



Covey CAHP Policy on Peer Review of Teaching *in support of the USA Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness*

1. Purpose and Scope

In accordance with the **University of South Alabama Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness Policy**, the Covey College of Allied Health Professions (CAHP) establishes this policy to define eligibility for peer reviewers and to outline procedures for the peer review of teaching. Peer review of teaching is a required component of the assessment of teaching effectiveness and is used consistently across annual review, probationary review, promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review processes.

This policy applies to **all instructional faculty within CAHP**, including tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track faculty of all appointment ranks, and is intended to promote high-quality teaching, meaningful feedback, continuous improvement, and fairness in evaluation.

The timeline of peer review of teaching will follow the USA Assessment of Teaching Effectiveness policy. In addition, all CAHP faculty will complete a peer review of teaching every 5 years post-promotion.

2. Guiding Principles

Peer review of teaching within Covey CAHP shall:

- Provide **constructive feedback** to support teaching effectiveness and professional development.
- Be conducted in a **consistent** and **transparent manner** across departments.
- Reflect the **faculty member's assigned and typical teaching responsibilities**.
- Utilize **evidence-based evaluation practices**.
- Serve as a credible component of faculty evaluation and promotion materials, showing growth in teaching effectiveness over time

3. Eligibility to Serve as a Peer Reviewer

To ensure appropriate expertise and fairness, faculty serving as peer reviewers must meet **both** of the following criteria:

1. **Promotion Requirement:** The peer reviewer must have achieved at least one promotion on their current faculty track.
2. **Rank Requirement:** The peer reviewer must hold the same or higher academic rank than the faculty member under review.

When practical, CAHP peer reviewers should be on the same track (Instructor, Professor of Instruction, Professor track) as the faculty member with whom they will be conducting their review.

Faculty Member Under Review

Instructor

Senior Instructor

Assistant Professor*

Associate Professor*

Professor*

*Professor of Instruction and Professor tracks

Eligible Peer Reviewers

Senior Instructor, Associate Professor*, Professor*

Senior Instructor, Associate Professor*, Professor*

Associate Professor*, Professor*

Associate Professor*, Professor*

Professor*, Department Chair

Peer reviewers within the Covey CAHP should be within the same department or program, if available, with consideration of primary teaching modality (i.e. certain teaching modalities may be better served by a peer reviewer outside of the faculty member's home department or program).

4. Teaching Encounters Subject to Peer Review

Prior to the observation, the faculty member and CAHP peer reviewer will coordinate the date, time, duration, and location of the review.

The peer-reviewed teaching encounter must be **representative of the faculty member's primary assigned teaching responsibilities**. Acceptable modalities include, but are not limited to:

- Didactic or lecture-based instruction
- Laboratory instruction
- Clinical teaching or supervision
- Online or asynchronous instruction
- Other formally assigned instructional activities (e.g., small group facilitation)

Faculty may elect, over time and particularly for promotion or tenure dossiers, to include **peer reviews across multiple teaching modalities** (e.g., both in-person and online instruction) to provide a more comprehensive representation of their teaching effectiveness.

5. Peer Review Evaluation Process

The Department Chair shall provide a roster of eligible CAHP peer reviewers. The faculty member, in collaboration with the Chair, will identify reviewers whose professional expertise and experience match the specific teaching modality (clinical, online, asynchronous, in-person didactic, etc.) being evaluated. Final selection will be based on availability of reviewers.

The faculty member will invite the peer reviewer to serve as their observer and will coordinate a classroom visit (or other visit appropriate to the course format).

Peer review of teaching shall be conducted using a **CAHP-adopted evaluation rubric** designed to assess teaching effectiveness using evidence-based instructional practices (see examples listed in the *CAHP Guidelines Pertaining to Tenure and Promotion* document). The rubric will be **adopted and periodically reviewed by a designated group of faculty from the Covey CAHP**.

- The rubric may be **updated as needed without requiring revision of this policy**.
- At the time of adoption, the rubric will be appended to this policy.

6. Documentation: Report of Peer Review of Teaching

The peer review process will culminate in a completed *CAHP Peer Review Rubric*, which serves as the official written report. This rubric includes qualitative sections addressing:

- Observed strengths
- Areas for improvement
- Alignment with evidence-based teaching practices

The reviewer will provide the completed report to the faculty member and the Department Chair. To ensure the integrity of the process, the peer reviewer must maintain strict confidentiality.

The faculty member under review may request a post-observation conference with the peer-reviewer.

The faculty member will provide a reflective response addressing feedback, planned changes, and/or professional development goals based on the feedback received. The peer review report and faculty reflective response will be included in the annual faculty evaluation materials and/or promotion application materials submitted by the faculty member in the respective year.

7. Developmental Review, Response, and Appeal Process

Developmental Follow-Up

When a peer review identifies substantive opportunities for improvement, the Department Chair and faculty member may collaboratively establish a developmental improvement plan, which may include:

- Consultation with a faculty mentor;
- Participation in faculty development programming;
- Observation of exemplary teaching peers;
- A follow-up peer review in the same or alternative teaching modality;
- Submission of revised teaching materials demonstrating implemented changes

The purpose of this process is faculty development, rather than disciplinary action.

Appeal Process for Procedural Concerns

Because individual peer reviews may ultimately contribute to summative tenure and promotion decisions, faculty retain the right to appeal a peer review when concerns exist regarding fairness of procedural integrity.

Grounds for appeal include:

- Failure to follow established peer review procedures;
- Assignment of a reviewer without appropriate expertise in the relevant teaching modality;
- Evaluation of a teaching encounter that was not representative of assigned teaching responsibilities
- Factual inaccuracies in the written evaluation;
- Evidence of bias, conflict of interest, or lack of objectivity.

The faculty member must submit a written appeal to the Department Chair within **5 business days** of receipt of the peer review report.

Following review, the Department Chair may:

- Affirm the original review;
- Request clarification or revision from the reviewer;
- Exclude the review from summative evaluative consideration if procedural deficiencies materially affected fairness;
- Conduct a second peer review.

If a second peer review is conducted due to substantiated procedural concerns, both reviews may be retained in the record with appropriate contextual documentation, or the Department Chair/Dean may designate the replacement review as the official evaluative document, consistent with college policy.

8. Review and Revision

This policy shall be reviewed periodically by the CAHP Dean's Office in consultation with the Department Chairs and College leadership to ensure continued alignment with University policies, accreditation expectations, and best practices in teaching evaluation.