3356-10-27 Peer evaluation of faculty.

(A) Policy statement.

(1) Participation requirements. Full-time faculty members shall participate in the peer review of teaching according to an established two-year rotation. Each faculty member will both conduct and receive a review during the two-year rotation, with the results incorporated into each participant's dossier and summarized in the chair's annual faculty evaluation narrative. The peer review two-year rotation will require each full-time faculty member to serve as reviewer or reviewee in alternating fashion.

(2) Purpose. The peer review process promotes continuous professional growth and reflective practice. Grounded in a growth mindset, it emphasizes constructive feedback as a means of learning and instructional improvement. The process is formative in nature and intended to support ongoing development.

(3) Assessment of participation. In the department chairperson's annual evaluation of faculty, assessment of participation in the peer review process shall focus on good faith engagement by both participants.

(a) For reviewers, evaluation will reflect active participation and provision of thoughtful, evidence-based feedback aligned with an agreed upon focus.

(b) For reviewees, evaluation will reflect a focus on continuous improvement of teaching duties, engagement in the review process, the quality of reflection, and action steps in response to feedback.

(4) Framework for review and feedback. The TEACH principles – YSU's shared framework for teaching excellence – along with the broader principles of effective instruction (clarity, student engagement, inclusivity, assessment, and reflection), serve as the foundation for review and feedback. These principles are located on the institute for teaching and learning (ITL) website.

(5) Professional development linkage. Findings from the peer review process may inform individual and collective professional development activities facilitated by the ITL or other venues,

ensuring that learning opportunities remain responsive to faculty needs across disciplines.

(6) Cross-disciplinary engagement. Cross-disciplinary and intercollege reviews are encouraged, when appropriate, to broaden pedagogical perspectives and strengthen collegial relationships across the university.

(7) Professional responsibility. Participation in peer review is a professional responsibility and a core component of the university's commitment to teaching excellence. Annual participation is considered part of regular faculty duties related to instruction and professional growth and shall not be classified as service or qualify for reassigned time or workload.

(B) Procedures.

(1) Regardless of modality, the peer review should focus on:

(a) Clear communication of learning objectives;

(b) Creation of engaged and intellectually diverse classroom environments;

(c) Use of evidence-based instructional strategies;

(d) Alignment of assessments with intended learning outcomes; and

(e) Reflective improvement.

(2) In addition, review procedures for in-person and synchronous online courses are as follows:

(a) The reviewer begins by examining relevant course materials and meeting with the instructor to establish the review focus and context. Reviews may focus on a variety of areas including classroom management, implementation of new technology, adoption of new content or modalities, redesign of assignments, or other focal areas appropriate to the faculty member's teaching duties.

(b) The review modality, including class observation or faculty reviewer meetings, will align with the review focus area and context.

(c) Upon completion of the process, the reviewer completes the peer review form and writes a brief narrative summarizing findings and feedback.

(d) A required on-campus follow-up meeting allows for discussion and reflection, after which the faculty member being reviewed submits a reflective statement and any action steps.

All materials are submitted to the department chairperson as part of the annual evaluation process.

(3) Procedures for asynchronous online courses are as follows:

(a) For asynchronous courses, the instructor provides the reviewer with a minimum ten-day access to the course within the learning management system after an initial meeting to establish focus areas.

(b) The reviewer reviews course content, instructional design, and engagement strategies, then completes the peer review form and writes a brief narrative summarizing findings and feedback.

(c) A required on-campus follow-up meeting allows for discussion and reflection, after which the faculty member being reviewed submits a reflective statement and any action steps. All materials are submitted to the department chairperson as part of the annual evaluation process.

(4) All reviews, regardless of modality, must be done on campus in a face-to-face format unless the faculty member has a remote-only appointment, in which case the review can be conducted virtually.

(C) Parameters.

(1) Full-time faculty members shall participate according to a defined rotation in which each faculty member alternates between serving as a reviewer and being reviewed. This structure ensures shared

engagement, mutual learning, and balanced participation across the faculty body. All full-time faculty will be engaged in one aspect every year as determined by the chair and approved by the dean.

(2) Department chairpersons are responsible for assigning faculty within the rotation. In making assignments, chairpersons shall consider disciplinary expertise, course modality, faculty rank, and opportunities for mentoring and professional development. Faculty may provide input on potential pairings. However, if disagreement arises, final determinations rest with the chairperson in consultation with the dean.

(3) Chairpersons may also identify the specific focus, course, or area to be observed to ensure the evaluation aligns with departmental or program goals or when a faculty member may benefit from targeted attention to a particular instructional area. Cross-disciplinary or intercollege pairings are encouraged when pedagogically appropriate.

(4) Faculty on leave at the time of the peer review are exempt from this process during that academic year.

(D) Oversight and rotation management. Oversight of the peer review process is shared among department chairpersons, college deans, and the office of academic affairs (OAA) with collaborative support from the ITL.

(1) Department chairpersons coordinate review schedules, assign reviewers, determine focal areas, classes, or instructional settings to be observed, and ensure adherence to the rotation. They maintain records confirming that each faculty member fulfills both reviewer and reviewee roles.

(2) College deans monitor departmental compliance through annual faculty evaluations and report to OAA on participation, rotation adherence, and trends or recommendations for improvement.

(3) The OAA and ITL periodically review the process to ensure continued alignment with university goals and the TEACH principles.

(E) Documentation and workflow.

(1) The faculty success technology platform (FSTP) system serves as the official platform for managing workflow and archiving documentation. Reviewees, reviewers, and chairs shall use FSTP to upload all required materials, including reports, narratives, reflections, and related correspondence.

(2) Department chairpersons and deans monitor completion through FSTP to ensure full participation and compliance. Aggregated data from FSTP may be shared with ITL to inform professional development initiatives, identify themes, and support programming aligned with faculty needs and institutional teaching goals.

(F) Implementation and support. The ITL serves as a resource to departments and faculty participants.

(G) Policy review. This policy shall be reviewed every five years.

(H) YSU shall not bargain peer evaluation policies. This policy applies, notwithstanding, any contrary provision in a collective bargaining agreement entered into on or after the statute's effective date.