

**Drexel University**  
**College of Nursing & Health Professions**  
**Faculty Peer Teaching Evaluation Policy**

**Rationale**

The primary purpose of peer review is to complement the faculty member's student evaluations, include aspects that students are unable to evaluate, and improve the students' experience. A peer review of teaching may be part of a faculty member's annual performance evaluation by the department chair/supervisor and contributes to a faculty member's teaching portfolio for mid-tenure reviews, tenure reviews, or promotion considerations. In addition, the peer review supports individual faculty development through self-assessment and reflection.

**Two Types of Peer Reviews**

- A. Review of course delivery
  - 1. Online
  - 2. Onsite
  
- B. Review of course content

A faculty member must request a peer review of teaching through his/her department chair/supervisor. Ideally, the decision to request a review is made at the time of the faculty member's annual review in the spring. Each department chair/supervisor will compile and prioritize the review requests for the following academic year, to allow time for scheduling and planning. However, a faculty member may request a review (through the department chair/supervisor) at any time, provided that enough lead time is allowed for scheduling.

**A. Review of Course Delivery**

Peer reviews of course delivery are conducted by members of the College of Nursing & Health Professions Master Teachers Guild (the Guild).

**Procedure:**

- 1. Faculty member completes the "Request for Peer Review of Teaching" form (available [here](#)) and submits it to his/her department chair/supervisor with a copy of the course syllabus.
- 2. The department chair/supervisor signs the form and submits it and the syllabus to Joe Rubertone for onsite courses or Fran Cornelius for online courses. If the

chair/supervisor is submitting multiple requests, he/she includes a prioritized list of the requests.

3. Joe or Fran contacts the faculty member to make the necessary arrangements and sets up an evaluation team consisting of three members of the Guild.
4. The team leader has a pre-evaluation meeting with the faculty member.
5. The full team conducts the evaluation.
6. Each team member completes a feedback form (either the Online Peer Support Feedback Form or the Onsite Peer Evaluation Working Form, as appropriate. These reviews are combined by the team leader on a summary form (either the Online Peer Support Feedback Summary Form or the Onsite Peer Evaluation Summary Form, appropriate; samples available [here](#) and [here](#)).
7. The full team meets with the faculty member after the evaluation.
8. The faculty member may choose whether or not to submit the feedback/evaluation summary form to his/her department chair/supervisor.
9. The faculty member has the option for a second review, and, if a second review is conducted, may submit *either* or *neither* of the feedback/evaluation summary forms to his/her department chair/supervisor.

## **B. Review of Course Content**

A review of course content is done by a faculty member from another university who teaches similar content. Topics reviewed in a course content review will include:

- Course objectives
- Course content match to course objectives
- Organization and appropriateness
- Teaching and learning methods, including incorporation of technology
- Student assessment (appropriateness of assignments, match to course objectives)
- Supporting materials (textbook, articles, websites, other technology and resources)

### **Procedure:**

1. The CNHP faculty member identifies the course for review. (If the department chair/supervisor believes that a particular course needs to be reviewed either for program purposes or to balance student evaluations of the course, a faculty member may be asked to have a specific course reviewed.)
2. The faculty member and his/her department chair/supervisor identify an external reviewer.
3. The faculty member provides the reviewer with a copy of the complete course syllabus, including course schedule, assignments, and any additional course-related material.

4. Prior to the review, the faculty member may elect to meet and discuss with the reviewer any areas in which the faculty member would like focused feedback for purposes of faculty development.
5. The faculty member and the reviewer set the review timeline. (Faculty completing mid-term, tenure, or promotion review should schedule their reviews accordingly in order to have adequate peer teaching reviews for their portfolio.)
6. The reviewer prepares a cover letter and report (see below) using the evaluation form supplied by the faculty member (available [here](#)).
7. The faculty member reviews the written report of the evaluation completed by his/her peer and writes a response, commenting on how the recommendations will be/have been used to enhance his/her teaching effectiveness.
8. After the review, faculty member may request to meet with the reviewer to discuss the recommendations in more detail.
9. The faculty member *may* submit copies of the review and response to the department chair/supervisor and have these become part of the faculty member's annual review. However, submission to the chair/supervisor is *required if the reviewer receives an honorarium*. Honoraria are usually about \$150 - \$200 and are typically paid with department funds.

### **Report of Reviewer**

The report of the peer reviewer should be in the following format and include the following content:

1. Cover letter
  - a. Format
    - Printed on the reviewer's letterhead with his/her signature
    - Addressed to the faculty member being reviewed, with a copy to the department chair/supervisor *only if the reviewer receives an honorarium*.
  - b. Content
    - What the reviewer was asked to do (e.g., review the course syllabus and specific lecture or learning unit of the course)
    - The reviewer's credentials, highlighting what qualified him/her to perform the review
2. Completed Peer Evaluation of Teaching (Course Content) form, supplied by the faculty member being reviewed (available [here](#)).