

## **Peer Review of Teaching**

**prepared by Dr. Susan Gibson, Associate Director CTL**

**Winter, 2014**

### **Preamble**

Increased emphasis is being placed on peer review of teaching in post secondary institutions (Blackmore, 2005; Byrne, Brown, & Challen, 2010; Chism, 2007; Hamilton, & Gaff, 2009); however, as Hira and Cohen (2011) note, “Teaching excellence is becoming a difficult summit to climb. The most precarious part of that climb is a missing support – the lack of a reliable system for accessing and rewarding teaching” (para. 2).

At the heart of the issue is the debate over the purpose of peer review as quality enhancement versus quality assurance (Byrne, Brown, & Challen, 2010; Kilfoil, 2014). The latter is often seen as ‘managerial surveillance imposed by leaders’ (Napier et al., 2014) that does little to improve or enhance teaching (the focus of the former) (Sachs, & Parsell, 2014).

Another issue is the reluctance on the part of academics to embrace peer review of their teaching even though there is wide acceptance of peer review of research (Hira, & Cohen, 2011; Iqbal, 2013). Assessment by peers can be daunting, but heavy reliance on quantitative student feedback for determining the effectiveness of teaching is also problematic (Bernstein, Burnett, Goodburn, & Savoy, 2006; Hira, & Cohen, 2011). While student feedback is important as one measure of instructor effectiveness, that of the day-to-day interaction in the classroom, Bernstein et al. (2006) argue that “peer review of teaching should refer to a much more complete examination of the intellectual work of teaching” (p. 6). These other aspects include: course content, academic rigor and appropriateness of objectives and topics (eg. preparation for advanced course work);

subject matter expertise; instructional materials and methods; and, assessment and grading.

At the University of Alberta, the recent Renaissance Committee Final Report emphasizes the need for "a comprehensive, clear and transparent [evaluation] system ...[which] has multiple sources of information collected through a variety of methods and assessed at multiple points in time" (p. 69). The U. of A. General Faculties Council policy states that, "Evaluation of teaching shall be multifaceted. Multifaceted evaluation shall include the Universal Student Ratings of Instruction set out in Section 111.3 and other methods of assessing teaching designed within the individual Faculties to respond to the particular conditions of that Faculty. Such assessments shall include one or more of the following: input from administrators, peers, self, undergraduate and graduate students, and alumni" (section 111.2). Peer review of teaching is one way in which to address multifaceted evaluation of teaching.

### **What is peer review of teaching?**

Peer review of teaching is informed collegial assessment of faculty teaching for either fostering improvement or making personnel decisions. There are two main types of peer review: formative and summative. Both formative and summative are recognized as integral to a comprehensive evaluation of teaching.

#### *Formative review*

Formative review of teaching has as its purpose the development and improvement of teaching practice. At the University of Alberta, this form of peer review can range from engagement in a number of activities offered by the Centre for Teaching and Learning including: **Teaching Squares** in which the focus is on gaining new insight into one's own teaching by observing others in their classrooms; **Mentoring Circles and Teaching Co-mentorships** where colleagues collaborate informally as either a group or one-to-one in mutually beneficial conversation about teaching and learning; and, **Peer Consultation** in which a trained peer consultant works with an instructor at his/her request to gather information from both classroom observation and student feedback regarding specific instructor questions or concerns.

### *Summative review*

“When teaching is viewed as professional knowledge there must be an accepted way to define characteristics of teaching excellence and to make judgments based on a stated set of criteria and standards that reflect the complexity of teaching” (Chism, 2007, p. 13). In that regard, summative review is informed collegial judgment about teaching intended for evaluative purposes. It is comparative in nature thereby enabling the evaluator to determine the quality of teaching performance with respect to performances of peers and to predetermined standards. Summative review of teaching is also multidimensional in that it includes multiple kinds of valid and reliable evidence (ratings, reflective statements, narrative appraisals, teaching artifacts such as syllabi, etc.) from multiple sources (administrators, students, peers and self).

“Performance appraisal is a complex and controversial human resource technique” (Blackmore, 2005, 219). Accordingly, summative review is a formal, systematic process that requires consistent standards and structures that are seen as fair and equitable across faculty. Having a clearly articulated plan for summative peer review of teaching is essential to the success of any program. Faculty need to be well informed about what will be expected of them throughout the process and to feel that the process is consistent, fair and equitable.

The following guidelines provide a step-by-step framework for initiating a summative peer review of teaching. This process will need to be adapted to address the unique teaching and learning contexts of the faculty, department and/or unit wishing to implement such a review process.

Six phases have been identified as being integral to the planning of any summative review:

1. establishing the purpose for peer review
2. determining what will be reviewed
3. choosing who will be reviewed

4. deciding on procedures for conducting a review
5. implementing the review process
6. revising, renewing and sustaining the review process

### **Phase 1: Establishing the purpose for summative peer review of teaching**

The first step in designing a review protocol is to decide what you wish to achieve by implementing a summative peer review of teaching process. This phase begins with the clear articulation of goals and desired outcomes for the program (See Appendices A & B). Here too decisions will need to be made about what information should be collected to address the desired outcomes, how that information is to be used, and by whom. In order to determine readiness for such an undertaking and to encourage faculty involvement, a survey aimed at identifying their knowledge about summative peer review of teaching and any questions and concerns about it they may have is recommended. This feedback can then be issued to guide the development of the faculty/department/unit protocol.

### **Phase 2: Determining what will be reviewed**

Once the goals and desired outcomes for the summative review of teaching program have been determined the next step is to decide what aspects of teaching are to be evaluated as part of the review. Initially the unit/department/faculty will need to identify what is considered to be effective teaching and valuable student learning (See Appendices C & D). These may vary for specific teaching contexts and academic disciplines. The elements of effective teaching and learning identified can then be defined in terms of standards or benchmarks to used in the actual evaluation. (In some cases these standards may already exist, i.e. those needing to be addressed for accreditation purposes). Here is where it is important that teaching is recognized as more than classroom performance. Other aspects of teaching to be considered as part of the review include course design, course materials used, contribution of the instructor to teaching in the faculty/department, and impact of the course/the instructor on student learning.

### **Phase 3: Choosing who will be reviewed**

Thirdly, decisions are made about who will be reviewed (probationary and/or tenured faculty, sessionals, clinicians, etc.) and whether participation in the review process will be considered mandatory or optional.

#### **Phase 4: Deciding on procedures for conducting the review**

Phase 4 addresses the logistics of the review process. Once the decision has been made about who is to participate, the next step is to determine when and how often over a career a faculty member should engage in summative peer review of teaching. A second important aspect of this phase is to decide what success criteria would provide evidence of the standards identified in Phase 2 (See Appendix E & F), and what performance expectations are to be applied to these criteria (i.e. meets expectations, exceeds expectations, below expectations, etc.). Following that, what evidence for checking the criteria against will need to be collected (i.e. observation(s), syllabi, course materials, assignments, the instructor's philosophy of teaching statement, materials that communicate course policy and practices, assignments and assessment of student performance, samples of instructor feedback on student work, reflective statements, etc.) and what kinds of discipline specific tools will be used to collect this evidence (templates, checklists, guiding questions, rating scales, etc). (See Appendices G – M)

Another aspect of this phase requires thinking about who the reviewers will be, who selects them and on what basis, how many will be needed, and how they will be trained. It is recommended that more than one reviewer is used for each case in order to allow for comparison of notes and the writing of one consolidated letter of recommendation. One of the two reviewers could be drawn from outside the faculty in which the review is taking place to alleviate concerns around power and authority. This external person would focus mainly on pedagogy, with the internal reviewer bringing content expertise. Training reviewers will be a very important element in the success of the program; this is where CTL can be of assistance. Being a reviewer can take a significant amount of time so it will also be important to think about how their time will be recognized (acknowledged at FEC).

Lastly, decisions need to be made about who will be responsible for interpreting the evidence (solely the reviewers, the faculty member, chair or director, combination of

these people), what format the reporting will take and to whom the report will be provided. Confidentiality is of primary concern here (See Appendices O and P for Sample Report forms).

### **Phase 5: Implementing the review process**

Once the first four phases are completed, the next critical step is to communicate the plan to the faculty. Faculty members will need to be clear on: the purpose of the review, the standards for teaching and learning to be applied, the areas to be assessed, the aspects of teaching to be reviewed, the review protocol, and the outcomes of review. To increase ownership in the review program, you may also wish to provide opportunities for some faculty control over aspects of the review such as allowing the person being reviewed to decide what class will be observed and what aspects of their teaching they would like the review to focus on, encouraging pre-review discussion for the instructor under review to have an opportunity to describe unique and specific teaching and disciplinary contexts, and post-discussion for them to address and expand on things noticed during the review (Donnelly, 2007; Harris, Farrell, Bell, Devlin, & James, 2008).

### **Phase 6: Revising, renewing and sustaining the review process**

Once established, regular review of the protocol is highly recommended as a final phase of any summative peer review of teaching plan. It will be important to decide what type of program review will provide the desired information about its successes and glitches, and how specifically the plan will be monitored and assessed. Encouraging feedback from the reviewers, those whose work is being reviewed and from faculty members at large will be important to improving and sustaining the process. Ultimately the greatest outcome from engaging in the process (as with formative review) would be to use the data collected to improve the quality of teaching in the faculty/department/unit.

The accompanying chart provides an overview of this protocol along with sample questions to guide each phase. The attached appendices include examples to accompany each phase as well.

## References:

- Bernstein, D., Burnett, A., Goodburn, A., & Savory, P. (2006). *Making teaching and learning visible: Course portfolios and the peer review of teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co. Inc.
- Blackmore, J. A. (2005). A critical evaluation of peer review via teaching observation within higher education. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(2), 218-232.
- Brent, R. & Felder, R. (2004). A protocol for peer review of teaching. Retrieved from [http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04\(Peer-Review\).pdf](http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04(Peer-Review).pdf)
- Byrne, J., Brown, H., & Challen, D. (2010). Peer development as an alternative to peer observation: A tool to enhance professional development. *International Journal of Academic Development*, 15(3), 215-228.
- Chism, N. V. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.)*. Bolton MA: Anker Pub. Co. Inc.
- Crisp, G. et al. (2009). Peer review of teaching for promotion purposes: Final report and appendices. *Australian Learning & Teaching Council*. Retrieved from <http://www.adelaide.edu.au/teaching-projects/peerreview/>
- Donnelly, R. (2007). Perceived impact of peer observation of teaching in higher education. Retrieved from <http://arrow.dit.ie/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1023&context=ltcart>
- Fernandez, C., & Yu, J. (2007). Peer review of teaching. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 21(2), 154-161.
- Hamilton, N., & Gaff, J. (2009). Proactively justifying the academic profession's social contract. University of St. Thomas School of Law Legal Studies Research paper No. 09-17. Retrieved from [papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=1444587](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1444587)
- Harris, K-L, Farrell, K., Bell, M., Devlin, M., & James, R. (2008). Peer review of teaching in Australian Higher Education. *Australian Learning & Teaching Council*. Retrieved from [http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/teaching/docs/PeerReviewHandbook\\_eVersion.pdf](http://www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/research/teaching/docs/PeerReviewHandbook_eVersion.pdf)
- Hira, A., & Cohen, D. (2011). Peer review could improve teaching assessment. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/peer-review-could-improve-teaching-assessment.aspx>
- Hubball, H., & Clarke, A. (2011). Scholarly approaches to peer-review of teaching: Emergent frameworks and outcomes in a research-intensive university. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal*, 4(3). Retrieved from [http://www.viu.ca/integratedplanning/documents/TD437\\_HubbalClarke\\_Peer\\_Review.pdf](http://www.viu.ca/integratedplanning/documents/TD437_HubbalClarke_Peer_Review.pdf)
- Iqbal, I. (2013). Academics' resistance to summative peer review of teaching: Questionable rewards and the importance of student evaluations. *Teaching in higher education*, 18(5), 557-569.
- Kilfoil, W. (2014). Peer review as quality assurance. In J. Sachs, & M. Parsell, (Eds.), *Peer review of learning and teaching in higher education: International perspectives* (pp. 105 – 123), Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer

Napier, J., Riazi, M., & Jacenyik-Trawoger, C. (2014). Leadership: A cultural perspective on review as quality assurance versus quality enhancement. In J. Sachs, & M. Parsell, (Eds.), *Peer review of learning and teaching in higher education: International perspectives* (pp. 53-66), Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer

Sachs, J. & Parsell, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Peer review of learning and teaching in higher education: International perspectives*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer

Shulman, L. (2004). *Teaching as community property*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

University of Alberta. GFC Policy Manual. Retrieved from <http://www.gfcpolicymanual.ualberta.ca/en/111TeachingandLearningandTeach.aspx>.

University of Alberta. Report of the Renaissance Committee (Nov. 22, 2013). <http://www.renaissance.ualberta.ca/~media/renaissance/RenaissanceCommitteeFinalReport.pdf>

### **Websites consulted in the design of this summative peer review of teaching protocol**

Texas A & M University. Peer review of teaching guide. <http://learning.tamu.edu/resource/peer-review-teaching-guide#indexthree>

University of British Columbia. Peer review of teaching initiative. <http://ctl.ubc.ca/about-isotl/programs-events/ubc-peer-review-of-teaching-initiative/>

University of Waterloo. Peer review of teaching <https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/teaching-resources/teaching-tips/professional-development/reviewing-teaching/peer-review-teaching>

University of Wisconsin. How do I design a peer review program? <https://tle.wisc.edu/teaching-academy/how-do-i-design-peer-review-program>

University of Wisconsin-Platteville. Department of Business and Accounting. Performance Review of Faculty Members. Retrieved from [http://www3.uwplatt.edu/files/bilsa/business\\_procedures.pdf](http://www3.uwplatt.edu/files/bilsa/business_procedures.pdf)



# Procedures for Developing a Summative Peer Review of Teaching Protocol

## Establishing the Purpose for Peer Review

What are the goals of the program?  
For what reasons is teaching being reviewed?  
What are the desired outcomes?  
What kinds of information are you looking for and what will you do with it?  
Who should get to see the information?  
How can the outcomes of the peer review be used?  
What are the impediments to implementation?

## Determining What Will Be Reviewed

What is considered to be effective teaching in your department/faculty?  
What ways of teaching are valued in your discipline?  
What kinds of student learning is valued?  
Are these values/expectations communicated clearly to the faculty?  
What areas of teaching should be assessed? (i.e. course design, classroom performance, course materials, contributions to teaching within the department/discipline)  
Are there already standards that exist for these areas that should be applied?

## Choosing Who Will Be Reviewed

Who may benefit from taking part in this program?  
Which faculty members will be involved?  
What will be the policy regarding participation?

## Deciding on the Procedures for Conducting Reviews

- a) When, how often and for what length of time will reviews take place?
  - Will teaching be reviewed once, or multiple times? Will it be reviewed during one course, or in various courses?
  - At what point(s) during the term/year will evidence be gathered? At what point(s) during a faculty member's career?
- b) What will be reviewed?
  - What aspects of teaching will be reviewed?
  - For the aspect of teaching being reviewed, what are the crucial elements?
  - What are the expectations for performance on these elements?
- c) What evidence will be collected?
- d) How will evidence be collected?
  - Who will the reviewers be?
  - What types of tools should be used to gather evidence in a consistent way?
  - What criteria will be used in the design of these tools?

## Implementing the Review Process

What input will faculty have into the peer review process?  
What control, if any, will the faculty member have over the process?  
How will the expectations for the review be communicated to the faculty?

## Revising, Renewing and Sustaining the Review Process

What type of follow-up will occur after the review process?  
What resources will be available for establishing and sustaining the program?  
How will the plan be documented and communicated?  
How will the plan be monitored and assessed?  
How often will it be reviewed and revised?  
What kind of support will be made available to faculty member whose teaching is in need of improvement to meet the unit's standards?

## **Appendices**

Appendix A: Statement of Purpose for Peer Review of Teaching

Appendix B: Writing Goals

Appendix C: Sample Standards and Criteria for Review

Appendix D: Addressing Standards

Appendix E: Selecting Criteria

Appendix F: Selecting Criteria

Appendix G: Sample Observation Tool (Likert Scale)

Appendix H: Sample Observation Tool (Checklist)

Appendix I: Sample Materials Evaluation Tool (Checklist)

Appendix J: Sample Materials Evaluation Tool (Course Materials Review)

Appendix K: Sample Tool (Rubric)

Appendix L: Tool for Review of Laboratory Instruction

Appendix M: Tool for Peer Review of Clinical Teaching

Appendix N: Tool for Review of Online Teaching

Appendix O: Sample Report

Appendix P: Menu for Sample Report

## **Appendix A: Statement of Purpose for Peer Review of Teaching**

### **Peer Review of Teaching Guide**

Faculty of Arts

The University of British Columbia

<http://www.arts.ubc.ca/files/2012/09/Faculty-of-Arts-Peer-Review-of-Teaching-Guide-May-20131.pdf>

Peer review of teaching is a well-established practice at UBC whose key purposes and benefits, as identified by the 2009 PRT Report, include:

- Contribution to reflection on teaching and professional development of faculty members.
- Increased awareness of the value of teaching within the university.
- Positive impact on the quality of teaching and student learning.
- Enhanced evidence beyond student evaluations of teaching to support assessment of teaching for decision making purposes (such as reappointment, tenure and promotion; teaching award nominations; etc.).

Peer review of teaching practices serve two main functions:

- summative PRT provides evaluative and comparative information for faculty members about the effectiveness of their teaching practice for decision-making purposes, including re-appointment, promotion and tenure as stipulated in the Guide to Reappointment, Tenure and Promotion Procedures at UBC 2012/13 [hereafter 'UBC Guide'], and the UBC Collective Agreement.
- formative PRT has as its focus the professional development of teaching through periodic collegial mentoring of instructors by colleagues.

This document is designed as a resource identifying suggested best practices to assist units in conducting fair and rigorous peer reviews by outlining exemplary elements and practices of PRT that units may adopt and adapt for their PRT policies and procedures. The following sections 3-7 focus on the elements of summative peer review, and section 8 provides some suggestions for formative PRT.

## **Appendix B: Writing Goals**

### **Goals of Summative Peer Review**

UBC Okanagan University

Peer Review

<http://www.ubc.ca/okanagan/ctl/support/peerreview.html>

- To assess a faculty member's abilities as an instructor in order to maintain institutional standards.
- To assess a faculty member's abilities as an instructor for the purpose of promotion.
- To diversify the course evaluation process beyond the student evaluation questionnaire.

### **Purposes of Peer Teaching Evaluation**

University of Washington

School of Dentistry

[http://dental.washington.edu/wp-content/media/restorative/DPTERCGuidelines2010\\_0928.pdf](http://dental.washington.edu/wp-content/media/restorative/DPTERCGuidelines2010_0928.pdf)

The Development/Peer-Teaching Evaluation Review Committee (DPTERC) was created to fulfill 2 basic needs for faculty members seeking development or promotion.

\*First, the committee will provide the Restorative Dentistry (RESD) chair with feedback about a faculty member's scholarly development, progress toward promotion, and the quality of promotion documents and CV. The chair can use this information to guide and help the faculty member.

\*Second, the committee will fulfill the requirement of the School of Dentistry APT document that a formal evaluation of the faculty member's teaching be provided to the Department Chair and APT committee in the year of promotion.

## **Appendix C: Sample Standards and Criteria for Review**

### **Dimensions of Teaching**

University of Adelaide, Australia

[http://www.adelaide.edu.au/teachingprojects/peerreview/peerReviewReport\\_part2\\_appendices.pdf](http://www.adelaide.edu.au/teachingprojects/peerreview/peerReviewReport_part2_appendices.pdf)

#### **Dimension 1: Students are actively engaged in learning**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- fostering a supportive, non-threatening teaching/learning environment
- encouraging students to express views, ask and answer questions, and allow time and opportunity for this to occur
- using questioning skills which encourage student engagement
- providing immediate and constructive feedback where appropriate
- demonstrating enthusiasm for teaching and learning
- (for smaller groups) fostering extensive interaction
- (for very large groups) presenting in such a manner as to achieve maximum engagement

#### **Dimension 2: Students' prior knowledge and experience is built upon**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- being fully aware of and/or determining students' prior knowledge and understanding
- building on students' current knowledge and understanding, and taking them conceptually beyond this level
- where appropriate, using and building upon student contributions and preparation

#### **Dimension 3: Teaching caters for student diversity**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- demonstrating an appreciation of the different levels of knowledge and understanding in a group
- addressing, as appropriate, different learning needs and styles within the group
- focusing on building confidence, enthusiasm and intrinsic motivation
- fostering students' responsibility for their own learning, encouraging them towards being self-directed learners, (as distinct from teacher-directed learners)
- using appropriate strategies for different needs, balancing discursive interactive strategies with those that are more didactic (where simple transmission of knowledge is needed)
- recognizing, at times, the need for teacher-directed strategies such as explaining, and being able to implement these effectively
- exercising balance between challenging and supporting students
- designing activities/tasks that allow students of differing abilities to participate/engage and demonstrate/enhance their learning
- providing examples or opportunities for discussion that cater for cultural diversity

#### **Dimension 4: Students are encouraged to develop/expand their conceptual understanding**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- helping students bridge the gap between their current conceptual understanding and the next "level"
- helping students become aware of what the next levels are
- encouraging students to become self-directed learners by using the "lecture"/presentation as the stimulus for individual study/learning
- challenging students intellectually e.g. by extending them with question/answer/discussion components where students' conclusions must be justified to the teacher and peers. This usually involves questions such as "What do you think is going on"; "Why"; "What if...?" etc.
- encouraging students to internalize or "construct" their individual conceptual understanding (ultimately the learner must be responsible for his/her own learning)
- encouraging deep (intrinsic) rather than surface (extrinsic) approaches to learning
- working cooperatively with students to help them enhance understanding
- clearly demonstrating a thorough command of the subject matter

### **Dimension 5: Students are aware of key learning outcomes**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- ensuring students are progressively aware of key learning outcomes
- focusing on learning outcomes at key points in the presentation
- ensuring a synthesis of key learning outcomes is emphasized towards the conclusion of the session so that individual student follow-up work is well focused
- encouraging each student to accept responsibility for learning issues to follow-up and consolidate
- ensuring students are aware of the link between key learning outcomes and assessment (formative and summative), as appropriate

### **Dimension 6: Actively uses links between research and teaching**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- emphasizing, where appropriate, links between research outcomes and learning
- using research links appropriately, given the level of student conceptual development
- raising students' awareness of what constitutes research

### **Dimension 7: Uses educational resources and techniques appropriately**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- using IT techniques effectively, eg PowerPoint or multimedia presentations of a professional standard using, as appropriate, a balance of IT and other strategies
- using available classroom resources to support student learning effectively
- supplying resources, materials and literature to support student learning
- using specific educational strategies and techniques in the design and delivery of teaching sessions, to achieve key objectives

### **Dimension 8: Presents material logically**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- providing an early brief structural overview of the session
- developing this structure in a coherent manner, ensuring students are constantly aware of the development of the session
- providing time for reviewing at key stages, including closure
- establishing closure, aiming at helping students draw together and understand major issues and identify individual learning needs and short-comings

### **Dimension 9: Seeks feedback on students' understanding and acts on this accordingly**

**Indicative teaching strategies for demonstrating this dimension may include:**

- seeking feedback progressively during the session eg through constant observation of interest level and engagement and by using specific questions to test understanding
- modifying the presentation to accommodate feedback messages
- seeking feedback towards the conclusion of the session to assist student to determine individual work to be consolidated

## **Appendix D: Addressing Standards**

### **Defining Teaching Expectations**

Guiding Principles for Quality Peer Review of Teaching.

UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy.

Retrieved from <https://pharmacy.unc.edu>

All teaching faculty at the UNC Eshelman School of Pharmacy are expected to meet basic teaching competencies. Assessment of these competencies includes consideration of (1) student activity and achievement, (2) instructor attributes (3) instructor-student interactions, and (4) instructional methods and materials (Palmer & Collins, 2006; Chickering & Gamson 1987), with evidence drawn from a variety of sources (e.g. self, student and peer review and evaluation). The process of defining, documenting and assessing whether faculty meet basic teaching expectations should be developmental to the individual instructor, viewed as continuous progression (i.e., formative assessment of teaching), and judged according to explicit and agreed upon indicators and sources of evidence, including self, student and peer review and evaluation of instruction and instructional materials.

#### **Student activity and achievement:**

As a result of effective teaching and learning practices, students should:

- Be actively engaged in the learning process and responding to learning experience (demonstrating positive anticipation, interacting, completing tasks, concentrating)
- Achieve defined learning outcomes, including discipline-specific and general education outcomes (e.g. critical thinking, communication, ethical decision-making, self-learning, social and contextual awareness and responsibility)
- Provide feedback regarding their learning

#### **Instructor attributes and instructor-student interactions.**

Instructors should:

- Be enthusiastic for the subject
- Be approachable
- Possess and apply good organizational and administrative skills to their teaching
- Keep abreast of their subject discipline
- Articulate clear expectations to students
- Actively engage students in the learning process
- Utilize teaching methods that address multiple learning styles and preferences
- Encourage student effort and achievement
- Provide students constructive feedback
- Commit extra support to less able students
- Reflect on and change practice

#### **Teaching methods:**

Instructional design, methods and materials should:

- Provide students with explicit, challenging but achievable, and positive learning goals
- Be 'pitched' at the appropriate level, based on assessment of students' prior learning (knowledge and abilities)
- Be well aligned with defined learning outcomes
- Focus attention on key learning points / concepts
- Organize information in ways that are meaningful to students and relate new knowledge and concepts to prior knowledge
- Provide learners with opportunities to practice and receive constructive feedback
- Use teaching environments (in- and out-of-class time) to maximize student learning opportunities (i.e., interaction with the material, other students, instructors, etc)

## Appendix E: Selecting Criteria

### Criteria Framework for Peer Review of Teaching.

University of British Columbia

Retrieved from Hubball, H., & Clarke, A. (2011). Scholarly approaches to peer-review of teaching: Emergent frameworks and outcomes in a research-intensive university. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning journal*, 4(3).

[http://www.viu.ca/integratedplanning/documents/TD437\\_HubbalClarke\\_Peer\\_Review.pdf](http://www.viu.ca/integratedplanning/documents/TD437_HubbalClarke_Peer_Review.pdf)

1) *Criteria that focus on faculty member's practice to enhance student learning outcomes such as the ability of students to demonstrate:*

- \* the acquisition, application and integration of knowledge
- \* research skills, including the ability to define problems and access, retrieve and evaluate information
- \* critical thinking and problem-solving
- \* proficient literacy and numeracy skills
- \* responsible use of ethical principles
- \* effective leadership, communication and interpersonal skills

2) *Criteria that focus on contemporary learning-centred teaching practices such as the faculty member's ability to demonstrate:*

- Command over subject matter (how knowledgeable or authoritative)
- Representation of recent developments in the field (what's in; what's not)
- Preparedness (for individual sessions and for overall course/term)
- Relationship between goals/objectives and assessment of learning
- Appropriateness of course materials and requirements (given the topic and level)
- Articulation with other programmatic courses/elements

3) *Criteria that focus on faculty member's teaching practice to address principles of learning:*

- Learning requires high levels of student engagement/active participation (e.g., critical thinking, problem-solving)
- Learners learn in different ways, have diverse backgrounds, are at different stages and progress at different rates
- Learning is an individual, social and contextual process
- Learning requires critical feedback (strengths and weaknesses)

4) *Criteria that focus on faculty member's ability to demonstrate Seven Principles for Effective Teaching Practice in Undergraduate Education:*

- Encourages student-instructor contact
- Encourages cooperation among students
- Encourages active learning
- Gives prompt feedback
- Emphasizes time on task
- Communicates high expectations
- Respects diverse talents and ways of learning

5) *Criteria that focus on faculty member's ability to demonstrate Ethical Principles in University Teaching:*

- Content Competence
- Pedagogical Competence
- Dealing With Sensitive Topics
- Student Development
- Dual Relationships With Students
- Confidentiality
- Respect for Colleagues
- Valid Assessment of Students
- Respect for Institution

6) *Criteria that focus on faculty member's ability to demonstrate effective teaching at the University of BC:*

1. The clarity of the instructor's expectations of learning.
2. The fairness of the instructor's assessment of learning
3. Instructor's ability to communicate course objectives & content.
4. Instructor's ability to inspire interest in the course material.
5. Instructor's concern for students' learning.
6. Instructor's overall quality of teaching.



## Appendix F: Selecting Criteria

### Peer Review Criteria

Faculty of Arts University of British Columbia

Peer Review of Teaching Guide

<http://www.arts.ubc.ca/files/2012/09/Faculty-of-Arts-Peer-Review-of-Teaching-Guide-May-20131.pdf>

1. Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges or other appropriate engagements for student learning.

- Course materials contain clear information about learning objectives, appropriate assigned readings or equivalent, evaluation procedures, and policies (e.g., regarding late assignments, accommodations, and other regulations and procedures).
- Sets high yet reasonable expectations of learning appropriate for level of the course and its place in the curriculum.
- Assignments and exams are designed to effectively assess stated learning objectives, and indicate how feedback will be provided to students
- In the session observed, the instructor indicated what students were expected to learn during that class period.

2. The instructor employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners.

- In course materials and in the session observed, instructor demonstrates command of subject matter and familiarity with recent developments in the field.
- Methods of instruction are appropriately designed to further research, communication, performance, professional, and/or other skills as appropriate.
- In the session observed, the instructor clearly phrased questions to foster critical thinking and promoted active student participation and engagement in learning.
- Evidence of reflection on teaching and incorporation of improvements in teaching methods through professional development opportunities and/or student and other feedback.

3. In the session observed, the class was well organized and planned.

- The instructor was well prepared and well organized
- Pace of class and amount of material covered was appropriate
- The level of teaching was appropriate to the students' abilities/background and the level of the course.
- Any examples, diagrams, demonstrations, etc. were helpful.
- Any hand-outs (downloadable or hard copies) were clear.
- Relevance of the material established
- Learning outcomes linked to student assessment for the course.

4. In the session observed, the class material was effectively communicated and instructor interacted effectively with students.

- The instructor's delivery was clear, loud enough, the tone was varied, and eye contact was made with students.
- Good rapport was established with the students.
- The instructor presented material in a way to inspire student interest and engagement.
- Audio-visual materials were effective and provided appropriately.
- Questions or comments were encouraged to promote student-instructor interactions.
- Methods of student participation were used to enrich educational experiences as appropriate (e.g., small group discussions, presentations, problem solving, hands on learning, performance analysis, etc.).

5. Respects Diverse Talents and Learning Needs of Students

- Promotes a stimulating learning environment for all students
- Recognizes and accommodates different learning needs (including background preparation, pace of learning)
- Demonstrates sensitivity to intellectual and cultural issues
- Use of creative assessment techniques and assignments;
- Incorporation of experiential learning (internships, study abroad, CSL, etc.) into course design.

6. The instructor attends to the intellectual growth of students.

In the session observed:

- The instructor checked occasionally to ensure students understand class material.

- A wide range of intellectual positions were given respectful consideration.
- The instructor listened to student questions and responded effectively, and was able to elaborate when necessary to increase students' comprehension of material.

## 7. Classroom management.

In the session observed:

- The class started and finished on time.
- The instructor effectively dealt with any problems that arose that could adversely affect learning (e.g., inappropriate student behaviour).
- Sufficient time was provided to students to respond to questions asked.
- Ground rules set at the beginning of the term were enforced as needed (e.g., use of cell phones, talking or interrupting at inappropriate times).
- Instructor concluded the session effectively.

## Appendix G: Sample Observation Tool (Likert Scale)

### Class Observation Checklist

North Carolina State University.

A protocol for peer review of teaching

[http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04\(Peer-Review\).pdf](http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04(Peer-Review).pdf)

Course: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle your responses to each of the questions and then add comments below the table.

5 – exceeds expectations in all respects

4 – meets expectations in all respects

3 – meets expectations in most respects

2 – meets expectations in some respects

1 – meets expectations in few or no respects

1 – was well prepared for class	5	4	3	2	1
2 – was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1
3 – was enthusiastic about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1
4 – spoke clearly, audibly, and confidently	5	4	3	2	1
5 – used a variety of relevant illustrations/examples	5	4	3	2	1
6 – made effective use of the board and/or visual aids	5	4	3	2	1
7 – asked stimulating and challenging questions	5	4	3	2	1
8 – effectively held class's attention	5	4	3	2	1
9 – achieved active student involvement	5	4	3	2	1
10 – treated students with respect	5	4	3	2	1

What worked well in the class? (Continue on back if necessary)

What could have been improved? (Continue on back if necessary)

## Appendix H: Sample Observation Tool

### Peer Observation Checklist

University of Albany.

Peer observation and assessment of teaching.

[http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/tlr/peer\\_obs/index.shtml](http://www.albany.edu/teachingandlearning/tlr/peer_obs/index.shtml)

Faculty member being observed \_\_\_\_\_

Course \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

	Observed? (Check if yes)	Comments
Instructor clearly communicates the purpose of class session and instructional activities.		
Instructor uses concrete examples and illustrations that clarify the material.		
Instructor uses a variety of activities to ensure all students are engaged.		
Instructor challenges students to think analytically.		
Instructor uses activities in class to determine whether students understand course material.		
Instructor fosters student-to-student interaction.		
Instructor links new material to previously learned concepts.		
Instructor uses visuals and handouts where appropriate to accompany verbal presentation.		
Instructor requires students to be active (e.g., completing a task, applying concepts, or engaging in discussion instead of passively listening).		

## Appendix I: Sample Materials Evaluation Tool

### Course Material Checklist

North Carolina State University.

A protocol for peer review of teaching

[http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04\(Peer-Review\).pdf](http://www4.ncsu.edu/unity/lockers/users/f/felder/public/Papers/ASEE04(Peer-Review).pdf)

Course: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

- 1. Course content includes the appropriate topics
- 2. Course content reflects the current state of the field
- 3. Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate
- 4. Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate
- 5. Lecture notes are well organized and clearly written
- 6. Supplementary handouts and webpages are well organized and clearly written
- 7. Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging
- 8. Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging
- 9. Tests are clearly written and reasonable in length
- 10. Student products demonstrate satisfaction of learning objectives

What are the strengths of the course materials?

What could have been improved?

## Appendix J: Sample Evaluation Tool

### Evaluation Of Teaching: Course Materials Review

Auburn University.

Overview of peer review of teaching.

<http://wp.auburn.edu/biggio/wp-content/uploads/2011/09/peer-review-packet.pdf>

#### Course Syllabus

- Identifies instructional resources – books, films, speakers
- Outlines the sequence of topics to be covered
- Describes evaluation procedures
- Includes a class or activity schedule or calendar
- Lists major assignments and due dates
- Contains information about the faculty member, i.e. name, office address, office hours, phone number
- Includes a statement or description of course objectives
- Is structured to make information clear and easily understood

#### Assignments (as they appear on the syllabus or elsewhere)

- Produce meaningful and challenging learning experiences
- Include a variety of activities which are responsive to varying student interests, abilities and learning styles
- Are appropriate to course objectives and content level
- Are spaced at appropriate intervals in the course
- Are challenging but not overly burdensome
- Prepare students for more complex courses in the subject

#### Exams

##### *An Ungraded Copy:*

- Contains content consistent with course objectives – in other words, the instructor is evaluating students on what she believes they ought to be able to do or know
- Contains items written so that the intent of the questions is clear and explicit
- Covers manageable amounts of material in terms of time allocated for studying it
- Requires analysis and application of content as opposed to regurgitation of details

##### *A Graded Copy:*

- Includes written comments which give some feedback about both right and wrong answers
- Presents written comments that are clear and readable
- Includes some explanation of how exam scores were calculated

#### Textbooks(s)

- Are appropriate to course level
- Are clearly related to course objectives
- Are generally acceptable in terms of departmental standards
- Present content in a systematic and logical order so as to enhance the understanding of someone unfamiliar with the topic
- Present material interestingly to encourage reading

#### Supplementary Reading Lists

- Contain relevant and current material
- Supplement course content
- Include content that is challenging yet not inappropriately difficult
- Specify location of supplementary materials
- Include information to direct reading in terms of its relationship to course content

#### Lecture Outlines (provided students)

- Communicate a sense of proportion and detail that is consistent with content
- Provide enough information to assist the note-taking process without making note-taking unnecessary
- Include space for students to write additional information
- Are enhanced by lecture presentations in class

**Study Questions/Review Materials**

- Prepare one to perform successfully on exams
- Cover content that is covered on the exam
- Are designed so that their completion facilitates student retention and understanding
- Do not force students to focus on large quantities of material that are irrelevant to exam content
- Provide opportunity to practice problem-solving skills

**Visual Materials (as in prepared slides and transparencies)**

- Illustrate content enhanced by visual representation
- Are clear and “graphically” illustrate the content
- Include written elaborations that are clear and easily read
- Can be seen and read with ease everywhere in the classroom
- Contain manageable amounts of material so excessive amounts of time are not required to copy the material down

**Overall Conclusions**

- Compared with other course materials you have seen these are better than average
- As demonstrated by these materials, the content selected for inclusion in this course is appropriate and justifiable
- These materials communicate an appropriate level of instructor preparation and concern

**General Comments**

## Appendix K: Sample Tool

### Teaching Competence Evaluation Rubric

Retrieved from Fernandez, C., & Yu, J. (2007). Peer review of teaching. *The Journal of Chiropractic Education*, 21(2), 154-161. Retrieved from <http://www.journalchiroed.com/doi/pdf/10.7899/1042-5055-21.2.154>

Teaching competence	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Exceptional
Commitment to Teaching and Student Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exhibits a lack of enthusiasm and excitement toward teaching and students</li> <li>• Discourages student's questions, involvement, and debate</li> <li>• Makes accessibility and availability difficult for students</li> <li>• Discourages individual expression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Often demonstrates enthusiasm and excitement toward teaching and students</li> <li>• Encourages student questions, involvement, and debate</li> <li>• Is accessible and available to students</li> <li>• Allows for individual expression</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistently demonstrates enthusiasm and excitement toward teaching and students</li> <li>• Has a well-established learning environment that encourages student questions, involvement, and debate</li> <li>• Makes students a priority in being accessible and available to their needs</li> <li>• Encourages and allows for individual expression</li> </ul>
Selection of Teaching Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely selects examples relevant to students experiences, "real world" applications and/or objectives</li> <li>• Does not relate content with what was taught before and what will come after</li> <li>• Does not present views other than own</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selects examples relevant to students experiences, "real-world" applications, and/or teaching objectives</li> <li>• Relates content with what was taught before and what will come after</li> <li>• Sometimes presents views other than own when appropriate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Frequently selects examples relevant to students experiences, "real-world" applications, and/or teaching objectives</li> <li>• Often relates content with what was taught before and what will come after</li> <li>• Presents views other than own when appropriate and provides explanation for possible differences of opinion along with evidence</li> </ul>
Mastery of Teaching Content/ Knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rarely explains difficult terms or concepts</li> <li>• Does not present background of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Does not present best evidence and up-to-date developments in the field</li> <li>• Does not answer students' questions adequately or does not admit error or insufficient knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains difficult terms or concepts</li> <li>• Presents background of ideas and concepts</li> <li>• Presents best evidence and up-to-date developments in the field</li> <li>• Answers students' questions adequately or admits error or insufficient knowledge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains difficult terms or concepts in depth and in more than one way</li> <li>• Presents background of ideas and concepts in depth</li> <li>• Frequently presents best evidence and up-to-date developments in the field</li> <li>• Answers students' questions in depth and admits error or insufficient knowledge with commitment to seek out information</li> </ul>



<p>Organization</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not begin on time and is disorganized</li> <li>• Fails to preview material to prepare students for the content to be covered in patient encounter or workshop</li> <li>• Fails to summarize main points at the end of session</li> <li>• Does not provide clear directions and procedures</li> <li>• Does not plan on a daily or weekly basis</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begins on time</li> <li>• Previews patient cases or session content</li> <li>• Summarizes main points at the end of session</li> <li>• Explains directions and procedures</li> <li>• Plans for daily and weekly activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Begins on time in an orderly, organized fashion</li> <li>• Consistently previews patient cases or session content</li> <li>• Summarizes and distills main points at the end of session</li> <li>• Consistently explains directions and procedures</li> <li>• Plans daily and weekly activities and follows-up on plans that was not able to complete</li> </ul>
<p>Meeting Teaching Objectives</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching content and methods do not meet stated objectives of syllabus or as stated by teacher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching content and methods are geared to stated objectives of syllabus and as stated by teacher</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teaching content and methods clearly meet stated objectives of syllabus and as stated by teacher</li> </ul>
<p>Instructional Materials (Readings, Media, Visual Aids) <i>Didactic</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to provide students with instructional materials</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporates various instructional supports such as slides, visual aids, handouts, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incorporates various instructional supports such as slides, visual aids, handouts, etc; Also provides references for materials presented when appropriate</li> </ul>
<p>Intern Evaluation and Achievement (Methods and Tools)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to provide students with assessment criteria and instructions</li> <li>• Does not perform minimum number of assessments required</li> <li>• Assessments are of poor quality, have minimal information, and do not lend themselves to meaningful student feedback</li> <li>• Feedback is not provided or is minimal</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides to students assessment criteria, instructions, and expectations</li> <li>• Provides satisfactory number of assessments required by department</li> <li>• Assessments are of satisfactory quality, have adequate information, and lend themselves to meaningful student feedback</li> <li>• Feedback to students is adequate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides to students the goals of assessment, along with criteria, instructions, and expectations. Also provides examples of expectations and type of feedback given</li> <li>• Provides beyond satisfactory</li> <li>• number of assessments</li> <li>• required by department</li> <li>• Assessments are of exceptional quality, have in-depth information including comments, and lend themselves to meaningful student feedback</li> <li>• Feedback to students is exceptional and allows for student's self-evaluation and reflection with steps for improvement</li> </ul>

Teaching Methodology and Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fails to use a variety of clinical teaching strategies to address diverse learning styles and opportunities</li> <li>• Fails to respond to changes in student attentiveness</li> <li>• Speech is inaudible and unclear</li> <li>• Is unprofessional and use of humor is negative and inappropriate</li> <li>• Fails to establish and maintain eye contact with students</li> <li>• Does not provide demonstrations when needed</li> <li>• Does not promote life-long learning</li> <li>• Does not promote students to be independent learners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a variety of teaching strategies to address diverse learning styles and opportunities</li> <li>• Responds to changes in student attentiveness</li> <li>• Speaks audibly and clearly</li> <li>• Models professionalism</li> <li>• Establishes and maintains eye contact with students</li> <li>• Provides demonstrations as appropriate</li> <li>• Mentors students in life-long learning skills</li> <li>• Allows students to be independent learners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a large variety of teaching strategies to address diverse learning styles and opportunities</li> <li>• Responds to changes in student attentiveness with comfortable transition of teaching strategies</li> <li>• Consistently speaks audibly and clearly</li> <li>• Models professionalism and use of humor is positive and appropriate</li> <li>• Establishes and maintains eye contact with students while communicating a sense of enthusiasm toward the content</li> <li>• Provides demonstrations as appropriate and has students demonstrate their understanding</li> <li>• Routinely mentors students in life-long learning skills</li> <li>• Guides students to be independent learners</li> </ul>
Support of Department Instructional Efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is unaware of department's instructional efforts</li> <li>• Does not demonstrate support of department instructional efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is aware of Department's instructional efforts</li> <li>• Demonstrates support of department instructional efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a comprehensive understanding of department's instructional efforts</li> <li>• Demonstrates support of department instructional efforts and demonstrates leadership in progressing instructional programs</li> </ul>

*Note:* This appendix is based on ideas in references 12 and 15 and the author's experience

## Appendix L: Tool for Review of Laboratory Instruction

**Peer review of laboratory instruction**  
**Georgetown University School of Medicine**  
<https://georgetown.app.box.com/s/du2op4nkla7srl6qu0rd>

Faculty observed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>CONTEXT: (name of course, title of lecture, number of students, etc.)</b>

Use the following scale to rate this instructor  
 5 = *Strongly agree*    4 = *Agree*    3 = *Neither agree nor disagree*    2 = *Disagree*    1 = *Strongly disagree*

<b>DESIGN OF LEARNING EXPERIENCE</b>					
A. Learning experiences are relevant to the course curriculum	5	4	3	2	1
B. Reflects current practice in the field	5	4	3	2	1
C. Appropriate level of challenge for students	5	4	3	2	1
D. Goals are clear	5	4	3	2	1
E. Assessment strategy is appropriate to the goals	5	4	3	2	1
<b>INSTRUCTIONS OR PROCEDURES MATERIALS</b>					
F. Instructions and procedures are clear	5	4	3	2	1
G. Appropriate length for time allotted	5	4	3	2	1
H. Contain information on goals and assessment	5	4	3	2	1
I. Proofread and in readable format	5	4	3	2	1
<b>INSTRUCTIONAL OVERSIGHT</b>					
J. Laboratory instructor shows understanding of the goals and procedures	5	4	3	2	1
K. Demonstrates the relevant content knowledge needed for the laboratory session	5	4	3	2	1
L. Takes a proactive role in engaging with the students in the lab	5	4	3	2	1
M. Is available for questions and assistance	5	4	3	2	1
N. In helping students, uses clear questioning and coaching strategies	5	4	3	2	1
O. Can use the equipment and demonstrates the techniques needed for the laboratory	5	4	3	2	1
P. Follows safety procedures	5	4	3	2	1
Q. Coordinates work with any laboratory assistants, if present	5	4	3	2	1
<b>ASSESSMENT</b>					
R. Assessment procedure is at appropriate level of challenge	5	4	3	2	1
S. Assessment procedures are clear to students	5	4	3	2	1
T. Instructor comments on graded work provides ample and helpful feedback	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Strengths:</b>	<b>Weaknesses:</b>				
<b>OVERALL COMMENTS:</b>					

Based on this observation, I would rate this instructor overall as:

**Exemplary**
**Excellent**
**Good**
**Fair**
**Poor**

Faculty Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

(Signature)

Source: Chism, N.V.N. (2007). Peer Review of Teaching: A sourcebook. Bolton, MA: Anker.  
 Form available at <http://som.georgetown.edu/medicaleducation/evaluationandassessment/>

## Appendix M: Tool for Peer Review of Clinical Teaching

Retrieved from Chism, N. (2007). Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. (pp. 138-139). Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Co. Inc.

### Peer Review of Clinical Teaching

- 5 = Strongly agree
- 4 = Agree
- 3 = Neither agree or disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 1 = Strongly disagree

#### Professionalism

Demonstrates respect for patients, coworkers and students	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates ethical conduct and discusses ethical issues with students	5	4	3	2	1
Exemplifies professionalism	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates enthusiasm	5	4	3	2	1
Serves as an appropriate clinical role model	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

#### Technical Competence

Demonstrates up-to-date clinical skills	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates up-to-date knowledge	5	4	3	2	1
Develops an appropriate treatment plan	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

#### Interaction with Students

Establishes rapport	5	4	3	2	1
Encourages all students to participate	5	4	3	2	1
Asks appropriate questions	5	4	3	2	1
Encourages students to defend their opinions	5	4	3	2	1
Elicits opinions before offering a diagnosis	5	4	3	2	1
Provides appropriate feedback	5	4	3	2	1
Comments:					

#### Overall evaluation:

**Exemplary      Excellent      Good      Fair      Poor**

## **Appendix N: Tool for Review of Online Teaching**

### **A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State**

The Pennsylvania State University  
College Of Earth and Metal Sciences

<http://facdev.e-education.psu.edu/evaluate-revise/peerreviewonline>

## Background

In 1987, Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson published “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education,” a summary of 50 years of higher education research that addressed good teaching and learning practices. Their findings, and faculty and institutional evaluation instruments based on the findings, have been widely used to guide and improve college teaching.

While instruments such as the Student Rating of Teaching Effectiveness (SRTE) provide a measure of student satisfaction with a course, the Seven Principles provide a useful framework to evaluate the effectiveness of online teaching and learning. Therefore, this *Peer Review Guide* adapts the Seven Principles to facilitate the peer review of online courses in both undergraduate and graduate level online courses at Penn State. Each principle is described in detail, including evidence of how a principle may be met. Examples of evidence to look for and resources for additional information are also included.

### The Seven Principles

Good practice:

1. Encourages contact between students and faculty;
2. Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students;
3. Encourages active learning;
4. Gives prompt feedback;
5. Emphasizes time on task;
6. Communicates high expectations; and
7. Respects diverse talents and ways of learning.

Chickering, A. & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *AAHE Bulletin* (39) 7.

While, ideally, good practice would suggest that all seven principles would be supported in some way in an online course, variations in course format, size, and faculty teaching experience can make reaching that ideal difficult. Like the SRTE, where achieving an overall score of “7” is rare, it is assumed that a peer reviewer will discover room for improvement when examining a course through the lens of the Seven Principles. This Peer Review Guide provides space for the peer reviewer to note teaching and learning strengths, as well as areas for improvement.

## Recommended Peer Review Process

Peer reviews of teaching are required for promotion and tenure at Penn State. We also need to conduct peer reviews for our part-time faculty members who teach online and at a distance. University Policy HR23 states, “Each academic unit (e.g., department, college, and University Libraries) of the University should take responsibility for developing detailed review procedures, supplemental to and consonant with general University procedures, as guidelines for promotion and tenure.” To help facilitate the peer review of online courses, we recommend the following peer review process:

1. The department/division head or school director or, where appropriate, campus chancellor and campus director of academic affair, identifies a faculty peer (“peer reviewer”) to conduct the peer review of teaching.
2. The course instructor completes the “Instructor Input Form” and shares that document with the peer reviewer to convey contextual information about the course.
3. After reviewing the completed “Instructor Input Form,” the peer reviewer uses the “Peer Review Guide for Online Courses” to work through the online course, observing how well the instructor addresses each of the Seven Principles. The reviewer notes the instructor’s strengths and areas for improvement for each Principle in the space provided.

NOTE: Reviewers should feel free to ask questions of the instructor any time clarification or information is needed during the review process.

4. The peer reviewer summarizes the feedback in the form of a letter to that instructor that can be included in the instructor’s dossier. The letter, as well as a copy of the completed Peer Review Guide, is then shared with the instructor, the Program Manager (if the course is part of an online program), and the department/division head or school director or, where appropriate, campus chancellor and campus director of academic affairs.

For **provisional faculty** (not yet tenured), it is recommended that peer reviews should occur at least once per year and in a variety of courses. Faculty being **reviewed for promotion**, it is better to have a series of peer reviews over time rather than several in the fall immediately preceding the review.

## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

<p><b>Principle 1: Good practice encourages contact between students and faculty.</b></p> <p>Frequent and timely student-faculty contact is the most important factor in student motivation and involvement, particularly in a distance education environment. Evidence of faculty concern helps students get through challenging situations and inspires them to persevere. Knowing a few faculty members well enhances students' intellectual commitment and encourages them to think about their own values and future plans.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence to look for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A "welcome message" is provided at the beginning of the course that encourages student-to-instructor contact for course-related discussions or concerns.</li><li>• The instructor encourages and fosters a healthy exchange of ideas and sharing of experiences among course participants.</li><li>• The instructor initiates contact with, or respond to, students on a regular basis in order to establish a consistent online presence in the course (and prior notice is given to students in the event that the instructor will be unavailable for more than a few days, such as might be the case during professional travel).</li><li>• A prominent announcement area is used to communicate important up-to-date course information to students, such as reminders of impending assignment due dates, curriculum changes, scheduled absences, etc.</li><li>• The instructor holds regular office hours, and by appointment, that are mediated by technology (e.g., the telephone, chat areas, Adobe Connect Pro) to accommodate distance students.</li><li>• Student inquiries are responded in a timely manner.</li><li>• The instructor provides students with interaction space for study groups, "hall way conversations," etc.</li></ul> <p><b>Where to look:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Discussion forums</li><li>• E-mail messages</li><li>• Posted announcements</li><li>• Course syllabus</li><li>• Chat space</li></ul> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• "What to do when opening a course" - <a href="https://www.e-education.psu.edu/facdev/pg3">https://www.e-education.psu.edu/facdev/pg3</a></li><li>• "Using online icebreakers to promote student/teacher interaction" - <a href="http://www.southalabama.edu/oll/jobaidfall03/Icebreakers%20Online/icebreakerjobaid.htm">http://www.southalabama.edu/oll/jobaidfall03/Icebreakers%20Online/icebreakerjobaid.htm</a></li></ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Feedback for the Instructor</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Found:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p>
---	---





## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

### Principle 3: Good practice encourages active learning.

Active learning methods engage students in the learning process by encouraging them to discover, process, and apply information. Empirical support for the positive impact of active learning on student achievement is extensive.

#### Examples of evidence to look for:

- Student activities that involve one or more of the following<sup>1</sup>:
  - Active use of writing, speaking, and other forms of self-expression
  - Opportunity for information gathering, synthesis, and analysis in solving problems (including the use of library, electronic/computer and other resources, and quantitative reasoning and interpretation, as applicable)
  - Engagement in collaborative learning activities
  - Application of intercultural and international competence
  - Dialogue pertaining to social behavior, community, and scholarly conduct
  - For General Education courses, three or more of these activities are integrated into courses offered in the knowledge domains (<http://www.psu.edu/ufs/geic/framework.html>):
- Opportunities for students to “customize” their learning by tailoring assignments to their personal and professional interests and needs.
- Examples of student work where they
  - Think, talk, or write about their learning
  - Reflect, relate, organize, apply, synthesize, or evaluate information
  - Perform research, lab or studio work, or physical activities
  - Participate in, design, or develop educational games and simulations.

#### Where to look:

- Course syllabus
- Instructional materials
- Assignment dropboxes
- e-Portfolios
- Discussion forums

#### Resources:

- Active Learning (Illinois State University) - <http://www.cat.ilstu.edu/additional/tips/newActive.php>
- “How Can Teachers Promote Learning and Thinking?” - <http://www.pgcps.pg.k12.md.us/~elc/theory9.html>
- “Inquiry-based Learning” - <http://www.schreyerstitute.psu.edu/pdf/IBL.pdf>

### Feedback for the Instructor

#### Evidence Found:

#### Strengths:

#### Areas for Improvement:

## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

<p><b>Principle 4: Good practice gives prompt feedback.</b></p> <p>Instructors help students frequently assess their knowledge and competence and provide them with opportunities to perform, receive meaningful suggestions, and reflect on their learning.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence to look for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Information about course feedback methods and standards on the course syllabus.</li><li>• Option (or requirement) for students to submit drafts of assignments for instructor feedback.</li><li>• Meaningful feedback on student assignments that is provided within a publicized, and reasonable, time frame.</li><li>• Assignment feedback that is clear, positive, specific, and focused on observable behavior that can be changed.</li><li>• Clearly communicated course and individual assignment grading criteria.</li><li>• Up-to-date, student-accessible course gradebook.</li><li>• An open discussion forum where students can ask questions, and receive instructor feedback, about course content and activities.</li><li>• Student surveys that provide the instructor with feedback for course improvement.</li><li>• Examples of student work that demonstrate advancement toward learning goals.</li></ul> <p><b>Where to look:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Course syllabus</li><li>• Instructional materials / Assignment directions</li><li>• Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios</li><li>• Course gradebook</li><li>• Discussion forums</li><li>• Survey instruments</li></ul> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• TLT Ideas for Giving Prompt, Better Feedback to Students - <a href="http://www.tltgroup.org/SEVEN/4_Feedback.htm">http://www.tltgroup.org/SEVEN/4_Feedback.htm</a></li><li>• Providing Feedback - <a href="http://www.netc.org/focus/strategies/prov.php">http://www.netc.org/focus/strategies/prov.php</a></li><li>• Collecting Feedback That Improves Teaching and Learning - <a href="http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/Tools/MidsemesterFeedback">http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/Tools/MidsemesterFeedback</a></li></ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Feedback for the Instructor</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Found:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p>
---	---

## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

<p><b>Principle 5: Good education emphasizes time on task.</b></p> <p>The frequency and duration of study, as well as effective time management skills, are critical for students and professionals alike. Students need help in learning to manage and prioritize their study time.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence to look for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A published course schedule that outlines topics to be covered and assignment due dates so students can plan their workload accordingly.</li><li>• Information on the course syllabus that provides an estimate of the amount of time students should spend on the course (e.g., "On average, most students spend eight hours per week working on course assignments. Your workload may be more or less depending on your prior experience with computing and the Web in general, and with this subject in particular.")</li><li>• Time-to-completion information on course assignments (e.g., "This assignment should take you approximately 2 hours to complete.")</li><li>• Course-specific study tips that provide students with strategies for utilizing their time well.</li><li>• Assignment feedback that provides students with information on where to focus their studies.</li><li>• Assignment due dates and timeframes that take into account the nature of the target audience. For example, a course targeted to working adult professionals might incorporate a weekend into an assignment timeframe.</li><li>• Course statistics that demonstrate that time-to-completion and weekly time-on-task estimates are on target.</li></ul> <p><b>Where to look:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Course syllabus</li><li>• Instructional materials / Assignment directions</li><li>• Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios</li><li>• "Report" tab in ANGEL</li></ul> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Emphasize Time on Task (Ohio Learning Network) - <a href="http://www.oln.org/ILT/7_principles/time.php">http://www.oln.org/ILT/7_principles/time.php</a></li><li>• iStudy Module (for students) on Time Management: <a href="http://istudy.psu.edu/modules.html">http://istudy.psu.edu/modules.html</a></li></ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Feedback for the Instructor</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Found:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p>
--	---

## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

<p><b>Principle 6: Good practice communicates high expectations.</b></p> <p>As the saying goes, “if you don’t know where you are going, how will you know when you get there?” Effective instructors have high, but reasonable, expectations for their students. They clearly communicate those expectations and provide support to their students in their efforts to meet those expectations.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence to look for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Explicit communication of the skills and knowledge every student needs to have in order to be successful in the course.</li><li>• Explanation of course learning goals and how assignments are designed to help students achieve those goals.</li><li>• Frequent feedback provided to students through written explanations and detailed feedback on assignments.</li><li>• Motivation and encouragement that inspires students to move past the easy answers to more complex solutions.</li><li>• Routine use of critical and probing questions when communicating with students about course assignments and activities.</li><li>• Examples and non-examples of high quality work, along with a discussion of the differences between these.</li><li>• Examples of student work that demonstrate advancement toward learning goals.</li></ul> <p><b>Where to look:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Course syllabus</li><li>• Instructional materials / Assignment directions</li><li>• Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios</li></ul> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “Student Learning Goals and Outcomes” - <a href="http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/pdf/DevelopingStudentLearningOutcomes.pdf">http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/pdf/DevelopingStudentLearningOutcomes.pdf</a></li><li>• “Checklist for a Course Assignment and Associate Grading Criteria” - <a href="http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/pdf/assignments_grading_checklist.pdf">http://www.schreyerinstitutione.psu.edu/pdf/assignments_grading_checklist.pdf</a></li></ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Feedback for the Instructor</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Found:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p>
--	---

## A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State

<p><b>Principle 7: Good practice respects diverse talents and ways of learning.</b></p> <p>People bring different talents and styles of learning to the learning environment. Some bring a wealth of relevant experience to a course, while others may new to the topic at hand. Likewise, students who are strong in a discussion situation may be less adept at lab or studio work. Students need the opportunity to demonstrate their talents and to “personalize” their learning so that it is relevant to them. It is also important to give students opportunities to learn in ways that may be less comfortable in order to improve their learning skills.</p> <p><b>Examples of evidence to look for:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Use of a variety of assessment tools that gauge student progress.</li><li>• Alternative assignment options that allow students to demonstrate their progress in a manner that is best conducive to their talents. For example, a podcast might be allowed as learning evidence instead of a written paper.</li><li>• Supplemental online materials are provided to students who lack prerequisite knowledge or who would benefit from having content presented in an alternative manner.</li><li>• Timely, corrective feedback for online activities.</li><li>• A positive online climate where students are encouraged to seek assistance with course content and learning activities if needed.</li><li>• A policy for accommodations that is stated on the course syllabus.</li><li>• Accommodations are proactively offered for students with disabilities.</li></ul> <p><b>Where to look:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Course syllabus</li><li>• Instructional materials / Assignment directions</li><li>• Assignment dropboxes and e-portfolios</li><li>• Discussion forums</li></ul> <p><b>Resources:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• “Learning effectively by understanding your learning preferences” – <a href="http://www.mindtools.com/mnemlsty.html">http://www.mindtools.com/mnemlsty.html</a></li><li>• “Classroom assessment techniques” - <a href="http://www.ntlf.com/html/lib/bib/assess.htm">http://www.ntlf.com/html/lib/bib/assess.htm</a></li><li>• Accessibility in course design forum on PSU Learning Design Community Hub - <a href="http://ets.tlt.psu.edu/learningdesign/forum/4">http://ets.tlt.psu.edu/learningdesign/forum/4</a></li><li>• Office of Disability Services Faculty Handbook – <a href="http://www.equity.psu.edu/ods/faculty/overview.asp">http://www.equity.psu.edu/ods/faculty/overview.asp</a></li></ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Feedback for the Instructor</b></p> <p><b>Evidence Found:</b></p> <p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p><b>Areas for Improvement:</b></p>
--	---

<sup>1</sup> Prince, M. (July 2004). Does active learning work? A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 93, 3, 223-232.

<sup>1</sup> Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (2001). A clarification of ‘active learning’ as it applies to general education (Legislative). Located at <http://senate.psu.edu/scca/curricular%20affairs%20reports/2-01%20CA%20RPT%202.pdf>

## Appendix O: Sample Report

### Peer Review of Teaching for Promotion Application

Australian Learning & Teaching Council

<http://www.adelaide.edu.au/teaching-projects/peerreview/documents.html#External>

**REPORT BY EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW TEAM MEMBER**

## COVER SHEET

(This sheet must be attached to external peer review reports)

The cover sheet and the External Peer Review Team Reports will be made available to the academic promotion committee that considers the applications for the corresponding promotion round. ***This cover sheet will not be returned to the applicant.***

### **Applicant**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Review ID for anonymity: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

University: \_\_\_\_\_

### **External Peer Review Team**

#### **Learning and Teaching Peer Reviewer**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Status: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

University: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Discipline Specific Peer Reviewer**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Status: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

University: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## REPORT BY EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW TEAM MEMBER

Learning and teaching reviewer

Discipline reviewer

### **Applicant**

---

Peer Review ID:

---

Faculty:

School:

---

University:

---

This report is intended to provide an academic promotion committee with a source of expert advice on the quality of the outcomes from an applicant's learning and teaching activities, based on conclusions drawn from a careful analysis of the evidence provided in an applicant's application for promotion.

The report does NOT include a recommendation that s/he should/should not be promoted.

The External Peer Review Team members, while adhering to the External Peer Review of Teaching processes and protocols outlined, should not feel constrained or restricted in their comments as they relate to the documentation presented for review. The following dimensions of learning and teaching activities would be appropriate for the teaching component of a promotion application. Since applicants will come from a variety of disciplines, the external review team will take into account the different formats that evidence may take in relation to different educational contexts.

1. Alignment of teaching practices with teaching philosophy
2. Effectiveness of teaching activity as evidenced through student engagement and outcomes
3. Effectiveness of curriculum and assessment design and development
4. Evidence of command of content in the discipline or field
5. Development of teaching based on feedback from sources such as students, peers, profession and/or community
6. Scholarly approach to learning and teaching; scholarly outcomes from research on learning and teaching
7. Effectiveness of leadership in learning and teaching
8. Recognition of contribution to learning and teaching
9. Other areas relevant to institutional priorities

**A. General comments**

Dimensions of learning and teaching activity:	Quantity and quality of evidence			
<p><b>1. Alignment of teaching practices with teaching philosophy</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	<p>No apparent alignment</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Some alignment</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Clear alignment</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Extensive alignment</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>2. Effectiveness of teaching activity as evidenced through student engagement and outcomes</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	<p>No apparent examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Some examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Many examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Extensive examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>3. Effectiveness of curriculum and assessment design and development</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	<p>No apparent examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Some examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Many examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Extensive examples</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>4. Evidence of command of content in the discipline or field</b></p> <p>Comments on quality of evidence presented:</p>	<p>No apparent evidence</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Some evidence</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Clear evidence</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Extensive evidence</p> <input type="checkbox"/>



Dimensions of learning and teaching activity:	Quantity and quality of evidence			
<p><b>5. Development of teaching based on feedback from sources such as students, peers, profession and/or community</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	No apparent examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Some examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Many examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive range of examples <input type="checkbox"/>
	Use of feedback not clear <input type="checkbox"/>	Use of feedback satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	Use of feedback good <input type="checkbox"/>	Use of feedback exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>6. Scholarly approach to learning and teaching; scholarly outcomes from research on learning and teaching</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	No apparent examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Some examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Many examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive examples <input type="checkbox"/>
	Quality not clear <input type="checkbox"/>	Quality satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/>	Quality good <input type="checkbox"/>	Quality exceptional <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>7. Effectiveness of leadership in learning and teaching</b></p> <p>Your examples and comments:</p>	No apparent examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Some examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Many examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive examples <input type="checkbox"/>
	Effectiveness not clear <input type="checkbox"/>	Effective <input type="checkbox"/>	Very effective <input type="checkbox"/>	Exceptionally effective <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>8. Recognition of contribution to learning and teaching</b></p> <p>Comments on prestige of examples:</p>	No apparent examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Some examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Many examples <input type="checkbox"/>	Extensive examples <input type="checkbox"/>

**Dimensions of learning and teaching activity:**

**9. Other areas relevant to institutional priorities**

Your examples and comments:

**B. Your summary of the quantity and quality of evidence and outcomes presented in applicant's documentation**

---

---

## Appendix P: Sample Outline for Summative Peer Review Report

### OUTLINE FOR SUMMATIVE PEER REVIEW-OF-TEACHING REPORT

Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah

Retrieved from <http://facultycenter.byu.edu/peer-review-teaching-0?destination=node%2F564>

#### Suggestions:

- Use the section headings of the review forms as the outline for the peer review report.
- Follow the expectations agreed upon in the department. Avoid interjecting personal “pet theories” of teaching or using one’s personal teaching practices as the department standard.
- Focus on the effectiveness of the course design and classroom teaching in *promoting student learning*.
- Be familiar with the statement of university expectations in [Section 3.3.2C of the University Rank and Status Policy](#).
- Support evaluative statements with specific evidence, rationale, and examples.
- Include both positive and negative comments.
- It is very helpful to use some type of peer review form. The department chair can determine whether to attach these forms or report numeric averages from the forms.

#### I. Introduction (Peer Review Process)

- Who was involved?
- When did the review take place?
- What was evaluated?
- Course materials reviewed
- Classes observed
- What agreed-upon department evaluation criteria/standards were used?

#### II. Review of Course Design

- Course Content
- Teaching Materials
- Learning Goals
- Learning Activities
- Learning Assessments

#### III. Review of Classroom Instruction

- Organization
- Instructional Strategies
- Presentation Skills
- Content Knowledge
- Rapport with Students
- Clarity

#### IV. Conclusion (Overall Assessment)

- Summarize positive and negative assessments
- Express overall professional judgment
- How much are students learning from this teacher?
- How effective is this teacher in promoting student learning?
- What is the likelihood that this teacher will continue to improve?
- Possibly comment on patterns or trends observed in peer review results

---

<sup>1</sup> Senate Committee on Curricular Affairs (2001). A clarification of 'active learning' as it applies to general education (Legislative). Located at <http://senate.psu.edu/scca/curricular%20affairs%20reports/2-01%20CA%20RPT%202.pdf>