

**DEPARTMENT OF CROP AND SOIL SCIENCE
FACULTY PEER TEACHING REVIEW PROGRAM**

The faculty of the Department view excellence in teaching as an integral component in our Department's success. Accordingly, we believe that all of our faculty can benefit from periodic review and assessment of their teaching effort. The primary focus of the peer-review of teaching is to ensure that our courses compel higher-level learning for our students.

Goals and Intent

- \$ Peer teaching evaluation is intended to be a positive, constructive experience for the instructor and 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:* evaluation intended to improve teaching.
 - Summative evaluation:* 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), grading and examinations, 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.
 - 4–To recognize the efforts and dedication of departmental teaching faculty.
- \$ Serving as peer evaluators may require a significant time commitment. Those who serve on peer evaluation committees should provide time for doing so and be rewarded for their efforts by the department head.

Frequency of Evaluation

- \$ All faculty teaching regularly scheduled courses should experience peer teaching evaluation. This includes courtesy faculty.
- \$ The entire teaching program (all courses that are taught by an instructor) should be evaluated.
- \$ The teaching program of non-tenured faculty will undergo peer evaluation no later than the third year of teaching and again immediately prior to preparation of P&T materials. The purpose of the first evaluation is to identify areas of teaching that may need improvement. The second evaluation may be a full evaluation or an abbreviated "check-back" to determine if any suggested changes have been made.
- \$ The teaching program of tenured faculty should undergo evaluation at least every 5 years.
- \$ The Department Head will maintain and distribute an annual schedule to ensure that faculty can adequately prepare for review.

Peer Evaluation Committee

- \$ A Peer Evaluation Committee will be appointed by the Department Head. This standing committee will consist of three to five faculty members, each of whom will serve staggered, three-year terms.
- \$ Ad hoc peer review committees will be formed for each faculty member being evaluated. Each ad hoc committee will consist of two members of the Peer Evaluation Committee and one or two additional members as needed to ensure subject matter expertise. The additional members may come from other departments.

Procedure for Conducting Peer Teaching Evaluations

§ The peer evaluation consists of two parts: examination of instructional materials and classroom visitations.

§ Examination of instructional materials:

1–The instructor provides to the committee a summary of the teaching program that includes: (i) an instructor's narrative consisting of the instructor's personal teaching philosophy, course descriptions, course objectives, relationship with other courses in the department (prerequisites, subsequent courses, etc.), description of methods and approach for delivering instructional materials, expected outcomes, recent changes in content and methods and recent efforts in teaching development, and comments and concerns relevant to evaluation, (ii) syllabi, (iii) reading list/text(s), (iv) examples of course handouts and/or website information, (v) a sample of exams and problem sets, and (vi) grade distributions. The Department provides a compilation of student evaluations for all courses taught in the last 5 years. Peer evaluation can provide insight into and context for results of student evaluations and suggest whether students and the instructor are "connecting." (Adapted from Seldin, 1985; University of Missouri, 1992).

2–Members of the committee review the teaching summary and meet as a group to discuss the instructor's teaching program. A list of possible questions for consideration by the committee is attached (Attachment I). The committee should identify the strengths of the program, areas for improvement, and formulate questions on aspects of the program that are unclear.

3–The committee meets with the instructor to discuss, clarify, and expand the materials summarizing the teaching program. 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 of the program should be discussed and areas for improvement should be suggested. Suggestions for improvement are recommendations for the instructor's consideration. Questions that arose at the previous meeting of the review committee should be discussed with the instructor.

§ Classroom visitations:

Done properly, visitation by peers demands a good deal of time and can be very useful to help improve teaching. In-class components must be part of peer evaluation within the OSU guidelines for Tenure and Promotion. Therefore, peer evaluation of untenured professors and those seeking promotion is essential. Classroom visitation can be helpful in resolving discrepancies between student evaluations and the perception of the peer evaluation.

1–The committee will meet with the instructor prior to coordinate classroom visits. One or more of the instructor's classes will be visited. Each class that is visited will be visited at least twice. All committee members will do at least one classroom evaluation. Guidelines for evaluation of classroom visitation are attached (Attachment II).

2–After the visitations the committee and instructor meet to discuss strengths/weaknesses, etc. Videotapes of selected lectures may be made for use by the instructor and/or committee.

The Review Document

§ The ad hoc committee will develop a written evaluation for consideration by the Peer Evaluation Committee. Based on this draft the Peer Evaluation Committee will prepare a consensus review letter to be submitted to the Department Head.

§ 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's responses must be considered in summative evaluation.

References

- Keig, L., and M.D. Waggoner. 1994. Collaborative Peer Review: The Role of Faculty in Improving College Teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports. The George Washington University, Washington, DC.
- The University of Missouri. 1992. Teaching Evaluation
- Seldin, P. 1985. Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.

Attachment I

Guidelines For Reviewing The Teaching Summary (Adapted from Seldin, 1985 & University 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?
- Is it 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?

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 student?
- Is adequate time given to complete the assignments?
- Is it consistent with expected quality?
- Are the assignments challenging to the students?

Grading and Examinations

- 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 made clear to the students?

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?

Attachment II

Department of Crop and Soil Science, Oregon State University Classroom Teaching Evaluation Form

Instructor name _____

Date _____

Class number/name _____ Class topic _____

Please rank the instructor's performance on the following items (**0 = poor to 4= outstanding; N/A if the item does not apply**), and provide additional comments and suggestion as appropriate. Use the other side of this sheet as needed. Sign and send original to the Department Head and a copy to the instructor. Talk with the instructor about observations if warranted.

Formative Evaluation

Instructor Preparation

The classroom was prepared appropriately.

Ability	0	1	2	3	4
N/A	0	1	2	3	4

The teacher started on time.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

The teacher appeared prepared for class.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comments/suggestions:

Relating the subject

The teacher provided a learning objective for today's class.

Ability	0	1	2	3	4
N/A	0	1	2	3	4

Information was current and relevant.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comments/suggestions:

Delivering the information

Information was presented in a logical manner.

Ability	0	1	2	3	4
N/A	0	1	2	3	4

The teacher used language appropriate for the student's level.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

8. The teacher used appropriate pacing for different portions of the presentation.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

9. Teaching aids (note types used) were useful and relevant.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Classroom presence and mannerisms.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comments/suggestions:

Relating to the students

11. The teacher listened to class members.

Ability	0	1	2	3	4
N/A	0	1	2	3	4

12. The teacher checked for student understanding throughout the class

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Questions from class members were answered effectively.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

The teacher encouraged students to think of solutions to problems.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

15. Options provided for dealing with questions not answered in class.

N/A	0	1	2	3	4
-----	---	---	---	---	---

Comments/suggestions:

Summative Evaluation

Overall teaching ability

Overall rating of teacher's performance?

Ability	0	1	2	3	4
N/A	0	1	2	3	4

Comments:

Name and reviewer signature _____

Date _____