STEWART LIBRARY
PEER REVIEW POLICY

(Reviewed and approved by Library Faculty February 2010)

"Every candidate for promotion or tenure review shall undergo peer review."
(WSU PPM 8-11:E-3)

I. Assumptions:

The purpose of peer review is to facilitate the evaluation process primarily through evidence-gathering. The professional file, supplemented by additional relevant information and observation of teaching and reference service, forms the basis for peer review. **Reviewers shall interpret this information in terms of library expectations**. Since there is no department level review in the Library, the Peer Review Committee gathers evidence in all three categories of formal evaluation and not just teaching.

Peer review should be perceived as a means of helping faculty to improve and enhance their performance. It should be clearly defined and well-understood by all library faculty.

The library's peer review process shall adhere to the intent and general guidelines specified in the University's PPM 8-11.

II. Categories to be considered in the peer review process:

1. **Teaching** (includes Librarianship)

   a.. Instruction
   b. Reference/Information Services
   c. Collection Management/Faculty Liaison

2. **Scholarship**

3. **Administrative and/or Professionally Related Service**

III. Time frame:

1. While library faculty may request peer review during any academic year, peer review is required in the years in which s/he is formally evaluated:

   a. Interim Review (3rd year)
   b. Tenure and Promotion Review (6th year)
   c. Promotion to Full Professor

Peer review of a tenured or untenured faculty member may also be requested by the University Librarian.

2. Peer reviewers will be selected by **no later than April 15th** during the academic year prior to the review. Reviewers will serve for one year.

3. Faculty being considered for tenure or promotion have until **January 15th** to complete their professional file for review by the college Ranking and Tenure Review Committee. **However, a "working" file must be ready for review by peer reviewers prior to the beginning of the peer review process.**

4. To accommodate the University's time-frame for tenure and promotion review, peer review **must be completed by no later than December 15th.**

IV. Composition and Selection of the Peer Review Committee

1. All library faculty are eligible to serve as peer reviewers.

2. The Peer Review Committee shall consist of a minimum of three and a maximum of five faculty, mutually agreed upon by the faculty member being reviewed and the University Librarian, and who are familiar with the program.

3. Three reviewers will be selected from among the library faculty. At the discretion of the faculty member and the University Librarian up to two, mutually agreed upon, additional reviewers may be selected from outside of the library.

V. Procedures

1. The University Librarian will meet with the faculty member to select peer reviewers. The University Librarian will then contact the mutually agreed upon individuals to invite them to serve on the Peer Review Committee.

2. The University Librarian will meet with peer reviewers to select a chair, discuss the peer review process, and determine the category for which each reviewer will take primary responsibility.

3. Reviewers will meet with the faculty member to establish a method and time table for completing the review, identify any supplementary information they wish to examine that is not available in the faculty member's professional file, and select the individuals whom they may wish to contact. This time table will be shared with the University Librarian.

4. Throughout the peer review process, the faculty member is responsible for providing materials deemed necessary by the reviewers. While the information included in the professional file forms the basis for peer review, additional relevant information may be requested by the reviewers and should be provided by the faculty member in a timely manner.

5. Reviewers will review the information contained in the professional file and any supplementary information, observe instructional sessions and reference service, and solicit comments from mutually agreed upon individuals who have direct knowledge concerning the faculty member's performance.

6. Reviewers will use the appropriate forms to record their observations and comments, giving careful consideration to the goals of the individual and the library.

7. Upon completion of their review, reviewers will meet with the faculty member to discuss the results of the review **prior to completing their written report**.

8. **The written report will be a narrative summary** that addresses the strengths of the candidate and identifies areas for improvement in each of the categories considered by the reviewers. Specific suggestions for improvement may also be included.

9. Signed copies of the reviewers' written report will be forwarded to the faculty member and the University Librarian. Should the faculty member wish to, s/he may place a written response in the file or may ask to appear before the college Ranking and Tenure Committee (PPM 8-11:E3). If the faculty member is not up for promotion or tenure, then the candidate may wait until the next promotion-tenure review or petition for the removal of the peer review as provided in PPM 8-13.

10. A copy of the signed written report will be placed in the faculty member's professional file **prior** to the faculty member's evaluation by the college Ranking and Tenure Committee.

11. The results of the peer review are to be evaluated by the college Ranking and Tenure Committee, which is charged with making a formal evaluation and forwarding its recommendation to the candidate with a copy to the University Librarian. Since the Library is not divided into departments, there is no department level review.

12. The University Librarian makes a separate and independent review. Her/his review is than forwarded to the Provost. (PPM 8-11:C)

PEER REVIEW-TEACHING-INSTRUCTION

To gather information on the instruction activities of library faculty and to assist faculty with improving their teaching, members of the peer review committee will:

1. Observe the faculty member teaching

    Process: Use the process described in the Teaching Observation Report Form (below) to review two teaching sessions.

2. Review Student End of Course Evaluations

    Process: End of course evaluations should be conducted for every for-credit class taught in the department. A representative number of those evaluations should be included in the faculty member's professional file.

3. Review Teaching Narrative/Materials Segment within the Professional File

    Process: Evidence of teaching effectiveness will be provided by the faculty member being reviewed in the form of a written narrative, with supporting materials (may also be known as a "teaching portfolio") within their professional file and/or supplementary materials in accordance with the University PPM 8.11 II.D. "Evidence of Teaching Effectiveness:

Evidence collected from each of the above evaluations and observations will be used in preparation of the final peer review committee report on instruction for the faculty member being reviewed. This report will include a narrative of the candidate's strengths, of areas in need of improvement, and suggestions for improvement.

TEACHING OBSERVATION REPORT FORM

Instructor: _____   **Course:** _____

Reviewer: _____   **Date:** _____

Purpose: To assist peer reviewers in gathering evidence on the quality of instruction provided and help faculty to improve teaching and learning.

Process and Instructions:

1. For the purposes of peer review, **two** teaching sessions will be observed. Those sessions may be for-credit class(es) or subject specific instructional sessions.

2. **Observations will be scheduled in advance as part of the peer review timetable**.

3. Faculty will provide reviewers with a written lesson plan or description of intended outcomes for each session at least 24 hours before each sessions that will be reviewed. This may be sent via E-mail.

4. For the instructional session observed, please indicate **whether or not** the faculty member met the general teaching expectations according to the scale listed below. Please explain any very low ratings and add comments that may assist in the peer review process or that would help the faculty member to improve teaching and learning.

Scale: (HIGH) 4 3 2 1 (LOW)

1. Adequately defined objectives for the class presentation.
Scale: **4   3   2   1**
Comment:

2. Effectively organized learning situations to meet the objectives of the class presentation.
Scale: **4   3   2   1**
Comment:

3. Used instructional methods encouraging student participation in the learning process.
Scale: **4   3   2   1**
Comment:

4. Used class time effectively.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

5. Demonstrated enthusiasm for the subject matter.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

6. Communicated clearly and effectively to the level of the students.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

7. Explained important ideas simply and clearly.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

8. Demonstrated command of subject matter.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

9. Responded appropriately to student questions and comments.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

10. Encouraged critical thinking and analysis as applicable.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

Additional Comments:

PEER REVIEW-TEACHING-INSTRUCTION
TEACHING MATERIALS

Listed below are items concerned with teaching materials, categorized into three areas. Members of the peer review committee will use this form to summarize evidence gathered regarding the candidate's teaching materials. For each item, please indicate whether or not (**Y/N**) the materials meet the criteria as represented by each item. If the item is not applicable, please indicate **NA**.

Course Organization:

____ The syllabus adequately outlines the sequence of topics to be covered.
____ The stated course objectives are clear.
____ The outline and sequence of topics are logical.
____ The course integrates recent developments in the field.
____ Time given to each of the major course topics is appropriate.
____ The course is designed to meet the needs of university level students.
____ The course objectives are congruent with the department curricula.

Readings, Projects, and Laboratory Assignments:

____ Texts and/or supplemental readings are well-selected, up to date and appropriate for the level of the course.
____ Students are given ample time to complete the assignments/take home exams.
____ The amount of homework and assignments are appropriate.
____ The written assignments and projects are carefully chosen to reflect course goals.
____ A variety of assignments is available to meet student needs.
____ Laboratory work is integrated into the course.
____ Students are given the course requirements in writing at the beginning of the course.
____ The assignments are intellectually challenging to the students.

Exams and Grading:

_____ The exam content is representative of the course content and objectives.
____ The exam items are clear and well written.
____ The standards used for grading are communicated in writing to the students.

Comments:

PEER REVIEW-TEACHING- REFERENCE/INFORMATION SERVICES

I. Observation of Reference Service

To gather information on the reference/information services activities of library faculty and to assist faculty in improving their reference service, one of more members of the peer review committee will spend a minimum of **two hours** observing the faculty member's reference service. Observations should occur on **two different days and at times that are usually busy**. Where possible, observers should be prepared to politely refer any questions asked of them to individuals scheduled at the reference desk, explaining that they are there as an observer only.

Instructions: Please indicate **whether or not** the faculty member met the following general reference expectations **according to the following scale**, adding comments as appropriate, and suggestions for improvement:

 (High)   4 3 2 1 (Low) NA (Not applicable/unable to judge)

A. Question Negotiation.

1. Skillfully interviews patrons.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

2. Recommends sources at the appropriate level.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

3. Determines patron's ability to use the source to which they are referred.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

4. Provides instruction when appropriate.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

5. Suggests alternative approaches.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

6. Regularly suggests alternative sources or services.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

7. Provides answers that appear to be accurate and appropriate.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

8. Ascertains whether patron's needs were satisfied; if not, provides alternatives.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

B. Knowledge of Resources.

1. Understands, uses and instructs patrons in the use of print and electronic resources.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

2. Consults with colleagues when appropriate.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

C. Service Orientation.

1. Is approachable.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

2. Acknowledges patrons who approach the Reference Desk, or who are waiting for assistance.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

3. Provides a level of service appropriate to demand.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

4. Pro-actively offers assistance to all patrons.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

5. Responds to patrons in a positive manner.
Scale: 4 3 2 1 NA
Comments:

6. Responds in a non-judgmental manner.
Scale: <u>4   3   2   1   NA</u>
Comments:

7. Treats all patrons with courtesy and respect.
Scale: <u>4   3   2   1   NA</u>
Comments:

II. Interviews with Reference Team Members

To gather additional information on the reference/information services activities of library faculty and to assist faculty in improving their reference service, one or more members of the peer review committee will conduct interviews with **at least two faculty members of the Reference Team** (excluding the team leader) who have worked at the reference desk with the faculty member. Interviewees should be assured that information share with the interviewer will not be attributed to any one individual.

Instructions: Ask the interviewees to rate the faculty member on each of the following statements **using a scale of 4 (always) to 1 (never).** Please encourage the interviewees to provide additional comments where appropriate.

1. Does s/he respond to inquiries and requests for assistance from you, from other members of the Reference Team, and from reference patrons in a timely and appropriate manner?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

 2. Does s/he cooperate willingly and effectively with other members of the Reference Team?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

3. Is s/he willing to provide assistance when team members assigned to the desk are extremely busy?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

4. Is s/he willing to ask for assistance from other members of the team when unable to easily answer a question?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

5. Is s/he willing to share his or her expertise with other members of the Reference Team?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

6. Does s/he work effectively as a member of the Reference Team?
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comments:

PEER REVIEW-TEACHING-COLLECTION MANAGEMENT/FACULTY LIAISON

To gather information on the collection management/faculty liaison activities of library faculty and to assist faculty in improving their collection management/faculty liaison skills, members of the peer review committee will conduct interviews with individuals having knowledge of the faculty member's collection management/faculty liaison activities. Interviewees should be assured that information shared with the committee will not be attributed to any one individual.

I. Interviews with Departmental Representatives (minimum of three):

These questions are intended to gather information on the faculty member's progress in (a) identifying information needs in assigned subject areas; (b) selecting appropriate library resources to meet identified needs; (c) promoting, marketing, and facilitating use of library resources and services; and (d) communicating effectively with faculty in assigned subject areas.

> **Instructions:** Based on your knowledge of and experience working with the library faculty member, please rate your satisfaction with her/his performance in each of the following areas, **using a scale of 4 (very satisfied) to 1 (not satisfied).**
>
> 1. How satisfied are you with her/his communication with you concerning library resources/services?
> **Scale:**   **4 3 2 1**
> **Comment:**
>
>
> 2. How satisfied are you with her/his awareness of the information needs of faculty/students in your department?
> **Scale:**   **4 3 2 1**
> **Comment:**
>
>
> 3. How satisfied are you with her/his assistance in selecting and acquiring resources needed by faculty and students in your department?
> **Scale:**   **4 3 2 1**
> **Comment:**
>
>
> 4. Has s/he provided library instruction for your students? **Yes / No.** If so, how satisfied are you with the quality of the instruction provided?
> **Scale:**   **4 3 2 1**
> **Comment:**

5. Overall, how satisfied are you with her/his general knowledge, efficiency, and helpfulness?
Scale: <u>4 3 2 1</u>
Comment:

Additional Comments:

II. Interviews with other subject librarians (minimum of two):

These questions are intended to provide information on the faculty member's progress in (a) knowledge of the collection in her/his subject areas; (b) program effectiveness; and (c) interpersonal communication.

Instructions: Based on your knowledge of and work with the faculty member, rate her/him on each of the following statements, **using a scale of 4 (always) to 1 (never)**.

1. Does s/he consult with you, share information, respond to inquiries and requests for assistance from you in a timely and appropriate manner?
Scale: <u>4 3 2 1</u>
Comment:

2. Does s/he communicate effectively the information needs of faculty and students in her/his subject areas?
Scale: <u>4 3 2 1</u>
Comment:

3. Does s/he work effectively as a member of the Collection Management Team?
Scale: <u>4 3 2 1</u>
Comment:

Additional Comments:

PEER REVIEW-SCHOLARSHIP

Library faculty shall engage in scholarship and will provide evidence of their activities in their professional file. Members of the peer review will gather evidence in this category by reviewing the candidate's professional file and supplemental materials.

The scholarship category includes the following activities:

a. Refereed publications.

b. Non-refereed publications.

c. Papers presented at professional conferences and workshops.

d. Professional improvement, such as graduate education beyond the terminal degree, development of new areas of expertise, additional training in existing areas of expertise, or attendance at professional conferences and workshops.

e. Projects such as group or individual grants and submission of reports as required.

f. Other activities appropriate to this category.

PEER REVIEW-ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR
PROFESSIONALLY RELATED SERVICE

Library faculty shall engage in administrative and/or professionally related service and will provide evidence of such service in their professional file.

The administrative and/or professional service categories includes the following activies:

a. Committee assignments at the university or library level with university assignments having more significance than library assignments. Leadership positions on committees are weighted more heavily than membership only.

b. Administrative responsibilities within the library and university above and beyond the duties described in the candidate's position description.

c. Leadership positions and/or active participation in professional organizations and similar activities that enhance the reputation of the candidate, the library, and/or the university.

d. Involvement in the planning and organization of professional workshops, meetings, conferences, symposia, etc., that benefit the library, the university, and/or the library profession.

e. Participation in projects that benefit the library, the university, and/or the library profession

f. Professionally-related community activities.

g. Consulting or otherwise providing professional expertise.

h. Student advisement activities or serving as an advisor to a student organization.

i. Other activities appropriate to this category.

Evidence Regarding Service to the Library

Library faculty shall participate in the development of quality library services and are expected to work cooperatively with colleagues within the library.

> **Instructions:** Based on information available in the professional file and the committee's knowledge and perceptions of the individual, the committee will rate the faculty member on each of the following statements, **using a scale of 4 (always) to 1 (never)**.

1. Accepts assignments willingly and assumes an appropriate share of the professional activities associated with the functioning of the library.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

2. Serves on and makes a positive contribution to library teams and committees.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

3. Participates in and/or provides training for library faculty/staff.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

4. Willingly shares expertise and knowledge with colleagues.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

5. Maintains a professional and cooperative attitude in dealing with colleagues, treating them with courtesy and respect.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

6. Communicates effectively with colleagues, team leaders, and the university librarian.
Scale: 4 3 2 1
Comment:

7. Consistently demonstrates effective time management and organizational skills. Keeps commitments and completes assignments in a timely manner.
Scale: <u>4   3   2   1</u>
Comment:

Additional Comments:

PEER REVIEW: TIMETABLE

Faculty Member Being Reviewed: _____

Peer Review Committee Members: _____, chair

_____

_____

I. Pre-review Meeting Date: _____

II. Observation of Reference Service (dates & times to be mutually agreed upon).
      Date: _____   Observer: _____

      Date: _____   Observer: _____

III. Observation of Teaching Sessions (either formal class or subject specific sessions. Dates & times to be mutually agreed upon).
      Date: _____   Observer: _____

      Date: _____   Observer: _____

IV. Collection Management -
      1. Interviews with academic faculty. Individuals to be interviewed will be mutually agreed upon by the faculty member and the peer review committee.

      Interviewee: _____ _____
                Name   Dept.
      Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

      Interviewee: _____ _____
                 Name   Dept.
      Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

      Interviewee: _____ _____
                 Name   Dept.
      Interviewer: _____ Date:

2. Interview(s) with other subject librarians

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

Interviewer: _____ Date: _____

V. Post-review Meeting -
    1. Must take place prior to December 15th and **before** the Committee drafts its narrative summary.

    Date: _____

VI. Committee's Written Report -
    1. Must be submitted to the faculty member and the University Librarian by **NO LATER THAN December 31st**.