

April 6, 2018

Peer Teaching Evaluation Process for CSS and SUS Instructors

University-wide criteria for promotion of Instructors is provided in the OSU Faculty Handbook <http://academicaffairs.oregonstate.edu/faculty-handbook/promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier>. A candidate must have an exceptional record of achievement in the assigned duties to be promoted. For Instructors, the criteria for Teaching, Advising and Other assignments can provide guidelines for evaluating and documenting the level of achievement.

A key mechanism for evaluating and documenting achievement by instructors is the peer teaching evaluation. The process for peer teaching evaluation is determined by the department and is outlined below.

1. Classroom or Ecampus peer teaching evaluation forms: Instructors who anticipate going through the promotion process are responsible for asking colleague(s) to provide a classroom teaching evaluation or Ecampus teaching evaluation for *each* course *each* year. Please use the PTC-visible forms provided. PDF versions of completed, signed and dated classroom teaching evaluation forms should be sent to Kristin Rifai each term and kept in the candidate's Faculty Profile. Tenure-track and non-tenure track teaching faculty may provide peer evaluation.

2. Mentoring committee: A mentoring committee for each instructor will be chosen by the faculty member and then appointed by the department head or program chair. The committee will consist of two to three faculty members, one of whom is a Senior Instructor, and may include tenure track and non-tenure track teaching faculty. At least one is from outside the instructor's department. The mentoring committee meets with the instructor annually to review course syllabi (and other teaching materials), peer evaluation forms, student evaluation of teaching (SET) scores and comments, and to provide feedback and guidance. The mentoring committee, along with Peer Teaching Evaluation Chair (Jennifer Parke in 2018), will serve as the candidate's Peer Teaching Evaluation Committee (PTEC). They will provide a summative letter reviewing the candidate's teaching to be included with the promotion dossier.

3. Teaching portfolio: The candidate is responsible for assembling a teaching portfolio that includes elements required in the dossier.

a. Candidates should follow current guidelines for the preparation of the dossier: <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/aa/faculty-handbook-promotion-and-tenure-guidelines#dossier>

The following items from the dossier should be made available to the PTEC:

- IV. Position description (% teaching)
- V. Candidate's statement on teaching (teaching philosophy)
- VIII. Promotion Vita, in particular:

- B. 1. Instructional Summary
- B. 2. Student Evaluation. Use the attached table template to summarize median SET scores for Question 1 (course as a whole) and Question 2 (instructor's contribution) for every course.

Table X. Student evaluation of teaching (SET) scores for [candidate name's] courses [date range]

Course	Term	Year	Number of student responses	Q1. Course Median SET			Q2. Instructor Median SET		
				This course	Dept.	University	This instructor	Dept.	University

Average

b. In addition to materials presented in the dossier, candidates should place the following materials in their Faculty Profiles and provide to the PTEC electronic copies of:

- All SET reports including narrative comments and suggestions
- All course syllabi, examples of exams, and other class materials as appropriate
- All Classroom or Ecampus peer teaching evaluation forms.

4. The PTEC will review the candidate's materials and provide a draft letter of evaluation to the candidate. The candidate will review the letter for inaccuracies. The final version, addressed to the department head or program chair, will be included in the dossier so that it can be considered by the CSS PTC Committee.

Components of the letter:

- a) Basis of evaluation: composition of the committee, materials considered in the evaluation process.
- b) Overall assessment: Short summary of the committee's findings.

- c) In-class or Ecampus class peer reviews: Summary of the findings in the peer teaching evaluation forms. May include verbatim excerpts.
- d) Activities: A list or brief summary of classes taught.
- e) Teaching philosophy: Summarize from candidate's statement, course syllabi, and interactions with the candidate.
- f) Course descriptions, syllabi, learning outcomes, and assessment tools: Copy and paste from syllabi, if not too long.
- g) Student evaluations of teaching (SET): Refer to the summary table of SET scores. Address how data compares to departmental and university norms, and comment on trends in course and instructor's SET scores over time.
- h) Teaching innovation and improvement: Provide examples of new course development, innovative teaching methods.

6. Summary of timing and responsibilities:

What	Who	When
Ensure that peer reviews of classroom or Ecampus teaching are performed.	Candidate	ongoing
Provide feedback to candidate on teaching.	Mentoring committee	annually
Declare intention to pursue promotion.	Candidate	Feb. 20
Assemble teaching portfolio. Provide to mentoring committee and PTEC Chair.	Candidate	April 1
Evaluate teaching portfolio. Draft letter.	PTEC	April 15
Send draft letter to candidate.	PTEC	April 20
Submit final letter to Jay Noller (Kristin Rifai) for inclusion in the dossier.	PTEC	Pre-May 1