

BB Peer Review Teaching Guidelines

(Adopted 15 June 2021)

Purpose: In BB, we greatly value teaching and encourage interactions and collaborations among faculty and students to maximize our teaching effectiveness. Of particular value are colleagues, both within and outside of BB, who have knowledge of “scientific teaching” practices and can help bring them into our community. In this light, peer evaluation of teaching reviews should be positive, constructive, evaluative, and reflective experiences for the teaching faculty member, and should be conducted fairly and with a spirit of collegiality. The goals of peer evaluation of teaching are to:

1. assist in the improvement of teaching,
2. foster faculty collaboration for the purpose of maximizing teaching effectiveness, and
3. provide assessments for use in promotion and tenure evaluations.

Note: Peer reviews of teaching are not designed to evaluate the extent to which the current coverage of topics aligns with or meets expectations of the department for the course in question. That must be done separately by another mechanism.

Procedure: Peer reviews of teaching for junior faculty must be done at least once per year, and ideally once per year for each distinct course taught. Peer reviews may be done by individuals, but a collaborative review from a pair of faculty is preferred. Peer reviewers will be selected in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed. They will typically be BB faculty, but may be from outside the department.

- Peer reviewer(s) will review the syllabus for the course in question, the online course web portal established by the university (i.e. Canvas or equivalent), and observe one or two class sessions. The timing of the class observations will be arranged in advance between the evaluator and the instructor (or for Ecampus/remote courses make an equivalent assessment of relevant items such as recorded presentations, assignments and discussion boards).
- The peer reviewers may also introduce and, at the invitation of the instructor, carry out specific assessments or inventories that are designed to help faculty improve their pedagogy.
- The peer reviewer(s) will then write a summary report (typically one or two pages) based on the evaluated materials and the classroom visit(s).
- The report will be shared with and discussed with the faculty member reviewed and then it will be provided to the department head and/or P&T committee chair.

The report will address at least the following questions with consideration of the topics noted in the “**Factors to consider in evaluation**” document on the following page.

1. Does the course syllabus include clearly defined learning outcomes?
2. Are the learning resources adequate and supplied in varied formats?
3. Is the level/depth of coverage of the material appropriate for this course?
4. Describe the method(s) of instruction.
 - a. Was the presentation clear and well organized?
 - b. Is there evidence of students doing out of class work to aid learning?
 - c. Describe the form and extent of student participation during the class. Were students attentive and engaged?
 - d. Does the instructor stimulate/encourage questions from students, and what was the level of clarity and responsiveness to questions?
 - e. How was the classroom mechanics? (Did the instructor speak clearly? Did the instructor use the board and/or technology in ways facilitating understanding and taking notes? Did the instructor have any habits or behaviors likely to detract from learning?)
5. Describe the instructor’s content mastery, breadth, and depth.
6. What specific suggestions would improve this instructor’s teaching?

BB Peer Review Teaching Guidelines

(Adopted 15 June 2021)

Factors to consider in evaluation¹

Content

- Is content up-to-date? Are there areas that could be made more up-to-date?
- Does the content appropriately reinforce key concepts of the overall curriculum? Are there ways to provide opportunities to practice or apply them in new and different ways?
- How does content supplement the department curriculum in non-redundant, complementary ways?
- How appropriate is the breadth and depth of coverage of the content?

Outcomes

- Are the course learning outcomes sufficiently aligned with course content allowing for assessment tools to accurately gauge outcome successes?
- How does the instruction incorporate the appropriate concepts, information, and skills that will allow outcomes to be achieved?
- Are there opportunities for students to display creative thinking, initiative, self-directed research, and/or scholarship skills commensurate with their level of education?
- Are analytical skills taught and tested?
- How does the educator encourage students to think critically?

Assessment

- Are assessment tools clearly written and fairly graded?
- How are assessment standards made clear to the students?
- Does the educator engage students during classes in ways that encourage active learning, clarification, and comprehension of the information presented?
- How might assessment tools be modified to better achieve course and curriculum objectives?

Organization

- Is the syllabus/program outline current and relevant to the departmental curriculum goals?
- How are performance expectations made clear to the students?
- If appropriate, are due dates clearly defined?
- Are the lecture, laboratory, or other assignments/activities integrated at an appropriate level? Is the time devoted to each topic appropriate?
- For online courses, have materials been reviewed by Ecampus for “Best Practices” or Quality Matters?

¹ Adapted from The University of Missouri. 1992. Teaching Evaluation. And Seldin, P. 1985. Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco.