

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA ASHEVILLE  
FACULTY SENATE

Senate Document Number SD1623S  
Date of Senate Approval 02/02/2023

-----  
Statement of Faculty Senate Action:

**FWDC 3:** **Revise Peer Reviews of Teaching for Lecturers**  
[Faculty Handbook Section 3.3.3.1.2](#)

**Effective Date:** Fall 2023

**Summary:** This document changes the frequency of required peer reviews of senior lecturers from every academic year to every other academic year. It also allows senior lecturers to conduct peer reviews of their colleagues.

**Rationale:** Peer reviews provide a way for faculty to learn best practices from each other. Our university would benefit if we provide opportunities for senior lecturers to share their expertise with their colleagues and for senior lecturers to be encouraged to observe their colleagues' teaching strategies. Currently only tenured full-time faculty members can perform required peer reviews. This document revises Section 3.3.3.1.2 to allow senior lecturers to also conduct required peer reviews of their colleagues.

This document also updates the frequency of required peer reviews. Currently, non-tenured faculty members are required to be peer reviewed every academic year, and tenured faculty members are required to be peer reviewed every other year. The rank of senior lecturer is reserved for members of the faculty who have completed at least seven years as a full-time faculty member and who have demonstrated noteworthy accomplishment in scholarship and/or service, in addition to high-quality teaching. This document revises Section 3.3.3.1.2 to require that senior lecturers be peer reviewed every other academic year, which is in line with expectations of tenured faculty members.

**Revise Section 3.3.3.1.2 as follows:**

[3.3.3.1.2 Peer Review of Teaching \(SD6315S\) \(SD1413F\)](#)

Peer review of teaching is an essential component of faculty evaluation. It contributes to evidence of teaching effectiveness through the observations of peers with an understanding of effective pedagogy and complements student ratings of instruction. **Tenured faculty members and senior lecturers should be peer reviewed at least once every other academic year; all other full-time faculty members should be peer reviewed at least once per academic year. ~~All untenured full-time faculty members should be peer~~**

~~reviewed at least once per academic year; tenured full-time faculty members should be peer reviewed at least once every other academic year.~~ This required peer review should be conducted by a tenured faculty member **or senior lecturer** in the same academic department or program area **or related program area**. Additional peer reviews may be conducted by any member of the faculty. Peer reviews should be submitted to both the faculty member and the Department Chair or Program Director who will incorporate the peer review into their annual evaluation and into any documents required for personnel review; peer reviews of Department Chairs should be submitted to both the Department Chair and to the appropriate Program Area Dean (see [section 3.4](#)). Peer reviews should be conducted according to the following guidelines.

1. Peer reviews of teaching should incorporate both evaluation of course materials and classroom observation. Reviewers should set up a pre-review conference to request relevant course materials and schedule a classroom observation. The reviewer and faculty member should discuss the plan and objectives of the class to be observed and the guidelines that will be used for the review. Reviewers should also meet with faculty members after the review of materials and classroom observation have been completed to provide prompt feedback and a copy of the resulting evaluation. Peer reviews should be retained in department files.
2. Evaluation of course materials may include examination of course syllabi, reading assignments, course management system pages, handouts, project guidelines, tests, rubrics, or instructor feedback on student work. If the faculty member maintains a teaching portfolio, portions relevant to the course being evaluated may be submitted. Such materials can provide valuable information about a faculty member's teaching philosophy, expertise, dedication, and creativity.
3. In the effort to enhance the reliability of classroom observations, reviewers should make use of standardized rating forms or checklists in their evaluations. Such forms should be adopted by departments in accordance with their disciplinary goals and accepted teaching practices. In selecting or adapting rating criteria, departments and program areas are encouraged to consult the Center for Teaching and Learning for relevant resources.
4. Faculty who teach regularly or substantially outside of their home departments (e.g., in humanities or arts) may opt for peer review in these areas instead of one within their departments. Peer review in this case should follow the procedures of the relevant department or program area.
5. Where possible over the course of a faculty member's career, peer reviews should be rotated among multiple observers, including observers outside their department. In addition, a range of classes taught by the faculty member should be observed.
6. Departments are encouraged to expand peer review activities beyond the aforementioned summative review procedures, incorporating formative peer review opportunities as a regular practice. Such experiences may be helpful for junior faculty, faculty teaching new courses, or faculty experimenting with new pedagogies.