
APPLIES TO: Faculty

ISSUED: May 18, 2022

KEYWORDS: faculty, peer, review, Quality Matters

EFFECTIVE: August 22, 2022

PURPOSE: The purpose of this policy is to outline the requirements for faculty peer review.

DEFINITION OF TERMS IN THIS POLICY:

1. **Annual evaluation process:** The annual process of evaluation required by the College for all employees.
2. **Face-to-face instructors:** Faculty who present some component of a course through in-person instruction. This includes hybrid courses that include a face-to-face component other than testing.
3. **Online course:** Course taught with no face-to-face instruction.
4. **Online instructors:** Faculty members for whom 100% of their teaching load consists of online courses OR those participating in a Quality Matters review during a given academic year, either as the subject of review or as a Quality Matters reviewer.
5. **Peer review:** Formative assessment of a faculty member through observation of their teaching by another faculty member.
6. **Peer reviewer:** A faculty member who observes another's teaching or online course materials and engages in a process of constructive evaluation with the faculty member observed.
7. **Quality Matters:** The online educational organization whose process is utilized by Kettering College to assure the quality of online courses.

POLICY DETAILS:

All Kettering College faculty will take part in the peer review process on a regular basis. This may be in the form of a Quality Matters review of an online course or through the Kettering College Peer Review Process for face-to-face teaching.

Frequency:

- Online instructors: Each online course will be reviewed using the Quality Matters process once every five years.
- Face-to-face instructors: Each instructor will participate in the Kettering College peer review process every two years.

Confidentiality:

- Results of the peer review will be confidential. No faculty member will be required to share the feedback received from their peer reviewer with any other individual, including for the purposes of promotion. The faculty may choose to voluntarily include the results of a peer review with others (including the Promotions Committee) but under no circumstances will they be penalized if they choose not to do so.

Documentation:

- Documentation of completion of the peer review will be provided by the peer reviewer to the faculty member reviewed, who will share this with their dean or department chair as part of the annual evaluation process.

- Following peer review of a face-to-face course, the faculty member undergoing review will submit a Faculty Reflection to their dean or department chair as part of the annual evaluation process.

PROCEDURE

This process is for review of faculty who teach a course with a face-to-face component (traditional and hybrid) at both the graduate and undergraduate level. Faculty exempted from this process are those for whom 100% of their teaching load consists of online courses, and those participating in a Quality Matters review during a given review cycle, either as the subject of review or as a Quality Matters reviewer. Exempted faculty may request to be part of this process.

- **Prior to Fall Colloquium in even years:**
 - Faculty are assigned to pairs by the administration.
 - This is the duty of the associate dean for assessment and accreditation.
 - Pairs will consist of individuals from different departments/divisions whenever possible.
 - Where possible clinical faculty will be matched with other clinical faculty.
 - Faculty members who have not previously been peer reviewed (“faculty-in-training”) will be assigned to work with a pair of more experienced faculty.
- **At Fall Colloquium:**
 - Training will be provided on the process during even years, and a reminder/refresher will take place during odd years.
 - Pairs will be given time to meet and organize.
 - Planning should include the following considerations:
 - Scheduling reviews during the 18-month window, keeping in mind:
 - Any upcoming promotions (review should be done within 12 months of submitting a promotions portfolio and by the deadline for submission of same).
 - All reviews must be completed no later than March 1 of the next even year to accommodate the annual faculty evaluation schedule.
 - Faculty-in-training will accompany one member (“the mentor”) through the process of reviewing the other.
 - Faculty-in-training will then be reviewed by the individual they observed.
 - This division of duties between the experienced faculty is optional; if desired the mentor may review the faculty-in-training.
- **During the subsequent 18 months:**
 - The pair will review each other, preferably during the same semester.
 - Prior to each observation, the pair will conduct a pre-conference (optional, see KC Peer Review Guidelines).
 - Reviewers will use the KC Peer Review Guidelines.
 - Following the observation reviewers will share observation notes with the subject.
 - Pairs will then meet to complete the post-observation conference.
 - This may be a single conference to discuss both observations or two separate meetings.
 - Reviewers will provide the faculty member they observed with a signed Documentation of Completion.
 - Each faculty will complete the Faculty Reflection to capture the lessons learned from the process (both as the reviewer and the subject of review).



Policy Name: Faculty Peer Review

KC Policy # AC 155

- Faculty-in-training will participate in each step with their designated mentor.
- Faculty-in-training will then be reviewed by another member of the team, who will conduct the pre-conference, observation, and post-conference.

Note on Promotions: Peer review conducted for the purposes of promotion should occur within one year of application, be timed to meet the Promotions Committee deadlines, and be conducted by an experienced faculty member (i.e., not a “faculty-in-training”).

- The Statement of Completion must be included in the faculty member’s promotion portfolio.
 - If desired, faculty may include the Observation Notes in their portfolio or request that their reviewer write a formal letter detailing the observation for inclusion in the portfolio.
- **Prior to the Annual Evaluation in Even Years:**
 - Faculty share the Documentation of Completion and the Faculty Reflection with their department chair/dean as part of their annual evaluation by March 1.
 - The department chair or dean ensures that the Documentation of Completion and Reflection are uploaded to the evaluation supplement in HealthStream

RESOURCES/REFERENCES:

Kettering College Peer Review Guidelines Form

Related KHN Policy: N/A

Maintained by: Office of the Academic Dean (through the Associate Dean for Assessment and Accreditation)

HISTORY OF REVISION:

Original date: May 18, 2022

Revision dates: N/A

Kettering College Peer Review Guidelines

Faculty Name: _____ Academic Rank / Level: _____

Title: _____ Department/Program: _____

Name of Peer Reviewer(s): _____

The reviewer and faculty being reviewed will establish a designated time/place for the pre-conference, classroom observation, and post conference.

I. Pre-conference (10 minutes)

- Set parameters for the observation.
 - Does the faculty member want feedback on a certain technique or concern?
 - Do they want a more generic evaluation?
 - Will the review be used as part of an application for promotion?
- The pre-conference can be done by email, phone, Teams/Zoom, or face-to-face.

II. The Observation (50+ minutes)

- Take notes.
- Note what went well.
- Observe student reactions.
- Observe teacher behaviors.
- Note teaching techniques utilized.
- Note areas that could be improved.

Observer Notes	
<p><i>Comment on the following as appropriate:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guides learners with clear objectives• Uses effective communication skills• Uses expertise/content knowledge• Engages learners• Creates a safe and respectful learning environment• Provides valuable supplemental materials/handouts• Uses a variety of teaching methods• Allows for meaningful feedback and discussion• Uses and promotes reflective thinking• Uses technology appropriately• Provides opportunity for closure	

III. Post-conference (30+ minutes) – should be scheduled preferably within seven days of the observation. It is important that the dialogue be honest and encouraging. The faculty observing should reflect on the class and share written notes prior to the post-conference discussion.

- First, ask the faculty to explain how they thought the class went, giving specific examples.
- Dialogue around those comments remembering to balance commendatory remarks with suggestions for improvement.
- Provide specific examples to support all comments.
- Offer suggestions and encouragement.
- The Documentation of Completion should be signed by the observer and copies maintained by both parties

Observer: Notes to share with faculty observed	
	<i>Additional Comments may be added here during discussion.</i>

IV. The Reflection – Following the post-conference, the faculty who was observed should make reflective notes regarding the process. This may be shared (optional) with the observer and the Faculty Reflection should be attached to the annual supplemental evaluation.

- What was useful?
- How could the suggestions be implemented to improve teaching techniques?
- What did you learn from observing another faculty member?

Faculty Reflection



Peer Review

Documentation of Completion

Faculty Member _____

Class/Subject _____

Directions:

Please give this form to the faculty under review for inclusion in their annual evaluation.

Statement of Completion:

I observed this faculty member in the classroom on (date) _____
Based on my observations, the Peer Review Process was completed and communicated to the
faculty member.

Observer:

Print Name

Signature