer should give attention to how these cohere with the Educator Criteria in Section I.

1. Thorough and clearly organized syllabus.
2. Congruence between course goals, objectives, content, and activities.
3. Appropriate assessment of student learning in relation to course goals and outcomes.
4. Appropriate assignments for students given the course objectives and course level.
5. Appropriate methods and criteria for grading.
6. Appropriate use of supportive resources through the semester, such as handouts, web sites, or Blackboard.
7. In team taught courses consideration should be given to only the specific responsibility of the faculty member in the course.

The faculty member being reviewed should be provided with the written opportunity to address any and all components of the Peer Review Letter. This response should be forwarded to the reviewer and the Dean/Chair.

---

**Procedures and Content for Peer Review of an Online Course at Duquesne University** (Effective Fall 2006)

The recommended procedure for conducting a peer review of an online course offered at Duquesne University is:

1. By September 1 (Fall), January 15 (Spring), or May 15 (Summer), the dean/chair provides the names of faculty who can serve as reviewers to the member being reviewed. Potential reviewers may be members of the person's academic unit, but if circumstances dictate, they may also be outside the unit at the discretion of the dean/chair.
2. By October 1 (Fall), February 1 (Spring), or June 1 (Summer) the instructor being reviewed identifies the course or courses to be evaluated and chooses at least three potential reviewers from the list provided by the dean/chair.
3. The dean/chair chooses one reviewer to evaluate each course. Priority in the selection of a faculty reviewer should be given to faculty members with online teaching experience and familiarity with the course content. If both expertises are unavailable, then online teaching experience is viewed as more important. If a potential reviewer is not from the faculty member's academic unit, the experienced online educator could be paired with a "content expert" from the faculty member's academic unit for the review.
4. Initially, the reviewer and faculty member should meet to discuss the course as a whole, and how representative sessions fit with the Gestalt. The person being reviewed should supply the reviewer pertinent documents, including the syllabus and any others chosen by the faculty member. If appropriate, reviewer access to private e-mail exchanges between the faculty member and students also may be provided by the instructor for a more accurate and complete review. In addition, the person being reviewed can use this opportunity to explain any unusual dimensions of the course (e.g., a syllabus that was not of their making) and/or to discuss the visibility of course content (e.g., if content is posted but being released to students until needed).
5. For the online review, "a class visit" means complete access to the Blackboard course website for the reviewer with as little disruption to the class learning environment as possible. Typically, having the reviewer added to the online course as a "student" would afford the reviewer access to the class material visible to the students without disrupting the course.
6. Online "class sessions" typically occur over several calendar days and can involve asynchronous and synchronous activities by both instructor and students. A "visit" to an online class should not be defined as a specific calendar day but should reflect the instructor's definition of a class session and consider the interaction that occurs between the instructor and the class of students and the instructor and individual students during the online class session. Additionally, the Blackboard learning system and its Building Blocks provide the instructor with various features and tools for use in conducting the online session and course. Reviewers should be aware that these tools typically are added over time and may not be available to all instructors.
7. It is recommended that the reviewer "visit the course" twice during a term, similar to the two class visitations expected of a reviewer of a traditional, face-to-face course.
8. After the class visits, the reviewer and instructor being reviewed should meet for an informal discussion of the reviewer's reactions. Every attempt should be made to meet within 24 hours of the class visit, when specifics are still clearly remembered.
9. Within 30 days after the second visit, the reviewer delivers a letter to the faculty member and to the dean/chair. The letter should be a comprehensive narrative focusing on the course as a whole, the class visits, and the integration of the two. The narrative should consider the evaluation criteria described below. It should NOT be written in the form of a checklist.

10. In the evaluation letter, the reviewer should include two separate sections, one regarding visits to the online course specifically and the other on the structure of the online course as a whole. The latter should be judged from personal discussions with the instructor and a review of a syllabi along with other documents. For both sections of the review letter, specific evidence should support conclusions. Two items especially (I.9 and I.10 below) involve the intersection between the online sessions and the course, but the entire letter should be a Gestalt that cites interrelations between course design and individual class visits.
11. Reviewers should address as many areas as are pertinent to a specific online course. In addition, reviewers are encouraged to discuss creative dimensions of teaching online not listed below.
12. Finally, the following list presents to the reviewer evaluation criteria to be considered when evaluating the instructor and preparing the review letter:
  - I. Evaluation of Visits for Online Class Sessions
    1. **Preparation for online class session** – *evident in the materials for the course session being reviewed, and in facets of presence, such as a “starter” message in the discussion forum, an announcement with reminders of the session’s topic and/or assignment, an announcement of a chat agenda, the text underneath the session’s folder, etc.*
    2. **Organization of the online class session** – *evident in the use of the online materials, assignments, readings, offline materials, discussion, chat; the class session is easy to navigate; components and structure understandable; course syllabus identifies and clearly delineates the role the online environment will play in the session.*
    3. **Instructor’s enthusiasm for the subject matter** – *evident in teaching presence, preparation, facilitation of online discussion and chat, and in responses from students during online session.*
    4. **Clarity of classroom communication in the online environment, both oral and written** – *evidenced in announcements, e-mail, discussion postings, lecture modules, folder/document identification, and/or other technologies used in the course site (i.e., chat room archives, viewlets, etc.).*
    5. **Facilitation of student participation appropriate to the class session’s online activities** – *evident in the instructor’s presence in the online session; promotion of 3-way interaction (student-content, student-teacher, student-student); and instructor’s response to perspectives that differed from his or her perspectives.*
    6. **Ability to make difficult concepts understandable** – *evident in written materials, explanations in discussions, chats, and announcements and based upon the students posted questions and responses to instructor’s feedback.*
    7. **Facilitation of higher order thinking** – *evident in instructor’s formulating productive questions for discussions/chat and group work; feedback provided to students on assignments and projects; presentation of course syllabus, lecture modules, class assignments, and student activities; and individual interactions with students.*
    8. **Mastery of the subject matter** – *evident in instructor’s ability to effectively communicate knowledge of subject matter, to organize student learning, and to facilitate student learning and assessment in the online environment through the tools and features available.*

9. **Integration of the individual class with course organization as a whole** – *evident in statements indicating how this class session relates to other sessions and to the course as a whole in instructor feedback, in postings to discussions or chats, in course syllabus, and in the use of course links, announcements, and other available technologies.*
10. **Selection and implementation of instructional strategies appropriate to learning goals** – *evident in instructor's application of effective instructional strategies for communicating course content through available online technologies and tools; in the learning experiences of the students; and in the relationship of the instructor's stated goals and objectives in the syllabus to the learning activities and assignments of students and presentation of course content by the instructor in the online environment.*

## II. Evaluation of Online Course as a Whole

1. **Overall Design and Organization of course** – *evident in the online course site through instructor's presentation of the syllabus and use of organizing tools (menu structure, folders, course links, etc.) and class session progression; ease of navigation; structure of course for student access to primary materials and activities.*
2. **Congruence between course goals, objectives, content, and activities** – *evident in instructor creating an online course structure and progression that demonstrated clear linkage between course objectives, course content and student activities.*
3. **Appropriate assessment of student learning in relation to course goals and outcomes** – *evident in facilitation of assignments and assessment activities in the course site and through online course tools.*
4. **Appropriate assignments for students given the course objectives and course level** – *evident in effective use of course tools to facilitate assignments and student learning activities in the online environment.*
5. **Appropriate methods and criteria for grading** – *evident in course syllabus and learning activities and the facilitation of these student learning activities and instructor feedback.*
6. **Appropriate application of online learning system technologies (Blackboard and its Building Blocks) as well as other supportive resources throughout the semester** – *evident in appropriate use of Blackboard tools and features, available educational technologies (multimedia, tutorials, publisher materials, etc.) and discipline specific Internet/software resources; effective instructional design and delivery of content, communication, and student and instructor activities to align with goals and objectives.*

Other considerations for evaluating the instructor in the online environment overall:

- **Presence of instructor** as indicated by active teaching elements, course design and organization, facilitation of discourse and level of direct instruction.
- **Quality and quantity of instructional posts and feedback.**
- **Creation of a community of learners in online environment** – *evident in instructor's ability to build and sustain the online learning community throughout the semester through introductions, biographical sketches, pictures, discussions, presentations, student activities, feedback, and student socializing in chats, discussion forums, etc.*
- **Suggest ways the instructor can make this course more effective.**