Goals and Intent
• Peer teaching evaluation is intended to be a positive, constructive experience for the
  instructor and that should be conducted fairly and with a spirit of collegiality.
• Peer teaching evaluation has a role in both formative and summative teaching
evaluation (Keig and Waggoner, 1994).
  Formative: evaluation intended to improve teaching.
  Summative: evaluation that functions in decision-making relative to P&T and
  compensation (required in OSU guidelines for P&T)
• Goals of peer teaching evaluation:
  1. To evaluate the teaching program of individual instructors including course design (e.g.,
     course content, objectives, syllabus, organization, methods and materials for delivering
     instruction), methods of assessment of student performance, relationship to overall
     curriculum objectives (including themes and skills appropriate to the courses), classroom
     presentation, and rapport with students.
  2. To provide insight into and context for results from other forms of evaluation (e.g.,
     student evaluations).
  3. To foster interaction among faculty; faculty work collaboratively to assess teaching and
     assist in improvement of teaching.

Who Should Experience Peer Teaching Evaluation
• All faculty teaching regularly-scheduled courses should experience peer teaching evaluation.
  This includes courtesy faculty and faculty teaching distance courses/sections (this is
  redundant).
• The entire teaching program (all courses that are taught by an instructor) should be
  evaluated. Distance education courses and sections of on-campus courses offered at a
  distance should be reviewed with special consideration for their delivery technology and
  content as in Attachment 3: Suggested Elements for Review of Online Instruction.

Frequency of Evaluation
• The teaching program of non-tenured faculty should undergo peer evaluation every three
  years. Most non-tenured faculty would experience evaluation twice prior to P&T. A
  principal purpose of the first evaluation is to identify, well in advance of P&T, areas of
  teaching that need improvement.
• The teaching program of tenured faculty should undergo evaluation every 4-5 years.

Peer Evaluation Committee
• The committee should be composed of two faculty members from inside the department and
  one from outside the department. Some committee members should have the expertise to
  evaluate course content. For instructors with distance education courses/sections a member
  of Extended Campus should be included in the committee and/or used as an advisor for the
  committee.
• The department head should work with the instructor to select mutually
  acceptable panel members. The instructor should not be evaluated by a colleague whom the
instructor believes might exhibit unfair bias.

**Procedure for Conducting Peer Teaching Evaluations**
The peer evaluation consists of three parts: evaluation of instructional materials, classroom visitations, and interviews with students.

**Evaluation of Instructional Materials**
1. The instructor provides to the committee a summary of their teaching program that includes an instructor’s narrative (will everyone know what this is?) and self-evaluation consisting of the instructor’s personal teaching philosophy, perceived strengths and areas needing improvement, recent efforts in teaching development, problems encountered by the instructor that hamper effective teaching (e.g., students lack of necessary quantitative skills, lack of TA support, problems interacting with students), and comments and concerns relevant to evaluation.

2. For each course the instructor should provide the following:
   a. Syllabus and outline for lecture and lab including course descriptions and course objectives, relationship with other courses in the department (pre-requisites, subsequent courses, etc.), reading list/text(s), description of methods and approach for delivering instructional materials, and expected outcomes.
   b. A description of course content sufficient to allow detailed peer review.
   c. A sample of exams, problem sets, and other materials and means of evaluating student performance.
   d. Method of grading and grade distributions (grading range?).
   e. Student evaluations. Only the summary of scores from the computerized student evaluation form can be used for teaching evaluation. It is university policy that the written comments from students on the Student Assessment of Teaching form cannot be used in evaluation of teaching and are only for feedback to the instructor. Department heads may not review the written student comments intended for instructors. (Does this apply to signed comments?)
   f. If a distance section of a course is offered the instructor should include and note any materials that are different than from those of the on-campus course, including DVDs, CDs, website access etc.

3. Members of the committee review the teaching summary (materials mentioned above?) and meet as a group to determine how the peer evaluation will be conducted, including a schedule for classroom visitations, to determine a process for review of technology use and course delivery and to determine how student interviews will be conducted. The conduct process of the review should be discussed with the instructor. After discussion with the instructor, an outline of the procedures for conducting the review should be submitted to the department head for approval.

**Classroom Visitations**
Done properly, visitation by peers demands a good deal of time, even though it can be and is useful in both improving and evaluating teaching. Classroom visitation also can be helpful in resolving discrepancies between student evaluations and perceptions of the peer evaluation committee. In addition, in-class components must be part of peer evaluation within according to the OSU Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.
Guidelines for classroom visits are given in Attachment 2. In general, more than one classroom visit is recommended. The instructor should be informed prior to each visit. The committee should meet with the instructor, prior to each visit to discuss the objectives of the lecture and review content and materials, and after the visits to discuss strengths/weaknesses, etc. Lectures can be videotaped and viewed by committee members who were unable to attend the visitations.

Student Interviews

A variety of methods could be used to conduct student interviews. The committee should attempt to avoid bias in selecting students for interviews and should solicit a cross section of student opinions on the instructor’s teaching performance. To avoid concerns over confidentiality of the identity of interviewed students, students should be interviewed in a group setting, perhaps after a class visit by the peer review team.

Course Delivery Technology Review

If the course uses any type of digital technology, whether for on-campus or distance students the committee should set up a process for reviewing the digital material. The committee should review and discuss Attachment 3: Suggested Elements for Review of Online Instruction with Extended Campus representatives before visiting the website or viewing digital materials. The committee should contact Blackboard Coordinators so that they may be given guest status to visit the course website for all courses using Blackboard.

As in classroom visits the committee should meet with the instructor prior to each visit to discuss the objectives of the lecture and review content and materials, and after the visit to discuss strengths/weaknesses, etc. (Does this mean committee members are not free to watch activity on Blackboard over a period of time?)

The committee should meet with the instructor to discuss, clarify, and expand the materials summarizing the teaching program, and results of classroom visitations and student interviews. Every effort should be made to keep the tone of the meeting positive and constructive. An oral summary of the committee’s reaction to the teaching program should be presented to the instructor. Strengths and weaknesses of the program and suggestions for teaching improvement should be discussed with the instructor.
The Review Document

- Based upon the teaching summary, discussions with the instructor, and classroom visits, individual reports or a consensus report is submitted by the committee to the department head. This letter will become a part of the instructor’s dossier for promotion and tenure. A list of possible questions for consideration by the committee is attached (Attachment 1). The list of questions is suggestive of general areas to be addressed in the review and can serve to focus evaluation of instructional materials. Individual responses to each question are not necessary. In general, the committee should:

  - Document the process used in conducting the review
  - Summarize the teaching responsibilities and general mode and method of teaching
  - Summarize findings from classroom visits and student interviews
  - Provide an analysis of student evaluation scores and trends in scores
  - Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching program and areas needing improvement
  - Evaluate course content and recommend improvements
  - Highlight innovative teaching methods
  - Note efforts to improve teaching
  - The committee should provide specific recommendations for improvement of teaching.

A copy of the evaluation(s) will be provided to the instructor who may respond to it in writing. Both the peer evaluation and the instructor responses must be considered in summative evaluation.
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Guidelines for Reviewing the Teaching Summary
(Adapted from Seldin, 1985 & University of Missouri, 1992).

Course Content
Is it up-to-date? Is the treatment balanced and fair? If appropriate, are conflicting views presented?
Are the breadth and depth of coverage appropriate? Has the instructor mastered the subject matter?
Is the coverage responsive to the needs of students? It is relevant to the discipline?

Course Objectives
Are the objectives clearly communicated to the students? Are they consistent with overall curricular
objectives? Does the course incorporate the appropriate themes and skills? Are in-class and out-of-
class work appropriately balanced? Does the instructor encourage students to think for themselves?

Grading and Examination
Are exams suitable to content and course objectives? Are exams representative of course content?
Are exams clearly written? Are exams fairly graded? Are grading standards mad clear to the
students?

Course Organization
Is the syllabus current and relevant to the course objectives? Is the course outline logical? Are the
lecture, laboratory, or other assignments integrated? Should they be? Is the time devoted to each
topic appropriate?

Assignments
Do assignments supplement lectures, discussions, labs, and field work? Do assignments reflect and
support course objectives? Are they appropriate for the level of the student? Is adequate time given
to complete the assignments? Is it consistent with expected quality? Are the assignments
challenging to the student?

Interest in Teaching
Does the instructor discuss teaching with colleagues? Does the instructor seek advice from others
and participate in teaching-related workshops and committees? Is the instructor sought out by others
on teaching-related matters? Is the instructor knowledgeable about current developments in
teaching?

Instructor Concerns
Are the instructor’s concerns about evaluation well-founded? Are the instructor’s needs for course
improvement well-founded?
Guidelines for Reviewing Classroom Visitations
(Adapted from Seldin, 1985).

Structure and Goals
Are the instructor’s presentations well-planned and organized? Are the various instructional elements (lecture, blackboard material, handouts) effectively integrated? Is the class time used efficiently? Is the material presented clearly and effectively?

Teaching Behaviors
Is the oral delivery appropriately paced?
Is the language used understandable to students?

Instructor-Student Rapport
Does the instructor demonstrate fair and equitable concern for all students? Do the students seem receptive to the instructor’s ideas? Is the instructor sensitive to response of the class? Are student questions answered clearly and simply? Does the instructor provide opportunities and encourage student questions? Does the instructor accept student ideas and comments? How would you describe the instructor-student classroom relationship?

Subject Matter and Instruction
Does the instructor demonstrate adequate knowledge of the subject? Are the transitions between topics effective? Is the course material presented in a lively and interesting style? Are the students generally attentive? Does the instructor demonstrate enthusiasm for the subject and for teaching? Does the instructor include material relevant to existing student interest?