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## **Introduction**

## **Overview**

Full- and part-time Temporary Faculty are encouraged to review the Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the California Faculty Association (CFA) and the California State University (CSU), and the Cal Poly Pomona (CPP) University Academic Manual (UM) policies and procedures related to their appointment and periodic evaluation, all of which can be found on the Cal Poly Pomona Faculty Affairs website and at the links below:

* CPP Office of Faculty Affairs - <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/index.shtml>
* Lecturer Periodic Evaluation

 <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/temporary-faculty/periodic-evaluation.shtml>

* CPP Academic Manual - referred to in this document as University Manual (UM)

<https://www.cpp.edu/academic-manual/>

* CSU – CFA Unit 3 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)

[https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx](https://www.calstate.edu/csu-system/faculty-staff/labor-and-employee%20relations/Pages/unit3-cfa.aspx)

Article 15 of the CBA and Policy 1336 of the UM cover the evaluation of lecturer faculty. The CBA is the controlling document in the event of discrepancies or ambiguities that might surface in the language of the evaluation procedures and criteria outlined below, and the UM takes precedence over this document.

Throughout this document, the Plant Science Department is referred to as the “department”, and temporary faculty are referred to as “lecturers”. “One academic year” refers to fall and spring semesters, e.g., fall 2023 plus spring 2024. All references to specific numbered “sections” and appendices refer to this document.

## **Department Philosophy**

The department strives to develop a collegial environment where all faculty (lecturer and tenure-track) and staff play an active role in being thoughtful and respectful with each other, and supportive of student success. We value teaching excellence. Lecturer faculty bring a wealth of professional/industry/community experience, backed by academic credentials, to enhance the depth and disciplinary diversity of the department. We affirm that faculty teaching and professional development will have the greatest impacts on student success and faculty well-being when department members from all backgrounds commit to advancing diversity, equity, inclusion, accessibility, and belonging.

The following review and evaluation procedures apply to all lecturers in the department. The goal is to provide our students with the best instruction possible. The objective of this document is to communicate the process by which lecturers are reviewed and evaluated.

Periodic evaluation of lecturer faculty members is an important faculty responsibility. The evaluation process is the mechanism by which we ensure quality of instruction, promote the professional development of lecturers, and thereby assure educational quality that meets department program learning outcomes for our students. It is the department faculty who are in the best position to provide clear expectations, create an environment conducive to achieving expectations, and apply a fair and consistent procedure when making decisions regarding one-year and three-year appointments.

## **Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee**

* 1. The Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee (TFEC) will be elected by the probationary and tenured faculty of the department during fall semester. Only tenured faculty members may serve on the committee. There shall be a minimum of two (2) tenured faculty members on the TFEC. A chair shall be selected by the members of the committee after its establishment. (CBA 15.2, UM Policy 1336).
	2. Duties of the TFEC are to:
* Assign tenure-track/tenured faculty members to conduct peer classroom observations who will arrange for a mutually convenient class meeting with lecturer faculty to conduct the review.
* Evaluate materials provided by the lecturer as specified in Section 5.
* Complete a written TFEC evaluation using a standard university form.
* Meet with lecturers to discuss evaluations.
* Forward the final, signed evaluation to the department chair (if the department chair is not serving on the Evaluation Committee).

## **General Evaluation Procedures**

* 1. The department shall develop a Criteria Document approved by a majority vote of the probationary tenure-track and tenured full-time faculty and reviewed for feedback by the Dean/Director every five years.
	2. All lecturers shall be evaluated by the department TFEC with a specified frequency (Section 4).
	3. Evaluations shall be based on specific criteria (Section 5).
	4. Evaluations shall be conducted according to a clearly defined timeline, with evaluations typically occurring in spring semester (Section 8).
	5. The evaluation shall include all courses taught since the last evaluation. The first evaluation of a lecturer shall include all courses taught as a lecturer in the department.
	6. At each level of the evaluation, lecturers shall have an opportunity to read and discuss the evaluation with the TFEC or other administrators and to submit a response or rebuttal that shall accompany the evaluation.
	7. The TFEC and the department chair (if not serving on the evaluation committee), write an evaluation report with constructive feedback and a copy of the report shall be placed in the lecturer faculty member’s Personnel Action File (PAF) located in the Dean’s office.
	8. Results of evaluations will be used in making decisions regarding one-year and three-year appointments (CBA 12.3 and 12.12).
	9. In addition to academic background and teaching experience, results of evaluations will be used to determine if a lecturer is qualified to teach a specific course (CBA 12.29).
	10. Results of evaluations may be used in decisions to recommend or deny a range elevation (CBA 12.16 to 12.20).

## **Frequency of Evaluation**

* 1. Lecturers appointed for one semester will be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department. The lecturer may also request that an evaluation be performed (CBA 15.25).
	2. Any lecturer who does not have a 3-year entitlement, and who has taught at CPP for two semesters (even if non-consecutive), must receive an annual evaluation. Lecturers in this group who teach periodically must receive an annual evaluation for those calendar years when they teach (CBA 12.12 and UM Policy 1336).
	3. Following two (2) semesters of consecutive employment within an academic year, a lecturer offered appointment to a similar assignment in the same department or equivalent unit at the same campus shall receive a one-year entitlementwith a time base equal to or greater than the time base in the prior academic year. (CBA 12.3, CBA Appendix F).
	4. After five (5) years of consecutive employment with at least one semester in each academic year, a lecturer, who is rehired for a sixth year, must receive a cumulative periodic evaluation in the spring of the sixth year. In this evaluation the lecturer will be evaluated for their first three-year entitlement based on the entire prior six academic years of service. This evaluation will include materials from the 6th year (e.g., 2023-2024 to 2028-2029). The Dean of the College shall determine whether the lecturer faculty has performed satisfactorily before an initial 3-year appointment may be issued. (CBA 12.12, 15.28., 15.29, UM Policy 1336).
	5. Lecturers with a 3-year entitlement must be evaluated at least once during the term of their appointment, typically the spring of their 3rd academic year appointment (CBA 15.26, UM Policy 1336). The period of cumulative evaluation is based on the academic years of service (e.g., 2023-20204 to 2025-2026). The Dean of the College shall determine whether the lecturer faculty has performed satisfactorily before the lecturer is reappointed to a subsequent three-year appointment. (CBA 12.13, 15.29, UM Policy 1336).

		1. Lecturers on three-year appointments may be evaluated during the first and/or second years of their appointment (in addition to the third appointment year evaluations), at the discretion of the department chair, the appropriate administrator, or the department.

4.7. Lecturers may request an evaluation at any time (CBA 15.25, UM Policy 1336).

## **Evaluation Criteria**

* 1. **One-year periodic evaluations** (Sections 4.1 – 4.3). The following items are to be submitted by the lecturer electronically on Interfolio:
1. An updated Curriculum Vitae.
2. A self-assessment narrative including a teaching philosophy statement, not to exceed two (2) pages. The narrative should respond to peer reviewer comments from classroom observations, pedagogical improvements, and any relevant professional development activities during the evaluation period. Recommendations for improvement from past reviews need to be addressed, if applicable.
3. All student evaluation of teaching reports provided to lecturers by the university for every section of every course taught during the period of evaluation, as defined in UM Policy 1329.
4. Statistical summaries, interpretation, and discussion of student evaluation of teaching scores relative to the minimum score standards set by the department (Section 5.7) for all courses taught during the period of evaluation, including proposed actions for improvement when scores do not meet the minimum departmental standard.
5. All peer classroom observation reports during the evaluation period.
6. Any responses to written student and faculty input, as defined by UM Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period. The department recognizes that lecturers have little control over signed student and faculty input. It is recognized that lecturers with an exceptional teaching record may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the Evaluation Committee.
7. For the period of evaluation, lecturers may choose to provide course materials to the Evaluation Committee. These documents may include syllabi, lecture outlines, PowerPoint decks, Learning Management System (e.g., Canvas) exercises, writing assignments, grading rubrics, quizzes, and exams that clearly demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to teaching excellence. The Evaluation Committee may also request that these materials be submitted by the lecturer.
	1. **Cumulative periodic evaluations** (Section 4.4 and 4.5).The cumulative periodic evaluation is comprised of the following items, to be submitted electronically by the lecturer on Interfolio:
8. An updated Curriculum Vitae.
9. A self-assessment narrative including a teaching philosophy statement, not to exceed four (4) pages. The narrative should address pedagogical improvements undertaken, including mention of any relevant professional development activities during the qualifying period. The lecturer shall highlight their accomplishments and areas of improvement during the preceding six or three years as well as remaining challenges and specific goals for continued professional development. Recommendations for improvement from past reviews need to be addressed, as applicable.
10. All student evaluation of teaching reports provided to lecturers by the university for every section of every course taught during the period of evaluation, as defined in UM Policy 1329.
11. Statistical summaries, interpretation, and discussion of student evaluation of teaching scores relative to the minimum score standards set by the department (Section 5.7) for all courses taught during the period of evaluation, including proposed actions for improvement when scores do not meet the minimum departmental standard.
12. All peer classroom observation reports during the evaluation period.
13. Any responses to written student and faculty input, as defined by UM Policy No. 1329, received by the department during the evaluation period: The department recognizes that lecturers have little control over signed student and faculty input. It is recognized that lecturers with an exceptional teaching record may receive no student or faculty input. Although there is no requirement for signed student and faculty input, such additional evidence of teaching performance may be considered by the TFEC.
14. For the period of evaluation, lecturers may choose to provide course materials to the Evaluation Committee. These documents may include syllabi, lecture outlines, PowerPoint decks, Learning Management System (e.g., Canvas) exercises, writing assignments, grading rubrics, quizzes, and exams that clearly demonstrate effectiveness in teaching and a commitment to teaching excellence. The Evaluation Committee may also request that these materials be submitted by the lecturer.
	1. **Assessment of teaching philosophy statement:**
		1. Has the lecturer faculty member thoughtfully reflected upon their approach in the classroom to teaching Cal Poly Pomona students?
		2. Has the lecturer faculty member provided evidence of having sought and completed additional training in classroom techniques through programs offered by the Center for Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ) or other programs?
	2. **Assessment of teaching-related materials:**
		1. Is the syllabus consistent with the department’s expanded course outline for this course?
		2. Is the syllabus clear and unambiguous about course learning objectives, expectations and assignments, classroom policies, and grading policy?
		3. Does the syllabus contain all information required by university and department policy? (UM Policy 1200).
		4. Are the syllabi and instructional materials accessible to all users, and delivered in a manner that is equally effective for individuals with disabilities as without disabilities. (See CPP Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence (CAFÉ) -Creating Accessible Courses).
		5. Are the exams and assignments thoughtfully conceived and intellectually challenging?
		6. Are the exams and graded assignments consistent with the course learning objectives?
		7. Do the materials used (textbooks, video, articles, Internet, etc.) represent the best and current resources available?
	3. **In-class peer evaluation of teaching performance:**
		1. Is the lecturer faculty member knowledgeable and current in the course’s subject matter?
		2. Does the lecturer make efficient and effective use of class time?
		3. Is the lecturer organized in presenting course materials (e.g., organization of lectures, activities, etc.)?
		4. Does the lecturer challenge students at a level appropriate to the class (lower division, upper division, graduate levels) and course expanded course outlines?
		5. Does the lecturer encourage class participation?
		6. Does the lecturer encourage and respect diverse points of view?
		7. Is the lecturer faculty responsive to student questions?
		8. Does the lecturer treat all students with respect and dignity?
	4. **Office Hours:**
		1. Does the lecturer provide reasonable convenient office hours for students (e.g., before or after class; during normal business hours unless teaching only evening classes, etc.).
		2. Does the lecturer keep their required office hours or make alternative office hours if regular office hours can’t be kept? (UM Policy 1394, Faculty Office Hours Policy).

* 1. **Assessment of student evaluations of teaching:**
		1. Departmental evaluation of student assessment results shall be based on all questions on the standard departmental instructional assessment form (Appendix A).
		2. The TFEC will evaluate student evaluation of teaching scores thematically by question and overall, for each class included in the evaluation period (Appendix A).
		3. The department considers a mean score of 3.25 (Likert scale: 1, worst to 5, best) on all individual questions to be the minimum satisfactory standard.
		4. A lecturer faculty shall receive satisfactory student evaluations of teaching whenever the average of all questions for the course is above 4.0 on the scale currently in use where 5.0 is the “best” score and 1.0 is the “worst” score.
		5. Evidence of mitigating circumstances that may compensate for student assessment scores below the minimum standard (below 3.25 on any individual question(s); below 4.0 average of all questions for the course):
1. Student assessment scores clearly improved during the evaluation period and/or over years prior to the evaluation period, if applicable.
2. Student assessment scores were below the minimum standard in only one course, and at least two other courses had scores above the minimum standard.
3. Student assessment scores were below the minimum standard only in courses taught for the first time by the lecturer, and at least two other courses had scores above the minimum standard.
	1. Other signed written communications provided by students that are included in the lecturer’s Personnel Action File shall be considered in the evaluation process and may provide supporting evidence for satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance (CBA 15.17b).
	2. Does the lecturer adhere to the department policy regarding cancelation of a class lecture, lab, or activity meeting?

	Lecturer faculty may only cancel a class meeting in the event of lecturer illness, inclement weather as announced by the university to affect instruction, or unforeseen extenuating circumstance beyond the lecturer’s control). In all cases, when a lecturer communicates to students that a class meeting is canceled, the lecturer must first inform the department chair and administrative support coordinator along with plan for make-up coverage of the material. Medical or other documentation for lecturer cancellation of class meeting may be requested by the department.

## **Instructional Assessment by Students**

(CBA 15.15 – 15.17, CPP UM Policy 1329).

* 1. Student evaluations of teaching are required for every section of every lecture and laboratory course taught during the evaluation period.
	2. Following each term, a summary of the evaluations will be returned by email to all instructors from Cal Poly Pomona Office of Faculty Affairs/Office of Institutional Research, Planning & Analytics. A copy will be placed in the lecturer’s personnel action file (PAF), and a copy retained in the department office.
	3. Student evaluation of teaching is not required for supervisory and internship courses.
	4. Any signed written communications provided to the department by students outside of the regular course evaluation will be placed in the lecturer’s personnel action file (PAF) to be considered in the evaluation process and may provide supporting evidence for satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance (CBA 15.17b).
	5. CPP Academic Manual, Policy No 1329 shall govern all student assessment procedures.

## **Peer Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness**

## Peer observation of teaching effectiveness by tenure-track faculty in the department shall be conducted at the frequencies specified in Section 7.3. A lecturer may request additional peer classroom/online course observations.

* 1. The individual lecturer being evaluated shall be provided notice of at least five (5) days that a face-to-face mode classroom visit, online mode observation, and review of online Learning Management System (e.g., Canvas) content is to take place. Lecturers and the TFEC are jointly responsible to ensure that the required classroom observations are conducted at the appropriate frequency regarding the classes to be visited and the scheduling of such visits. (CBA 15.14).
	2. Frequency of Classroom Observations:
		1. Lecturers who are eligible for a one-year appointment and have taught at least 6 wtus during the current annual year shall have at least one classroom observation during the evaluation period. The classroom or online observation shall be conducted in a lecture course whenever possible.
		2. Lecturers who are eligible for a three-year appointment and have taught at least 6 wtus during the current academic year shall have at least two classroom observations, with at least one during one of the two semesters preceding the evaluation. The classroom observation shall be conducted in a lecture course whenever possible.
	3. The TFEC shall identify tenure-track faculty members to conduct the classroom observations. Faculty participating in the Faculty Early Retirement Program (FERP) can only participate in the evaluation process if it is requested by the department and approved by the University President.
	4. The individual conducting the classroom observation will then confer with the lecturer to determine an appropriate date and time with at least five (5)-day notice given before the classroom observation (CBA 15.14).
	5. The lecturer being observed shall provide to the peer observer access to the online Learning Management System course page (e.g., Canvas), the course syllabus, and any lecture notes, outlines, or other materials available to students for that lecture.
	6. A written report shall be submitted by the peer observer to the lecturer peer within 21 calendar days of the peer observation. The report shall be written on the department approved Peer Evaluation of Classroom Teaching form posted on Office of Faculty Affairs website. The report shall address all observations of teaching performance (Sections 5.5 – 5.7) and must include an evaluation of the course syllabus to confirm compliance with University Course Syllabus Policy UM 1200.
	7. The lecturer faculty member will have ten (10) calendar days to sign the peer evaluation of teaching report or submit a response or rebuttal to the peer teaching evaluation report and return the document to the tenure-track peer observer who will submit the completed report to the TFEC chair.
	8. At the same time the peer observation report is submitted to the TFEC chair, a copy of the report shall be sent to the lecturer and another copy shall be placed in the lecturer’s personnel action file (PAF).

## **Timeline of Evaluation Process**

* 1. Evaluations will normally be conducted during the spring semester. Lecturers on one-year appointments and on three-year appointments follow different timelines. Lecturers in their sixth year of one-year appointments should follow the timeline for three-year appointments. Lecturers on three-year appointments but being evaluated prior to their final (third) year at the request of the department or other administrators shall follow the timeline of the one-year appointments. (CPP Office of Faculty Affairs Lecturer Periodic Evaluation, Temporary Faculty Evaluation Calendar <https://www.cpp.edu/faculty-affairs/temporary-faculty/periodic-evaluation.shtml>).
	2. The timeline for evaluations will be based on university guidelines posted on the Office of Faculty Affairs website. Generally:

		1. Fall Semester. Evaluation criteria and procedures shall be made available to the lecturer faculty no later than 14 days after the first day of the academic term.
		2. Fall and Spring semesters. The TFEC and lecturers shall work together to schedule classroom observations to satisfy the required frequency of peer reviews, as outlined in Section 7.
		3. ~Second week of the spring semester. The TFEC chair notifies active lecturers who have taught at least two semesters in the department, including the ongoing semester, that they will be evaluated and will need to submit evaluation materials to Interfolio, as described in Sections 5.1 – 5.2.
		4. ~Third week of Spring semester. The TFEC chair posts written announcements, in prominent places in the department containing the names of lecturers being considered for one-year and three-year appointments; the name of the TFEC chair to whom signed and dated comments or recommendations should be sent; and the deadline (date and time) for receipt of signed comments. The purpose of this announcement is to solicit input from students and tenure-track faculty.
		5. ~Sixth week of spring semester. Deadline for lecturers on one-year appointments to submit documents described in Sections 5.1. to Interfolio.
		6. ~Ninth week of spring semester. Deadline for TFEC to complete their evaluation and meet with each lecturer on one-year appointments to discuss their evaluation. Lecturers then have ten (10) calendar days to sign and/or submit a response or rebuttal to the TFEC report on Interfolio. Similar process follows for evaluation by the Department Chair (if not serving on the TFEC), due to the lecturer during the thirteenth week, and if necessary, by the Dean, due to the lecturer during the final week of the semester.
		7. ~Tenth week of spring semester. Deadline for lecturers on three-year appointments to submit documents as described in Section 5.2, on Interfolio.
		8. ~Fourteenth week of spring semester. Deadline for TFEC to complete their evaluation and meet with each lecturer on three-year appointment to discuss their evaluation. Lecturers then have ten (10) calendar days to submit a response or rebuttal to the TFEC report via Interfolio. Similar process follows for evaluations by the Department Chair (if not serving on the TFEC), due to the lecture during the final week of the semester, and by the Dean, due to the lecturer during early to mid-summer.

# **Appendix A: Instructional Assessment by Students**

## A.1. Course evaluations are distributed by the university (Institutional Research, Planning, and Analytics (IRPA)) to students enrolled in classes in the Fall and Spring Semesters. Course evaluations are online and IRPA provides administrative service to the colleges and department by supporting the course evaluation process and summarization of evaluation results. IRPA adheres to the policies and course evaluation content that has been approved by the University and the Academic Senate (CPP Academic Manual, Policy No 1329).

A.2. Student Evaluation of Teaching – Questionnaire (Section B.4.)

A.3. Course Evaluation Timeline:

A.3.1. Week 11: Faculty can see their courses to be evaluated in Blue (university online course evaluation product, <https://www.cpp.edu/data/course-evaluations.shtml>). Faculty also have the option to specify their evaluation dates within the default two-week period.

A.3.2. Week 12: Online course evaluations are created, and student reminders are setup by IRPA.

A.3.3. Weeks 13-14: Evaluations open. Evaluations are sent to students via email. Students can also access their evaluations through the Canvas LMS.

A.3.4. Weeks 13-14: Lecturers monitor their response rates and apply best practices for increasing their rates. Students should be reminded that their evaluation responses are anonymous, and the instructor will not be given the results of the assessment until after grades are turned in. Under no circumstances may the instructor influence or imply that students respond in a particular way to course evaluations.

A.3.5. After the grade submission deadline: Individual reports are created and distributed to instructors. Department chair and administrative support coordinator(s) can also access the results.

 A.4. **Student Evaluation of Teaching** – List of questions utilized in the online instructional assessment by students:

**Response Scale:**

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.

“Not Applicable” is its own separate category and is not grouped together with the Likert scale items 1-5. Students have the option to select “Not Applicable” for every question. If students select “Not Applicable” or leave the question blank, it will be excluded in the calculations for averages and overall scores.



**Questions:**

1. I understood what knowledge and/or skills I was expected to master in order to succeed in this course.

2. To me, course content seemed well organized in Canvas, and other class platforms (If applicable).

3. To me, synchronous class sessions seemed well organized. (If applicable)

4. To me, asynchronous class sessions seemed well organized. (If applicable)

5. The time I spent on class activities contributed positively to my understanding of the course material.

6. I felt welcome to seek help and advice from the instructor.

7. I gained awareness of the relevance and importance of the course material.

8. I found course materials, activities, and assignments contributed to learning success.

9. The grading criteria for this class was clear to me.

10. The class atmosphere supported my learning.

Please rate the next items only if you have first-hand experience from making contact with your instructor for help:

11. When I sought help from the instructor (by phone, e-mail, or synchronous office hours), I received it.

12. The help I received from the instructor was useful to my learning.

# **Appendix B: Peer Observation of Teaching Procedures**

Plant Science Peer Observation of Teaching Protocol

*Adapted by Cal Poly Pomona Plant Science Department Temporary Faculty Evaluation Committee from Victoria Bhavsar, Center for the Advancement of Faculty Excellence. August 2020.*

Appendix B specifically address each step in the process.

# Steps in the Peer Observation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Steps | Instructions |
| 1. Pre-observation documentation
 | Completed by the Instructor. Sets the context and teaching philosophy. |
| 1. Pre-meeting
 | Meeting between the Peer-observer and Instructor to clarify pre-review materials and arrange for access to the course. Discuss “Plan B” for tech failure. |
| 1. Observation of course
 | Completed by the Peer-observer. Use the instrument adopted by the department. |
| 1. Complete report
 | Completed by the Peer-observer using data gathered in Steps 1-3.  |

# Citations

* Aduviri, C., et al. 2018. Peer-Review of Online Teaching Guidelines. Oregon State University. <https://senate.oregonstate.edu/sites/senate.oregonstate.edu/files/peer_review_observation_formrev.pdf>.
* Chickering, A., and Z. Gamson. 1987. Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. AAHE Bulletin March 1987, pg. 2-3. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED282491.pdf>.
* Office of Instruction & Assessment. 2014. Peer Review of Online Teaching Guidelines for Instructor to be Reviewed (Reviewee). University of Arizona.
* Quality Matters. 2018. Course Design Rubric Standards 6th ed. <https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric>.
* Rainville, K.N., D.G. Title, and C.G. Desrochers. 2023. Faculty Peer Coaching in Higher Education – Partnerships to Support Improved Instructional Practices. Information Age Publishing <https://www.infoagepub.com/products/Faculty-Peer-Coaching-in-Higher-Education>
* Taylor, A.H. 2017. A Peer Review Guide for Online Courses at Penn State. <https://facdev.e-education.psu.edu/sites/default/files/PeerReview_OnlineCourses_PSU_Guide_13June2017.pdf> and <https://facdev.e-education.psu.edu/evaluate-revise/peerreviewonline>.

Step 1. Pre-Observation Documentation

# General Instructions:

The Pre-Observation sets context and allows the peer observer access to the course. The instructor completes the pre-observation documentation and discusses it with the peer observer in Step 2, the pre-meeting. **Attach a copy of the course syllabus to this document.**

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

Peer Observer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Instruction Mode: (face-to-face, asynchronous, other\*) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\* <https://www.cpp.edu/studentsuccess/guides/instruction-modes.shtml>

# Steps in the Peer Observation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Steps | Instructions |
| 1. Pre-observation documentation
 | To be completed by the instructor. Sets the context and teaching philosophy. |
| 1. Pre-meeting
 | Meeting between the Peer-observer and Instructor to clarify pre-observation materials and arrange for access to the course. Discuss Plan B for tech failure. |
| 1. Observation of course
 | Completed by the Peer-observer. Use the instrument adopted by the department. |
| 1. Complete report
 | Completed by the Peer-observer using data gathered in Steps 1-3.  |

# Logistical information:

## Module or Section for Observation:

Identify which course module or section will be observed in the classroom or online, and on Canvas. For face-to-face or synchronous instruction modes, designate the class meeting or meetings to be visited.

## External Technology Tools:

Identify any external technology tool(s) used in the course outside of Canvas that the peer observer should see.

## Peer Observer Access to Canvas:

For Canvas, the instructor shall manually add the observer to the course as a Teaching Assistant. If other technologies in addition to Canvas are used (e.g., course materials on OneDrive), the instructor can describe how the observer will get access.

## Purpose of Observation: Identify the purpose and goals for the observation.

* Is this observation for annual or cumulative lecturer evaluation, or some other purpose?
* Why did you choose this particular course to be assessed?

# Course Overview:

## Course data:

* Major course
* General Education
* Elective
* Pre-requisite (if yes, to what course(s), if known \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ )
* Other (specify)
* Is this course part of a sequence?
* Number of students:
* How many times have you taught the course?

## Instructor’s Role(s) in Course Development:

What is the extent of your contribution to the development of this course? Are there aspects of the course content that you cannot change, such as specific learning outcomes, a mandated course text, common exams, a required assignment, etc.?

## Other:

Is there any additional information about the course itself that would aid the observer in completion of the observation?

# Teaching Narrative

The instructor should provide some written thoughts OR include a conversation in the pre-observation meeting to discuss their teaching philosophy and strategies.

## Teaching Philosophy:

Briefly describe how your approach to teaching this course embodies your teaching philosophy.

## Creating Community

Explain steps you take to foster a learning environment that is supportive, inclusive, and motivates students to learn. Describe how you encourage student-to-student interaction in course assignments and other learning activities. Discuss how you communicate your expectations for participation and collaboration.

## Motivating Students:

Explain strategies you use to encourage students to take responsibility for their learning. Describe your approach to delivering timely and appropriate constructive feedback.

## Communication and Responsiveness:

Describe ways in which you model positive and clear communication. Discuss your approach to responding to student concerns and course-related issues.

## Scaffolding\* Content:

Describe how you scaffold content to meet learning outcomes. Please provide a specific example.
\*<https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/sca/cresource/q1/p01/#:~:text=Instructional%20scaffolding%20is%20a%20process,they%20are%20learning%20new%20skills>.

## Ongoing Reflection and Improvement:

Explain how you evaluate the effectiveness of your course and your strategy for updating and refining course content and assignments. Describe ways in which you seek out student feedback to improve your course.

# Other

Is there any other information the instructor wishes to provide to the peer observer?

Step 2. Pre-Observation Meeting Guidelines

# General Instructions:

The instructor and peer-observer should meet in person or synchronously online before the observation begins. This is an opportunity for the peer- observer to ask for clarification on anything the instructor provided in the Pre-Observation Worksheet. The peer-observer should ask questions if clarification or information is needed during the process.

# Steps in the Peer Observation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Steps | Instructions |
| 1. Pre-observation documentation
 | Completed by the Instructor. Sets the context and teaching philosophy. |
| 1. Pre-meeting
 | Meeting between the Peer-observer and Instructor to clarify pre-review materials and arrange for access to the course. Discuss Plan B for tech failure. |
| 1. Observation of course
 | Completed by the Peer-observer. Use the instrument adopted by the department. |
| 1. Complete report
 | Completed by the Peer-observer using data gathered in Steps 1-3.  |

Step 3. Observation of Canvas Course Site, Module or Lesson, and Synchronous Meeting

# General Instructions

When using the department approved Peer Observation of Teaching rubric (Appendix C), the peer observer must make sure to indicate where evidence is located for each item on the rubric criteria. For example, if marking that course learning outcomes are clearly specified to an exemplary degree, make a note of where the course learning outcomes are located in the course (syllabus, home page, etc.).

 The department approved rubric is based on Quality Matters. (<https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric>)

If the course is fully asynchronous, the observer should mark rubric items for synchronous courses or face-to-face meetings as not applicable.

# Steps in the Peer Observation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Steps | Instructions |
| 1. Pre-observation documentation
 | Completed by the Instructor. Sets the context and teaching philosophy. |
| 1. Pre-meeting
 | Meeting between the Peer-observer and Instructor to clarify pre-review materials and arrange for access to the course. Discuss Plan B for tech failure. |
| 1. Observation of course
 | Completed by the Peer-observer. Use the instrument adopted by the department. |
| 1. Complete report
 | Completed by the Peer-observer using data gathered in Steps 1-3.  |

Step 4. Peer-Observation of Teaching Report Guidelines

# General Instructions

In this final step, the peer observer provides a report for the instructor’s personnel action file (PAF). Some departments may ask for a letter or other narrative; some departments may simply include summarizing questions as part of their observation instrument. The sample summary questions and sample narrative structure provided below are intended only as models and are not proscriptive.

# Steps in the Peer Observation Process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Steps | Instructions |
| 1. Pre-observation documentation
 | Completed by the Instructor. Sets the context and teaching philosophy. |
| 1. Pre-meeting
 | Meeting between the Peer-observer and Instructor to clarify pre-review materials and arrange for access to the course. Discuss Plan B for tech failure. |
| 1. Observation of course
 | Completed by the Peer-observer. Use the instrument adopted by the department. |
| 1. Complete report
 | Completed by the Peer-observer using data gathered in Steps 1-3.  |

# Sample Summary Questions

* Provide any context you feel is necessary to understand the results of the course observation, e.g., this is a very large class, this is a capstone experience, etc.
* Summarize the strengths of this instructor in remote teaching, giving some specific examples.
* Summarize areas this instructor could improve upon, giving some specific examples.
* Summarize your overall assessment of this instructor’s effectiveness in remote teaching of this class. Describe or specify the evidence from your observation upon which you base this assessment.

# Suggested Narrative Structure

## Introductory paragraph

Include the class identifier, course title, number of students, format of the class

# **Appendix C: Peer Observation of Teaching Form**

**PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FORM**

This form is to be completed by the peer observer based on the class observation and date specified below. Lecturer faculty will have the required ten (10) calendar days to sign the peer evaluation of teaching report or submit a response or rebuttal and return the document to the tenure-track peer observer who will submit the completed report to the TFEC chair and department chair.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Date of Observer to Lecturer Pre-Observation meeting |  |
| Date of Class Observation |  |
| Peer Observer |  |
| Course Discipline Code (e.g., PLT), Course Number, Course Title  |  |

**Please write a brief non-evaluative description of the class you visited.**

1. Was it a large or small class, how many students were in attendance (for face-to-face or synchronous class observation)?
2. What methods were used to present the material (e.g., lecture, slides, dialogue between instructor and students, student peer-to-peer discussion, active learning exercise, etc.)?
3. How was the time apportioned for the scheduled class period?

**Review of Syllabus, Resources, Assignments, Course Design Approach**

Explanation of all marks in column “Baseline” and “Exemplary” is required. Use column provided and/or describe in mandatory reviewer comments section at the end of this table.

|  | **Baseline** | **Effective** | **Exemplary** | **Evidence/Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alignment** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Course learning outcomes:*** |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly specified |  |  |  |  |
| Appropriate to level of course |  |  |  |  |
| Measurable or demonstrable |  |  |  |  |
| ***Module, unit, or lesson learning outcomes:*** |  |  |  |  |
| Clearly specified |  |  |  |  |
| Aligned with course learning outcomes |  |  |  |  |
| Measurable or demonstrable |  |  |  |  |
| ***Assessment activities (graded work, exams)*** |  |  |  |  |
| Assessments clearly measure learning outcomes and build on learning activities |  |  |  |  |
| Grading system and scale are clear, reasonable, consistent with general departmental practices. |  |  |  |  |
| **Organization** |  |  |  |  |
| Navigation throughout course is logical, consistent, and efficient. |  |  |  |  |
| The relationship between synchronous and asynchronous work is clear (if applicable). |  |  |  |  |
| Syllabus complies with university and department syllabus policies. |  |  |  |  |
| **Engagement** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Student-content engagement*** |  |  |  |  |
| A variety of course activities that support course and module/unit/lesson learning objectives are offered. |  |  |  |  |
| Opportunity for information gathering, synthesis, analysis, problem-solving  |  |  |  |  |
| Active and varied use of forms of written and oral communication. |  |  |  |  |
| Opportunity for information gathering, synthesis, analysis, problem-solving  |  |  |  |  |

Reviewer comments on above (mandatory)

Instructor Comments on above (optional):

**Review of Classroom, Synchronous, or Online Visit**
Explanation of all marks in column “Baseline” and “Exemplary” is required. Use column provided and/or describe in mandatory reviewer comments section at the end of this table.

|  | **Baseline** | **Effective** | **Exemplary** | **Notes/evidence** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** |  |  |  |  |
| Class Start (i.e., on time, overview of session w/ clearly stated goals. |  |  |  |  |
| Instructional Methods (i.e., lecture, discussion, small-group work) well suited for teaching the content covered. |  |  |  |  |
| Objectives/goals set for the session were met. |  |  |  |  |
| **Engagement** |  |  |  |  |
| ***Student-instructor contact*** |  |  |  |  |
| Instructor’s communication is respectful, welcoming, and supportive of students with diverse needs and concerns |  |  |  |  |
| Presentation techniques indicate subject matter knowledge. |  |  |  |  |
| Provide opportunities for student participation encourage engagement with the course content, instructor, and/or peers. |  |  |  |  |
| Provides clear explanations to student questions. |  |  |  |  |
| ***Asynchronous class sessions (if appropriate)*** |  |  |  |  |
| Activities are appropriate to the asynchronous format  |  |  |  |  |
| Online lecture videos have clear audio and visuals, are not too long |  |  |  |  |
| The session includes active learning such as discussion boards. |  |  |  |  |
| ***Integration of Technology (if applicable)*** |  |  |  |  |
| Technology is used to engage students, enhance learning, and/or enrich students’ class experience as part of lecture, activities, or discussion. |  |  |  |  |
| **Explicit equity-minded and inclusive practices** |  |  |  |  |
| Most course materials are accessible to students with disabilities, with equally effective access plans offered. |  |  |  |  |
| Course content and activities deliberately represent diverse voices and contributions from a wide array of perspectives |  |  |  |  |
| Language in the syllabus, assignments, student communication, course materials is welcoming, inclusive, and supportive.  |  |  |  |  |

Reviewer comments on above (mandatory)

Instructor Comments on above (optional):

Signature of Lecturer Observed: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature of Peer Faculty Observer: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Rubric: Based on Quality Matters

 (<https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards/higher-ed-rubric>