

Peer Review of Teaching for Credit Course Guidelines for Tenure-Track and Tenured Faculty

Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering
Oregon State University

Introduction

Oregon State University Promotion and Tenure (P&T) Guidelines state:

“When teaching is part of the faculty assignment, effectiveness in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment or advancement. Faculty with responsibilities in instruction can be promoted and tenured only when there is clear documentation of effective performance in the teaching role.”

The following document outlines the Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering’s policies and procedures for completing the peer review of an instructor in the context of one of his/her courses. The resulting report from the review committee is intended to support the teaching component of the faculty member’s dossier. Further evidence of effective teaching required for the dossier (e.g. teaching philosophy, club advisement, professional development, grants, SETs, learning assessment) must be provided by the faculty member.

For additional guidance, see the College of Agricultural Sciences Peer-Review of Teaching Guidelines at: https://agsci.oregonstate.edu/sites/agscid7/files/main/about/peer_review_of_teaching_guidelines_6_9_17.pdf

Policies

Who will be evaluated?

All faculty who teach will be required to complete a peer review of teaching for at least one of their courses.

Frequency of evaluation

Non-tenured faculty – minimum of 2 times prior to consideration for P&T (continuous reviews strengthen the record). Evaluation(s) should be scheduled such that the instructor has sufficient time to respond to constructive suggestions and schedule a second peer evaluation, if desired, prior to consideration for P&T.

Tenured faculty – minimum of every 5 years (faculty seeking promotion to Full Professor must demonstrate excellence in teaching and will benefit from more frequent evaluation).

Note: It is the responsibility of the individual faculty member being evaluated to decide when they will be reviewed and initiate the process.

Peer evaluation committee

The committee will be composed of three OSU teaching faculty (generally two BEE faculty and one external to the department). At least one committee member must have expertise to evaluate course content. The faculty member being reviewed will work with the department head, mentors, and/or the P&T committee in selecting mutually acceptable committee members. The instructor should not be evaluated by a colleague that might exhibit unfair bias.

Procedures

Step 1 – *The instructor assembles a teaching portfolio for the course being reviewed.*

The teaching portfolio should provide relevant information about the course, including (but not limited to):

- a description of the course (history of the course, topics/content, typical enrollment, role of the course in the departmental curriculum, format, frequency)
- a description of the instructor's strategy for teaching the course
- learning objectives for the course
- course syllabus
- examples of course assignments, quizzes and/or exams
- historical student evaluations of teaching (SET)

Step 2 – *The instructor meets with their committee to review the course portfolio.* This meeting is scheduled by the instructor and should occur prior to teaching the course.

Step 3 – *The committee members observe the instructor.* The committee members must observe the instructor in a teaching situation at least twice during the term the course is being taught. Observation dates and times should be arranged by the instructor and committee members during the portfolio review meeting. The Teaching Observation Worksheet (Attachment I below) provides the format for this portion of the review and is to be completed by each committee member at each observation.

Step 4 – *The review committee convenes to author the Peer Review of Teaching Summary Report.* This meeting will occur within 10 days following the final observation of the instructor. The Peer Review of Teaching Summary Report (Attachment II below) provides the format for this portion of the review. One report is authored collectively by the committee.

Step 5 – *The Peer Review of Teaching Summary Report is submitted to the instructor being reviewed.* The instructor has the opportunity to respond to the report in writing. The response must be completed within 10 days of receiving the *Peer Review of Teaching Summary Report*.

Step 6 – *The review committee meets with the instructor to discuss the Summary Review Report.* This meeting is to occur no later than 30 days after the final observation of the instructor.

Step 7 – *The Summary Review Report is submitted to the unit leader.*

Attachment I. Teaching Observation Worksheet

Instructor being reviewed: _____

Date and time of the teaching observation: _____

Course (Name and number): _____

Class session topic: _____

Reviewer's name (please print): _____

Reviewer's signature: _____ Date: _____

Category	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs improvement	Notes
Opening the class session				
Instructor clearly communicates the purpose and relevance of the class session				
Instructor clearly communicates the intended learning objectives of the class session				
Instructor reviews previous material and clearly links the session's content to past and future course goals				
Instructor outlines the activities for the session and communicates what is expected of the students				
Instructor communicates how student learning will be assessed				
Instructor's introduction to the topic is interesting to the students				

Category	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs improvement	Notes
Content and structure of the class session				
The venue is prepared and organized to optimize achievement of the learning objectives				
The instructor is prepared and organized				
The pace of the class session is appropriate for the students				
Examples and illustrations are used effectively				
Aids and materials are used to support learning				
Key points are highlighted and emphasized effectively				
Instructor summarizes throughout the class session				
Instructor/student dynamics				
Instructor is enthusiastic				
Teaching methods engage students in the content (i.e. they are active in the learning process)				
Teaching methods provide a variety of learning opportunities				

Category	Excellent	Satisfactory	Needs improvement	Notes
Instructor listens to student input				
Instructor is responsive non-verbal student behaviors				
Instructor asks questions relevant to the learning objectives				
Instructor provides time for students to formulate answers				
Instructor gives specific feedback on correct and incorrect responses; explains why				
Closing the class session				
Instructor facilitates a summary of the learning emphasizing main points				
Instructor further links what was learned to past material and upcoming course directions				
If applicable, instructor clearly communicates follow-up learning activities and expectations (assignments, projects, etc.)				

Comments:

**Attachment II.
Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering
Peer Review of Teaching Summary Report**

Review Committee members:

Instructor being reviewed:

Date:

Description of the Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering's Peer Review of Teaching Process:

The Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering requires all faculty who teach to be peer reviewed for at least one of their courses. Non-tenured faculty are reviewed a minimum of two times prior to consideration for P&T, and tenured faculty are reviewed a minimum of every five years. The committee is composed of three OSU teaching faculty. The committee reviews a portfolio prepared by the instructor and two subsequent class sessions. During the review process, the instructor meets with the committee twice to discuss outcomes and findings. The resulting summary report (this document) from the review committee is submitted to the unit head and P&T committee. The report is intended to improve the instructor's teaching and to support the teaching component of the faculty member's dossier.

Portfolio review:

Performance review:

Signatures

Instructor

Date

Committee member 1

Date

Committee member 2

Date

Committee member 3

Date

Unit head

Date