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Goals and Intent

- Peer teaching review has a role in both improving teaching and, per OSU Guidelines, reviewing teaching quality for promotion and/or tenure. It also can be useful as a consideration in compensation (i.e., merit raises).

- Peer teaching review is intended to be a positive, constructive experience for faculty members being reviewed, and should be conducted fairly and with a spirit of collegiality.

- Peer teaching review should recognize that a diversity of teaching approaches and styles can be employed in effective teaching.

- Peer teaching review should not place an undue burden on faculty, both those being reviewed and those doing the review.

Specific Objectives of Peer Teaching Review

- To foster interaction among FES faculty, encourage faculty to work collaboratively to assess teaching and assist in improvement of teaching, and contribute to a culture of engaged and effective teaching within the FES Department.

- To review and provide feedback on faculty teaching, including teaching philosophy, course design (e.g., course content, learning outcomes, syllabus, organization, methods and materials for delivering instruction), methods of assessment of student performance, classroom presentation, and rapport with students.

- To provide insight into, and context for, results from other forms of review (e.g., student reviews).

- To provide a report (i.e., letter) from the peer teaching review committee that becomes part of the faculty member’s dossier for tenure and/or promotion and their departmental file.

Who Should Experience Peer Teaching Review

All FES faculty teaching regularly-scheduled courses, whether they are teaching on-campus or E-campus courses, should periodically experience peer teaching review.

---

1 These guidelines and the attachments on the detailed review criteria draw from the Guidelines for Peer Teaching Review for the Department of Fisheries & Wildlife (revised Fall 2013), along with approaches from the FERM and WSE departments within the College of Forestry.

2 The word “faculty” refers to tenure/tenure-track faculty, Instructors, Senior Instructors, and others, as displayed on the FES website on “Teaching and Research Faculty.”

3 For a list of FES teaching faculty, see the FES website “Teaching and Research Faculty.”
Frequency of Review

- Tenure-track faculty should generally experience two reviews prior to promotion and tenure. A principal purpose of the first review is to identify, well in advance of promotion and/or tenure, areas of teaching that may need improvement.

- Tenured faculty should undergo review every five years.

- Faculty with Instructor or Senior Instructor ranks and other non-tenure-track faculty should undergo review every three years.

- Faculty can request peer teaching reviews more frequently than described above.

Designation of a Continuing Mentor/Resource

To ensure continuity across peer reviews and reduce the burden on the reviewers, a FES faculty member will be designated as a continuing Mentor/Resource for the peer review process. That person will attend the organizational meeting of each peer review committee to provide advice and answer questions, and also review the draft teaching review report (i.e., letter).

Selection of Peer Review Committee and Course(s) to Review

- The committee should be composed of two faculty members. It may be necessary to go outside the department for content expertise.

- All FES faculty members (including Instructors and Senior Instructors) are expected to participate as a peer reviewer of teaching, as part of their service FTE allocation, to ensure that the workload is distributed evenly and undue burden is minimized.

- At least one committee member should have the expertise necessary to review course content.

- One committee member will be designated as Chair. The Chair must be an FES faculty member. The Chair will be responsible for coordinating the review process and creating the first draft of the report (i.e., letter), with subsequent edits conducted in consultation with the other committee member.

- The Department Head will work with the faculty member being reviewed to identify mutually acceptable peer review committee members.

- The Department Head will work with the faculty member being reviewed to select the course(s) to review. At least one course will be reviewed, but review of more courses may provide a more complete picture of the faculty member’s teaching, especially if the faculty member teaches courses that differ in content and delivery.
Protocol and Process for Peer Teaching Review

Peer teaching review will be based on assessment of: (a) materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed (#1 below), (b) meetings with the faculty member being reviewed (#3 and #7 below), (c) review of the faculty member’s delivery of the course(s) (#4 below), and student feedback (#5 below).

Reviews will be made of both on-campus and E-campus courses. While the process for on-campus courses is completely represented below, some components of the E-campus process, especially course delivery (#4) and student feedback (#5) need more development. The E-campus review process will be fully developed and brought before the faculty by the end of this calendar year.

The protocol and process is outlined as follows:

1. Materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed.

Self-assessment and teaching materials will be provided to the peer review committee at least two weeks before the committee’s organizational meeting (#2 below).

Self-assessment
The faculty member being reviewed will provide a narrative and self-assessment covering his or her personal teaching philosophy, accomplishments related to teaching (e.g., teaching awards, teaching publications), perceived strengths and areas needing improvement, recent efforts in teaching development/improvement, problems encountered by the faculty member that hamper effective teaching (e.g., students lack of necessary quantitative skills, lack of TA support, problems interacting with students), reflections on SET scores as needed (including any perceived biases), and comments and concerns relevant to the review. Maximum of 3 single-spaced pages (12 point font).

Instructional Materials
For each course reviewed, the following materials will be provided:

a. Course syllabus that meets university standards (Attachment #4), which includes “course-specific learning outcomes” and “course content (concise outline of topics and/or activities).”

b. Representative exams, problem sets, and/or other materials and means of evaluating student performance.

c. Overall course grade distributions for the last three times the course was taught (if available).

d. Student reviews (SET scores). Scores for all SET questions will be provided, not just the overall scores for the course as a whole and instructor contribution. Only the quantitative summary of scores from the computerized student review form can be used for teaching review. It is university policy that the written comments from students on the Student Assessment of Teaching form cannot be used in review of teaching and are only for feedback to the course instructor. Department heads may not review the written student comments intended for the course instructor. The exception to this rule is signed student comments, where the student has waived his or her right to anonymity.

e. Access to the Canvas site for the course being reviewed and/or access to other learning materials given to students as appropriate.
2. **Organizational meeting of the peer review committee**

Members of the committee review the materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed (#1 above) and meet as a group to determine how the peer review will be conducted, including a schedule for classroom visits for on-campus courses and a schedule for E-campus course involvement.

3. **Initial meeting with the faculty member being reviewed**

The review committee will meet with the faculty member being reviewed to outline the process and discuss the self-assessment. They should discuss, clarify, and expand on the materials provided for the course(s) as needed, including the SET scores. Guidelines for committee review of the self-assessment, teaching materials, and meetings are covered in Attachment #1. The meeting should be conducted in a spirit of collegiality.

4. **Review of faculty member’s delivery of course(s)**

   **On-campus**

   In general, more than one classroom visit is recommended: review committee members should try to attend at least two class periods for the course(s) being reviewed. The course instructor (i.e., the faculty member being reviewed) will be informed prior to each classroom visit. Guidelines for classroom visits are in Attachment #2.

   Done properly, visits by peers can be useful in both improving and reviewing teaching. As an example, it is important that the reviewer get to the class before it starts and sit quietly in the back in an unobtrusive manner and does not participate. Also, it might be useful for the instructor to quickly note that a visitor is in the class so the class isn’t wondering who is sitting in the back.

   Classroom visits also can be helpful in resolving discrepancies between SET scores and perceptions of the peer review committee. In addition, in-class components are generally part of peer teaching reviews per the OSU Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.

   **E-campus**

   To be developed, including evaluation guidelines.

5. **Student feedback**

A variety of methods could be used to receive additional student feedback beyond SET scores. An important goal of receiving such feedback should be to avoid bias in selecting students by soliciting a cross-section of student opinions. The peer review committee, therefore, should take the following approach:

   **On-campus**

   - Ask for 15 minutes at the end of a class of the course(s) being observed, at which point the instructor (i.e., faculty member being reviewed) must leave the room.
   - Distribute Attachment #3 to the students to complete immediately in-class, after announcing the answers will be anonymous.
   - Have the students give their responses to the review committee member(s) when they are done.
Comments must be summarized in a way that protects student identity; this is especially important for courses with low enrollment.

6. Preparation of draft teaching review report (i.e., letter)

Based on the teaching materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed, discussions with that faculty member, review of the delivery of the course(s), and student reviews (SET scores) and feedback, the peer review committee (with the Chair taking the lead with the first draft) will prepare a draft of the peer teaching review report (i.e., letter). Attachments 1 and 2 will help in completing this report, but individual responses to each question are not necessary in the final report (i.e., letter). 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 the classroom visits (on-campus) or Canvas review/interaction (E-campus)
- Provide an analysis of SET scores and trends in scores, if appropriate
- Identify strengths and weaknesses and areas needing improvement, based on both committee observations and the student feedback
- Review course content and recommend improvements
- Highlight innovative teaching methods
- Note efforts to improve teaching
- Provide specific recommendations for improvement of teaching.

7. Second meeting with faculty member being reviewed

The committee will present an oral summary of its review. Strengths and weaknesses, and suggestions for teaching improvement should be emphasized. Every effort should be made to keep the tone of the meeting positive and constructive.

8. Completion and submission of final peer teaching review report (i.e., letter)

The committee will then revise its review report (i.e., letter) as needed before submission to the Department Head. This final report (i.e., letter) will become a part of the faculty member’s dossier for promotion and/or tenure, and their departmental file.

The letter that goes in the dossier will follow the guidelines provided by the faculty handbook on promotion and tenure: “3. Peer Teaching Evaluations: Peer evaluations should be based on a review of course syllabi, texts, assigned reading, examinations, class materials, and other assessments such as attendance at lectures as appropriate for the field and subject. Peer teaching evaluations should be systematic and on-going, following unit guidelines for peer review of teaching. A letter from the peer teaching review committee that summarizes all peer teaching reviews over the evaluation timeframe should be included in the dossier.”

http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier

The faculty member being reviewed will be able to see the final letter and may respond to the review in writing with that document also going into the dossier and departmental file.
Attachment #1

Guidelines for Reviewing Faculty Self-Assessment and Course Materials, and for Faculty Meetings

This is a list of potential questions and areas of inquiry to pursue in the course of the teaching review. Additional questions can be added based on the self-assessment by the faculty member being reviewed.

**Course Content**
- Is the course up-to-date?
  - e.g. are the latest concepts and practices represented or does the material reflect only an historic perspective of the field.
- Are the breadth and depth of coverage appropriate for the course level (lower division undergraduate, upper division undergraduate, graduate)?
- Has the instructor mastered the subject matter?
- Is the coverage responsive to the needs of students? It is relevant to the discipline?
- If appropriate, are conflicting views presented?

**Course Learning Outcomes**
- Are the learning outcomes clearly articulated?
- Are the stated learning outcomes consistent with overall curricular objectives of the course?
- Do the stated learning outcomes incorporate the appropriate themes and skills?

**Grading and Examination**
- Are exams and/or other related means of evaluating student performance suitable to content and course objectives?
- Are exams and/or other related means of evaluating student performance representative of course content?
- Are exams and/or other related means of evaluating student performance clearly articulated and fairly graded?
- Are grading standards/rubric made clear to the students?

**Course Organization**
- Is the syllabus current and relevant to the course objectives?
  - Note that OSU requires a considerable amount of material that is now required in every syllabus (Appendix #4)
- Is the course outline logical?
- Are any potential class participation expectations clear?
- Are any due dates clear and reasonable?
- Are the lecture, laboratory, or other assignments integrated? Should they be?
- Is the time devoted to each topic appropriate?

**Assignments**
- Do assignments logically fit within the course, supplementing lectures, discussions, labs, and/or field work?
- Do assignments reflect and support course learning outcomes?
- Are assignments appropriate for the levels of students in the course?
- Is adequate time given to complete the assignments? Is it consistent with expected quality?
- Are the assignments rigorous and challenging to students?

**Application of Teaching Pedagogy**
• Is the faculty member knowledgeable about current developments in teaching styles?
• Are in-class and out-of-class work appropriately balanced in regard to addressing alternative learning styles?
• Does the faculty member explore alternative teaching styles or target aspects of class to alternative learning styles?
• Acknowledging that not all material can or should be modified to fit new teaching models, is the faculty member open to potential modifications of portions of their courses to incorporate alternative teaching tools?

Faculty Member Concerns
• What are the faculty member’s concerns
  o With their courses
    ▪ Would they like an opportunity to teach other classes?
    ▪ Are they having issues updating aspects of the course?
    ▪ Are there conflicts or competition with other courses on campus?
  o With their teaching
    ▪ Do they feel they are supported in gaining opportunities to learn more about teaching?
    ▪ Are there specific areas of teaching where she/he would like to improve?
  o With SET scores or other student feedback
    ▪ Are there concerns with any aspect of the scores, issues associated with the development of a new course, or their trial of some new teaching tool/style (for example) that should be taken into account?
    ▪ Other concerns about SET scores?
  o With this peer teaching review process (this is a new model for FES so getting feedback on this would be useful at least for the first few years).
Reviewers should provide detailed comments (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, potential areas for improvement) associated with each of the following questions as appropriate.

**Review questions during classroom visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Structure and Organization</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class time is used efficiently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor is well prepared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives for the class are stated clearly verbally or on slides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class remains focused on objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide summary comments (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, potential areas for improvement):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Strategies</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pace of class is appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor voice tone and pitch is understandable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor relates course material to practical situations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor uses multimedia effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor demonstrates knowledge of the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional methods used are appropriate for the class objectives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor provides clear directions for assignments and activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide summary comments (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, potential areas for improvement):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor – Student Rapport</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor demonstrates fair and equitable treatment of all students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor effectively holds the attention and interest of the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor is sensitive to class responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are encouraged to ask questions and participate in discussions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor facilitates any classroom discussions and group work well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor answers student questions clearly and respectfully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor is sensitive to individual abilities and learning styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please provide summary comments (e.g., strengths, weaknesses, potential areas for improvement):

Any additional observations:
Attachment #3
Student Feedback Form

We are conducting this short survey to learn about your opinions regarding this course and its instructor. Your input is important and will assist both the university and the instructor. Please freely answer the four questions below and return this form at the end of class. Please do not put your name on this form because it is important to maintain student anonymity and confidentiality.

1. In your opinion, what are the strengths of this course? Please write your comments in the space below.

2. In your opinion, what are the weaknesses of this course? Please write your comments in the space below.

3. In your opinion, what are the strengths of this instructor? Please write your comments in the space below.

4. In your opinion, what are the weaknesses of this instructor? Please write your comments in the space below.
Attachment #4 OSU Guidelines for Course Syllabus
Minimum Requirements

Course proposals require a syllabus* to be attached under Documents in the proposal. Special Topics and Blanket Numbered courses do not require syllabus to be submitted with the proposal. All syllabi should include the following information:

- **Course Name**: For example, Introduction to Statistics
- **Course Number**: For example, ST 101
- **Course Credits**: Include the number of hours the course meets per week/term in lecture, recitation, laboratory, etc. In the case of online courses, please comment on the number of hours on average that students will interact with course materials. For example, "This course combines approximately 90 hours of instruction, online activities, and assignments for 3 credits."
- **Prerequisites, Co-requisites and Enforced Prerequisites**: See the following link to Prerequisite Enforcement from the Office of the Registrar: [http://oregonstate.edu/registrar/prerequisite-enforcement](http://oregonstate.edu/registrar/prerequisite-enforcement).
- **Course Content**: Include concise outline of topics and/or activities.
- **Course Specific Measurable Student Learning Outcomes**: See [Student Learning Outcomes](#) for a definition and instructions. (For 4XX/5XX courses, list appropriate distinctions in outcomes, instructional opportunities, and evaluation procedures between the 4XX and 5XX versions of the course.) For online (E-campus) courses, student learning outcomes must be identical to those in the on-campus course, even though the mode of delivery and course content might differ.
- **Baccalaureate Core Category Learning Outcomes**: All Bacc Core syllabi must include the relevant Baccalaureate Core category learning outcomes verbatim.
  - Each syllabus must explicitly identify/label these outcomes as Baccalaureate Core Learning Outcomes for the category it satisfies.
  - Each syllabus must include a description that helps students understand the connection between the course and the Bacc Core Category.
  - Within the syllabus, make clear to students how Bacc Core category learning outcomes will be integrated into the course and assessed.
  - WIC syllabi must also make it clear that:
    - Individual writing comprises at least 25% of the course grade
    - Students individually write and revise (after feedback) at least 2,000 words in formal, graded writing - about 10 pages
    - Revision of the 2,000-word formal writing is required, not optional
    - The total word count for formal writing is at least 4,000 words (2,000 counted for the draft and 2,000 counted for the final copy)
    - Informal, minimally, or ungraded writing comprises about 1,000 words (or enough to make the total word count at least 5,000)

See: [Learning Outcomes](#).

- **Evaluation of Student Performance**: In the OSU online catalog, refer to AT 18 and AR 19 regarding assignment of grades: [http://catalog.oregonstate.edu/ChapterDetail.aspx?key=75#Section2886](http://catalog.oregonstate.edu/ChapterDetail.aspx?key=75#Section2886).
- **Learning Resources**: Textbooks, lab manuals, etc.; indicate if required or optional.
• **Statement Regarding Students with Disabilities**: Accommodations are collaborative efforts between students, faculty and Disability Access Services (DAS). Students with accommodations approved through DAS are responsible for contacting the faculty member in charge of the course prior to or during the first week of the term to discuss accommodations. Students who believe they are eligible for accommodations but who have not yet obtained approval through DAS should contact DAS immediately at 541-737-4098.

Source: Disability Access Services, Faculty and Staff Responsibilities Before the Term (6-4-15)

• **Link to Statement of Expectations for Student Conduct**, i.e., cheating policies

• **OPTIONAL: Student Evaluation of Courses**: The online Student Evaluation of Teaching system opens to students the Monday of dead week and closes the Monday following the end of finals. Students will receive notification, instructions and the link through their ONID. They may also log into the system via Online Services. Course evaluation results are extremely important and used to help improve courses and the learning experience of future students. Responses are anonymous (unless a student chooses to “sign” their comments agreeing to relinquish anonymity) and unavailable to instructors until after grades have been posted. The results of scaled questions and signed comments go to both the instructor and their unit head/supervisor. Anonymous (unsigned) comments go to the instructor only.

*Approval & Revisions: Curriculum Council 11/12/2005; 05/04/2012 Additional Information: Student Learning Outcomes; Slash (4XX/5XX) Courses:

*RESOURCE: syllabus template
Estimated Faculty Time for Review

Please note these are estimates and may vary depending on the situation.

Continuing peer mentor/resource: 4 hours per peer review (organizational meeting/review report).

Faculty member being reviewed:

Writing the self-assessment---8 hours
Preparing course materials---2 hours
Talking to the review committee (2 hours total across two meetings)

Total: approximately 12 hours every three to five years. This does not include a written response to the peer teaching review report.

Faculty members on the peer review committee:

Review materials from instructor---2 hours
Meetings---5 hours (organizational, two class visits, two meetings with faculty member)
Review student input---2 hours
Prepare draft report (Chair)---4 hours
Comment on/revise report---2 hours

Total: approximately 15 hours for the Chair and 11 hours for the other reviewer

Total across all responsibilities: 4+12+15+11 = 42 hours
Average Faculty Hours/Year to Participate in Peer Review of Teaching of On-Campus Courses

Faculty

Professorial

Tenured

9 Professor

6 Associate Professor

Tenure track

1 Assoc. Prof.

5 Assistant Prof.

Instructors

2 Senior Instructors,

Other

1 Assoc. Prof. Fixed term.

Total= 24 faculty teaching on-campus courses

The estimate we sent out of faculty time to do the review (total hours for mentor, person being reviewed, two reviewers) is approximately 40 hours. Tenured faculty would receive a review every 5 years, tenure-track every two-three years (for two reviews before the tenure decision), instructors/others every 3 years. Weighting by the number of faculty in the different categories, we get an average of a review about every four years: 

\[ \frac{16 \times 5 + 6 \times 2.5 + 2 \times 3}{24} = \frac{80 + 15 + 6}{24} = \frac{101}{24} = 4.2 \]

The average number of reviews per year would be 24/4=6. Total hours = 6\times40=240.

Average number of hours/year/faculty member = 240 hours of review per year/24 faculty= about 10 hours per year.