Guidelines for Peer Teaching Review (2/11/2022)

Department of Forest Ecosystems and Society[1]

Peer review of teaching committee:

Dawn Anzinger, Ashley D'Antonio, Paul Ries

Goals and Intent

- Peer teaching review has a role in both reviewing and improving teaching in the department. Peer reviews are required for promotion and tenure and can be useful as a consideration in compensation decisions (i.e., merit raises). Peer review improves teaching in the department by creating a collegial process for reviewing faculty teaching and department courses and for sharing teaching ideas, methods, current advances in course design and delivery.

- Peer teaching review is intended to be a positive, constructive experience for faculty members[2] being reviewed. It should be conducted fairly and with a spirit of collegiality.

- Peer teaching reviewers should recognize that a diversity of teaching approaches and styles can be employed in effective teaching.

- In situations where the faculty member is using learning materials or approaches that they did not develop themselves, to the extent possible, the peer review will focus primarily on instruction rather than on course content.

- Peer teaching review should not place an undue burden on faculty, both those being reviewed and those conducting the review.

- The department head may initiate peer or external review of teaching independent of this departmental policy.

---

[1] These guidelines and the attachments on the detailed review criteria draw from the previous iteration of FES Peer Review of Teaching guidelines (2016), the Quality Teaching Framework (OSU Faculty Senate, 2021) and Peer Review of Online Teaching Guidelines (OSU Faculty Senate, 2018).

[2] The word "faculty" refers to tenure/tenure-track faculty, Instructors, Senior Instructors, and others, as displayed on the FES website on "Teaching and Research Faculty."

Specific Objectives of Peer Teaching Review

- To foster interaction among FES faculty, encourage faculty to work collaboratively to assess teaching and assist in the improvement of teaching, and contribute to a culture of engaged and effective teaching within the FES Department.

- To review and provide feedback on faculty teaching, including teaching philosophy, course design (e.g., course content, learning outcomes, syllabus, organization, methods and materials for delivering instruction), methods of assessment of student performance, classroom presentation, and rapport with students.

- To provide insight into, and context for, results from other forms of review (e.g., student reviews).

- To provide a report (i.e., letter) from the peer teaching review committee that becomes part of the faculty member's personnel file, as well as the dossier for tenure and/or promotion.

Whose Teaching Should Be Peer Reviewed?

All FES faculty[1] with teaching in their position description should periodically experience peer teaching review.

Frequency of Review
Teaching faculty (individuals who teach 6+ credits per year) should generally experience two reviews within the first 6 years of employment and/or prior to the promotion and tenure process. A principal purpose of the first review is to identify areas of teaching that may need improvement. The second review is meant to ensure that recommended improvements are made. Thereafter, faculty should undergo peer review every five years. Faculty can request peer teaching reviews more frequently than described above.

Designation of Continuing Mentors

To ensure continuity across peer reviews, two FES faculty members will be appointed as a Continuing Peer Review Mentors to help facilitate the process for all peer reviews. Continuing Mentors will provide advice to the Committee Chair, answering questions about the review process and reviewing draft teaching review reports. Appointments will last two years and be staggered so that a new Continuing Mentor is appointed each year.

Selection of Peer Review Committee and Course(s) to Review

- The committee should be composed of two faculty members. It may be necessary to go outside the department for content expertise.

---

[1] For a list of FES teaching faculty, see the FES website "Teaching and Research Faculty."

- All FES faculty members (including Instructors and Senior Instructors) are expected to participate as a peer reviewer of teaching, as part of their service FTE allocation, to ensure that the workload is distributed evenly and undue burden is minimized.

- To the extent possible at least one committee member should have the expertise necessary to review course content. It may be desirable to seek additional input from outside the department, but this is not required.

- At least one committee member should have expertise and experience in the teaching modality (online, remote, mixed or on campus) being reviewed.

- One committee member will be designated by the Department Head as Chair. The Chair must be an FES faculty member. The Chair will be responsible for coordinating the review process and creating the first draft of the report (i.e., letter), with subsequent edits conducted in consultation with the other committee members.

- The Department Head will work with the faculty member being reviewed to identify acceptable peer review committee members.

- The Department Head will work with the faculty member being reviewed to select the course(s) to review. At least one course will be reviewed, but review of more courses may provide a more complete picture of the faculty member's teaching, especially if the faculty member teaches courses that differ in content and delivery. The faculty member may request a particular course(s) be reviewed; however, the onus is on the faculty member to plan ahead and initiate the peer review process with adequate lead time.

Protocol and Process for Peer Teaching Review

Peer teaching review will be based on assessment of: (a) the instructor worksheet, (b) materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed (self assessment, instructional materials, SLE results), (c) review of the faculty member's delivery of the course(s) and (d) student feedback.

 The protocol and process are outlined as follows:

1. *Introduction and Instructor Worksheet*
   - The committee chair contacts the faculty member being reviewed (hereafter, Instructor), introduces the names of the committee members, and shares the Instructor Worksheet (Appendix A).
   - Chair determines if the instructor would like to participate in a planning meeting with the committee.
   - Instructor a) completes the worksheet and b) adds committee members as Course Observers on the Learning Management System (LMS). (How to add an Observer to Canvas.)

2. *Review Planning*
   - Committee members review the instructor worksheet and correspond to determine how the peer review will be conducted, including a schedule for classroom visits for on-campus courses and/or a schedule for Ecampus course observation.

- The committee chair notifies the instructor of the classroom visit/course observation schedule in advance of the proposed visits.
- If the instructor requests a planning meeting, the committee will meet with the instructor to discuss plans for the review, logistics, and other concerns.

3. *Review Materials*

The instructor provides SLE survey results, a self-assessment, and instructional materials to the peer review committee. Ideally, these materials will be provided to the peer review committee at least two weeks before the planned classroom visit and/or online course observation.

- **SLE Results**
  Results of SLE surveys from the previous two offerings of the course will be provided. Only the quantitative summary of scores from the computerized student learning experience surveys may be used for teaching review. It is university policy that the written comments provided by students on SLE surveys may not be used in review of teaching and are only for feedback to the course instructor. Department Heads may not review the written comments intended for the course instructor, except in the case of signed comments, where the individual has waived their right to anonymity.

- **Self-assessment**
  The faculty member being reviewed will provide a narrative self-assessment covering their personal teaching philosophy and some reflection on how their own identity influences the learning environment. This self-assessment should include a description and explanation of:

  o recent efforts in maintaining current disciplinary practices and teaching development; including how these efforts have been implemented in the learning environment and any contributions to teaching development (e.g., leading workshops)

  o efforts to mitigate barriers to learners and to foster an inclusive sense of belonging and collaboration in the learning environment

  o efforts to foster learners' personal, professional, and academic growth in the learning environment, including encouragement for students to take responsibility for their own learning

  o ways in which positive and clear communication is modeled

  o perceived strengths and areas needing improvement

  o reflection on the effectiveness of each course and how that effectiveness is measured.

  o problems encountered by the faculty member that hamper effective teaching (e.g., learners lack of necessary quantitative skills, lack of TA support, problems interacting with students)

  o reflections on SLE scores from the previous two course offerings, as needed (including any perceived biases)

- **Instructional Materials**
  For each course reviewed, the following materials will be accessed on the LMS (Canvas) course site or provided by the instructor:

  - *Course syllabi* for the courses being reviewed (along with a course schedule and outline of topics and/or activities, if not already included in the syllabus or on the LMS).

  - *Assessments* such as representative exams, problem sets, assignment instructions, and/or other materials and means of evaluating student performance, along with associated grading rubrics.

  - *Examples of instructor-learner correspondence and/or feedback* (with student names redacted), if the instructor wishes these materials to be include in the review. Examples of feedback and correspondence may prove especially helpful for review of Ecampus teaching, as instructor-student interaction is primarily in this form.

4. Review of Course Delivery

- *Review of on-campus and mixed (blended, hybrid) courses (courses with a significant synchronous face-to-face component)*

  Review of on-campus and mixed course delivery will be through in person or Zoom **classroom visits**. In general, more than one classroom visit is recommended: review committee members should try to attend at least two class periods for the course(s) being reviewed. The course instructor (i.e., the faculty member being reviewed) will be informed prior to each classroom visit. Guidelines for classroom visits and review of learning materials are in Attachment C.

  Done properly, visits by peers can be useful in both improving and reviewing teaching. As an example, it is important that the reviewer get to the class before it starts and sit quietly in the back in an unobtrusive manner and not participate. Also, it might be useful for the instructor to quickly note that a visitor is in the class so students aren't wondering who is sitting in the back.

  Classroom visits can be helpful in resolving discrepancies between SLE scores, student feedback, and perceptions of the peer review committee. In addition, in-class components are generally part of peer teaching reviews per the OSU Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion.

- *Review of Ecampus, remote, and mixed courses (courses with a significant online component)*

  Review of online course delivery will require two steps, a general **review of the course website** on the LMS and a **course observation**.

  - Review of the course website
    Lecture, learning materials, and assessments are embedded in a course website within the LMS. Critical to this step in the review is determining the extent to which the instructor developed the

course site and course materials. The PR committee should focus, to the extent possible, on materials developed by the faculty member being reviewed, though a general overview of the course is also needed. Clear assignment instructions and easy-to-find contact information for the instructor are especially important, as the instructor is not present to address student questions and concerns as they arise. See Attachment C for guidance on reviewing course sites.

- o Online course observation
  In a face-to-face observation, two class periods are typically observed; similarly, the online observation should focus on a specified time in the course as to provide a snapshot. Peer reviewers will limit their in-depth observation to one week of course material (typically one course learning module). Learning materials, assessments, and instructor-student interactions should be the focus of the course module observation. It is strongly encouraged that one or more online discussions be observed, along with course announcements. See Attachment C for guidance on course observation.

5. Collection of Student Feedback

Student feedback questions are modeled on the [Student Learning Experience (SLE) survey](#). Survey questions are in alignment with the Quality Teaching Framework and assess aspects of quality teaching that are difficult, if not impossible, for peers to observe.

An important goal of receiving student feedback should be to avoid bias. The peer review committee, therefore, should take one of the following approaches:

Classroom feedback (in face-to-face courses)
- Ask for time at the end of a class of the course(s) being observed, at which point the instructor must leave the room.
- Distribute the Student Feedback Form (Attachment B) to the students to complete immediately in-class, after announcing the answers will be anonymous.
- Have the students submit their responses to the review committee member(s).

Online feedback (in online courses)
  Post an announcement on the course site requesting student feedback for departmental review of teaching. Message students (from within the LMS, ideally), requesting their assistance and feedback and providing a link to the Qualtrics Student Feedback survey (housed by the FES department).

6. Preparation of Draft Teaching Review Report

Based on the teaching materials provided by the faculty member being reviewed, correspondence with that faculty member, review of the delivery of the course(s), SLE results, and student feedback, the peer review committee (with the Chair taking the lead with the first draft) will prepare a draft of the peer teaching review report (i.e., letter). **This letter should be no longer than three pages, single-spaced**. Attachments A, B and C will help in

completing this report, but individual responses to each question and example are not necessary or expected in the final report (i.e., letter). The committee should:

- *Document the process and materials used in conducting the review*
- *Summarize the teaching responsibilities and general modality and method of teaching*
- *Highlight efforts to improve teaching and accessibility*
- *Using OSU's [Quality Teaching Framework](#) as a guide, summarize attributes of quality teaching demonstrated in course worksheet, self-assessment, course materials, SLE survey results, student feedback, and course delivery*
- *Using the Quality Teaching Framework as a guide, identify areas of teaching that could be improved and provide specific suggestions for doing so*

The committee chair will share the draft letter with a Continuing Mentor for feedback and suggestions.

7. Peer Review Meeting

In a meeting with the faculty member being reviewed the committee will present an oral summary of its review. Strengths, weaknesses, and suggestions for teaching improvement should be emphasized. Every effort should be made to keep the tone of the meeting positive and constructive.

8. Completion and Submission of Final Peer Teaching Review Report (i.e., letter)

The committee will then revise its review report (i.e., letter) as needed before submission to the Department Head. This final report (i.e., letter) will become a part of the faculty member's dossier for promotion and/or tenure and their departmental file.

The letter that goes in the dossier will follow the [guidelines](#) provided by the faculty handbook on promotion and tenure.

The faculty member being reviewed will be able to see the final letter and may respond to the review in writing with that document also going into the dossier and departmental file.

Appendix A. Instructor Worksheet

Instructor:	Peer Review Chair:
Course:	Date:

General Instructions: The Pre-Review sets the context for the review and allows the peer reviewers access to the course. The narrative section encourages instructor reflection. This Pre-Review form is to be completed by instructor and then discussed with the peer-reviewers.

Purpose of Review:

Identify the purpose and goals for the review (mark all that apply):

___ Promotion   ___ Tenure   ___ Periodic review of teaching

___ other (please specify) _____

How was this course(s) chosen? -Do you have any specific concerns about the course(s) being reviewed?

Course Overview:

Provide the peer reviewers with course overview information pertinent to the observation. Attach a copy of the course syllabus to this document.

___ Undergraduate ___ Graduate ___

___ Elective ___ Required course

Is this course part of a sequence of courses? If so, briefly explain: _____

Typical number of students _____ How many times have you taught the course? _____

Do you have a TA for this course? _____ Yes _____ No _____ Not currently

Is there any additional information about this course that you want to share?

Classroom visit and/or online course observation

- Suggest a few dates for the classroom visit. Also, note class periods that are not ideal for a classroom visit (field trip, student presentations, etc.).

   _____

- Suggest 1-2 modules for the online course observation. Please try to select modules that include online discussions.

   _____

Instructor's Role(s) in Course Design and Content Development:

This section helps the peer reviewers to understand the extent of the instructor's contributions to course design and content development.

• Course design: What is the extent of your contribution to the course design (both face-to-face and online)? (E.g., website organization, course structure and alignment, scaffolded assignments, integration of lecture/lab instruction or face-to-face/online instruction, etc.)

• If the course was developed through Ecampus, did you have the help of an instructional designer or faculty redevelopment grant? If yes, approximately when was it last updated?

• Content development: What is the extent of your contribution to content development? (E.g., selection and/or creation of learning materials, writing of assignment instructions and rubrics, etc.) Are there aspects of the course content that you cannot change due to program policy or other factors? If applicable, who created or developed this course?

Course Learning Objectives

For each course being reviewed, please provide the course learning outcomes and a brief explanation of the learning materials and assessments used to achieve them.

Peer Review Considerations
Please provide short answers to the questions in this section:

• As the faculty member responsible, do you have any concerns about the courses being reviewed courses? For example, are you having issues updating any aspects of these courses?

• What kind of support or feedback from the review committee would be most helpful?

• Are there issues associated with new course development or experimentation with a new teaching tool/style (for example) that should be taken into account during the review?

• Are there specific areas of teaching where you would like to improve?

• Are there concerns with any aspect of SLE scores or student feedback more generally?

Appendix B. Student Feedback Form

We are conducting this short survey to learn about your opinions and perspectives regarding this course and its instructor. Your input is important and will assist both the university and the instructor. Please freely answer the six questions below and return this form. Please do not put your name in this form because it is important to maintain student anonymity and confidentiality.

1. Describe the classroom atmosphere established by the instructor. To what degree do they create a welcoming atmosphere? Does your instructor foster a sense of belonging and a collaborative environment?

2. Does you instructor mitigate barriers to your learning? Do you feel you have the resources you need to succeed in the course?

3. How does the instructor positively support your learning?

4. How could the instructor better support your learning?

5. How does the instructor and/or course support your professional and/or academic growth?

6. What are the strengths of this course?

7. What are the weaknesses of this course?

Appendix C. Evidence of Quality Teaching in Review Materials

Evaluation of teaching is guided by the principles outlined in OSU's Quality Teaching Framework (Appendix D). Reviewers should look for evidence of quality teaching in the review materials and note areas for improvement. The linked spreadsheets provide examples of quality teaching in the different review materials. Examples in this spreadsheet were pulled from following three sources:

- Quality Teaching Framework (OSU Faculty Senate, 2021)
- Peer Review of Online Teaching Guidelines (OSU Faculty Senate, 2018).
- FES Peer Review of teaching guidelines (FES, 2016)

Reviewers should keep in mind that instructors have unique teaching styles, approaches, and strengths. The spreadsheets do not cover all possible examples quality teaching, nor is it expected that an instructor demonstrate all or most of the examples listed. Instead, the reviewers should look for evidence within each principle and subprinciple and note any gaps. The examples also serve as potential suggestions for improving teaching.

Examples of Quality Teaching (links to spreadsheets)
- Syllabus
- Self Assessment & Instructor Worksheet
- Learning materials
- Student feedback and SLE survey results
- Course delivery:
    - Classroom visit
    - Course website
    - Online course observation

Appendix D. Quality Teaching (QT) Framework

The following text is from the [Quality Teaching Framework](#) (OSU Faculty Senate, 2021).

OSU faculty are committed to quality teaching and student success. An instructional faculty member engaged in quality teaching is one who:

1. Champions a culture of Diverse, Equitable, and Inclusive Learning.
   1.1. Recognizes how their own identity influences the learning environment and intersects with broader cultural, social, and political contexts.
   1.2. Mitigates barriers and provides pathways for learners to achieve full participation.
   1.3. Builds a sense of belonging and enables collaboration across difference.
   1.4. Ensures each learner has the resources and experiences needed to achieve shared goals.

2. Practices teaching as a discipline.
   2.1. Demonstrates intentional and effective course design.
   2.2. Demonstrates evidence-based and disciplinary facilitation.
   2.3. Demonstrates intentional and effective assessment.
   2.4. Learns from and contributes to the professional development of teaching.
   2.5. Maintains currency in disciplinary practices and content.

3. Mentors and advises learners.
   3.1. Supports learners in their personal growth.
   3.2. Supports learners in their professional growth.
   3.3. Supports learners in their academic growth.