Evaluation of Teaching Peer and Self Assessment DRAFT 4/8/2021 Developed by the Academic Policy Council with input from the Welfare Council

This document presents guidelines and recommendations to conduct peer assessment of teaching on a regular basis. These can be implemented at the college or department levels. Some colleges have already implemented a process.

Evaluation of Teaching should be matched with the modalities (in person, online, labs, flipped) and level of program (undergraduate, graduate, professional).

Definitions

Collective Bargaining Agreement Definition

18.3d Peer Assessment. A faculty member has the right to have a peer or colleague to observe/visit the faculty member's teaching and to have an assessment of that observation/visitation included as part of the faculty member's annual report. The chair shall invite the peer evaluator, who may be within the University, a retired colleague, or a colleague in the same discipline from another university.

Evaluation of Teaching

Rigorous, fair, unbiased evaluation of teaching is required on an annual basis as part of a faculty's annual evaluation and as part of an evaluation for tenure and/or promotion. The evaluation should be comprehensive and not solely be based on the end of course evaluations by students. The recommendation is to implement a review capturing three voices: end of course evaluation (as they are currently done) to capture the student's voice, a peer review of teaching to capture the peer's voice, and a self-assessment (in conjunction with a peer review) to capture the faculty's voice. A peer assessment should not be punitive and should be used to provide constructive feedback that can be used to improve teaching.

Additional documentation of a teaching vision and evidence can be collected in an educational portfolio which can be submitted in section 11 of the promotion and tenure packet.

How is the assessment conducted?

The recommendation is that the faculty member first completes a self-assessment in which they can outline the goals for the course, the implementation and associated pedagogy, and other information to provide context. This self-assessment is provided to the peer evaluator(s) before a classroom visit.

Frequency of Evaluation

Faculty (tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track) should have a peer assessment of teaching 2-3 times before their next promotion. For a mid-term evaluation, at least 1 assessment should be conducted.

Reference: IFAS conducts 2 before mid term, 1 before tenure application, Vet Med conducts 2-3 evaluations per year, CoEd conducts 2 per tenure/promotion period.

Who conducts the evaluation?

The department chair shall invite the evaluator(s). The recommendation is to have a team of 2 evaluators, 1 evaluator with the disciplinary knowledge of the field of the course, and 1 evaluator with experience in evaluating pedagogy.

During the classroom visit, the evaluators will use a predefined rubric to assess the course. A core rubric is provided on the next page. Any non-relevant sections of the rubric (depending on the type of course), can be omitted. The following examples of rubrics are provided for colleges who want to expand the core rubric:

- Center for Teaching Excellence
- CALS
- Vetmed

Results of the assessment

The results of the assessment are the rubric form with a free text (no more than one page) assessment. In the case of multiple evaluators, they will come to a consensus and present the results on one form.

Core Rubric

This rubric should be used as a core to allow some consistency between colleges.

| | | Strong | | | vement | A |
|--|----------|--------|---------------------|----------|-------------------|---------|
| | ۍ. | 00 | 10 | ليني. | ist. | and cto |
| | Super, | Stron | Satisf _ā | Need | U _{nsat} | N/A |
| Course materials and organization | | | | | | |
| The course goals and objectives in the syllabus are clearly stated and measurable. | | | | | | |
| The course activities, content, and assessments help students develop critical thinking skills and achieve appropriate levels of cognitive achievement. | | | | | | |
| The course materials are presented in an organized and logical manner. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Educational delivery | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| The professor uses a range of teaching activities and techniques to address differences in student learning styles, drawing on those that are appropriate to the course content. These may include readings, lectures, student projects, audio- | | | | | | |
| visual materials, and various forms of student interactions. | | | | | | |
| The professor's presentation of course materials and instructions are clear and easy to follow. | | | | | | |
| Is there alignment with the course goals and objectives? | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Student Engagement | <u> </u> | 1 | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | 1 | 1 |
| The professor provides opportunities for students to be actively engaged in the learning process through methods such as exercises, questioning, student presentations, discussions, and interactive activities. | | | | | | |
| The professor actively encourages student engagement with the course contents, the professor, and/or their classmates. | | | | | | |