

Physical, Life, Movement and Sport Sciences

Peer Review, Evaluation and Observation

In accordance with General Policy of Faculty Evaluation 2.112, Faculty Rank and Promotion 2.106, Tenure 2.111, and PLMSS Division Criteria for Promotion and Tenure

Peer review is an essential component of the evaluation process for all teaching at Lewis-Clark State College. It can be used to enhance teaching practice for the reviewee as well as providing evidence of proficiency and excellence for promotion and tenure, and feeding into the Annual Faculty Evaluation process.

The goals and requirements of PLMSS Peer Review are to:

- provide annual evidence for tenure and promotion as required in policy.
- support reflection and growth for each faculty appropriate to their career stage.
- be meaningful and not onerous.

Peer Reviews are required every year before tenure and promotion but there is no requirement after promotion to full, as described in Policy and Procedures (See Section III). Thus, the type of Peer Review that a faculty member participates in is dependent upon their rank, as described below in Section I.

I. Peer Review by Rank

A. Peer Review for Instructors and Assistant Professors

Policies 2.106 (Promotion) and 2.111 (Tenure) require annual peer evaluations for faculty seeking promotion and tenure, and that the faculty member is at least proficient in their teaching. To provide evidence for proficiency, the faculty seeking promotion or tenure should have an annual teaching observation in which:

- The observation is done in fall semester so that it can be included in the materials for Annual Faculty Evaluation (see section II).
- The observers are varied, and alternate between different disciplines and similar disciplines each year.
- Feedback and/or connection to resources such as professional development are provided to the faculty member by the observer in the spirit of reflection and continual teaching growth.
- The faculty member is given [evaluation documentation](#) for their portfolio written by the observer. [Here is a version for online classes.](#)
- The faculty member is encouraged to write about their teaching experiences and growth annually for their portfolio by the observer.
- The observation is included in the faculty's job description.

B. Peer review for Associate Professors

In order to be promoted to Full Professor, faculty must demonstrate excellence in teaching. Excellence in teaching may be supported by peer observation of teaching, but there are a range of other activities that also align with the Policy definition of teaching excellence that could be used for annual evaluation. For example, a faculty member could mentor junior faculty in teaching, facilitate a professional development training in teaching, or collaborate on a new class design. Thus, faculty seeking to be promoted to full professor should engage in either an annual observation or design a different annual collaborative activity that enhances their growth in teaching. If the faculty member chooses observation, they should follow the guidelines in the previous section, Peer Review for Instructors and Assistant Professors. If the faculty chooses an annual collaborative activity, the activity should:

- reflect the spirit of the growth-minded activities described in the evidence of excellence section of our Promotion Criteria, and be able to be used as evidence of excellence in a promotion portfolio.
- include at least one other faculty member on campus, the “collaborator.”
- be evaluated in a manner consistent with the activity. For example, a feedback survey for a PDT that the faculty facilitates or this [general activity evaluation form to be filled out by a collaborator](#).
- be reflected upon by the faculty member.
- be included in the annual job description.

C. Peer review for Full Professors

Peer review is not a requirement for full professors and no wording related to peer review or evaluation appears in the annual review policy language nor the five-year review policies. However, there is the expectation of the faculty’s “continued performance” in all areas. Peers play a vital role in the continued intellectual growth of the mid- to late-career faculty member and make it possible for academic innovation to be shared in-house, leveraging the expertise of experienced faculty. In order to both provide opportunities for full professors to continue to develop intellectually in meaningful ways, and also share their experience, annual collaborative activities should be carried out that:

- Provide opportunity for reflection and growth in teaching.
- Are collaborative and meaningful.
- Can be used as evidence for performance reviews.

II. Annual Performance Review materials

Each year, faculty undergo an Annual Performance Review, in which the materials described below are required by the General Policy of Faculty Evaluation 2.112:

“The faculty will determine by majority vote at a division meeting, the materials to be used in preparing the written Annual Performance Review. The list of materials used for evaluation will be reviewed every three (3) years by the members of the division. At minimum, the following materials are required (divisions may choose to have additional forms such as a peer observation form):

1. Current year Job Description.
2. Current student evaluations (Faculty must submit both numeric and student comment pieces of Student Course Evaluations).
3. Current and updated Curriculum Vita (CV).
4. Current course syllabi.”

As described in the paragraph above, PLMSS chooses to also include the following additions to the materials:

- (a) For faculty who are not tenured, the peer observation documentation.
- (b) (optional) An annotated prior year Job Description that describes unforeseen events, roles, etc.

III. Policy Excerpts on Peer Review

Below are relevant excerpts from policies upon which this document is based.

A. Excerpts from General Policy of Faculty Evaluation 2.112

By majority vote at a division meeting, divisions will develop a system of peer review. The system of peer review (and the degree to which it informs the Division Chair or Director) shall be reviewed every three (3) years and voted on by members of the division.

B. Excerpts from General Policy of Tenure 2.111 (promotion reads the similarly)

The tenure portfolio will be prepared by the applicant and must include, at a minimum, the following contents:

1. A copy of Division Evidence List
2. Candidate Statement.
3. Curriculum Vitae

4. Job description and annual chair and *peer evaluations* over the last four (4) years
5. For teaching faculty, student course evaluations over the last four (4) years (6)
6. Reviewers may request additional materials.

C. Excerpts from Periodic Performance Review 2.113

Performance Review Portfolio (PRP) :

The faculty member will develop a PRP containing a current curriculum vita (provided by the faculty member); all Student Feedback forms (SCEs), including written student comments, since the faculty member's last review; copies of all signed annual evaluations since the last review, and any additional materials the faculty member wishes to include.

D. Links to PLMSS Promotion and Tenure Criteria

- [Promotion](#)
- [Tenure](#)