



## Peer Review of Classroom Teaching Procedures

---

Peer review of classroom teaching can be a valuable tool for formative feedback for all teaching faculty and adds to our evaluation repertoire. It gives the faculty member qualitative feedback from peers (versus from students).

The feedback from peer review can be useful in the following circumstances:

- The feedback can be used in the reappointment, tenure and promotion process to create a fuller view of an individual's teaching performance. It can make the case for excellence and improvement of performance in the classroom situation.
- The feedback can be used to evaluate the performance of sessionals hired to teach courses. Right of first refusal for sessionals is accrued immediately on teaching a course unless there is a negative evaluation or other documented concerns.
- The feedback can be used to help a faculty member improve his or her teaching.

### Procedures:

1. Any faculty member can initiate the peer review process with the Head, OR the Head initiates the process in the following 5 situations:
  - a. Evaluations/student complaints indicate problems
  - b. Application for reappointment upcoming
  - c. Application for promotion to associate professor upcoming
  - d. Application for promotion to full professor upcoming
  - e. Sessional instructor is in first term of teaching a course or there have been complaints or concerns raised
2. Two evaluators are chosen through consultation between the faculty member and the Head. The Head may be one of the evaluators. At least one evaluator should be knowledgeable in the subject matter of the course.
3. Evaluators will normally be UBC faculty members of equal or higher rank or may be visiting faculty members or adjunct professors whose area of expertise would make them a good evaluator.
4. Evaluators will schedule a pre-observation and a post observation meeting with the faculty member, and may attend either one or more lectures given by the faculty member. If there are significant problems identified in the first lecture, a follow-up evaluation should take place to give the person being evaluated an opportunity to show improvement or correct identified problems.
5. Evaluators will use guidelines shown in Appendices A, B and C in the meetings with the faculty member being evaluated, and will record their answers, which will be made available to the person being evaluated.



6. In the post-observation meeting, the evaluator will share their observations and suggestions with the faculty member being evaluated. They may share their information in either written or verbal form.
7. The evaluator will forward to the Head a written copy of the evaluation for the applicant's file, and a written or verbal summary of any suggested next steps.
8. The Faculty member may meet with the Head to discuss the report/feedback and decide on follow up or recommended improvements.
9. The peer review process is confidential, and the results should be shared only with the Head and the person being evaluated. However, the fact that this information will be available to the unit standing committee on promotion and tenure committee should be emphasized.



## Appendix A: Peer Review of Teaching

### Suggested Questions for the pre-evaluation meeting.

**The faculty member** should provide a course outline, a sample examination, and sample assignments given during the semester for this class, and allow access to WebCT for the evaluator. If concerns were expressed in the first peer review session, these should be discussed along with steps that have been taken to address them.

### Samples of topics that could be discussed in the pre-lecture interview:

1. What are the major topics for this course and how does this lecture fit into the course as a whole?
2. What kinds of evaluation instruments do you use?
3. Do you use clickers or any other ancillary techniques?
4. Are there any particular strategies that you are planning to use in this lecture?
5. Do you use a text for the course? If so, how do you use it? Are there other sources of information that you provide or expect the students to access?
6. What do you perceive your strengths as a teacher to be? Is there anything that you would like specific feedback on? What are you trying to improve in your teaching?
7. How many scheduled office hours do you have? Do you answer emails promptly?
8. Is there anything else that I should know before I come to your lecture?



## Appendix B: Peer Review of Teaching

Please indicate which course you evaluated, the time and location of the lecture, the number of lectures attended, the number of registered students, and an estimate of the attendance at the lecture.

### Potential classroom observation questions:

The peer evaluator should consider basing the report on the following:

1. Did the lecturer 'set the scene' for the students? i.e. give a brief overview of what was covered in the last lecture, and what the objectives were for this lecture.
2. Was the lecture well organized?
3. Did the topics clearly fit into the course syllabus?
4. Was there good flow?
5. Was the pacing of the lecture appropriate?
6. Was the depth appropriate?
7. Was the level appropriate for the course level?
8. Could students follow the lecture and take notes if necessary?
9. If the notes were available on WebCT, were they easy to follow?
10. Did the instructor monitor the class for understanding?
11. Did the instructor use examples and answers questions in a way that showed an appropriate depth of knowledge of the material?
12. Did the faculty member encourage participation by stopping to allow students to ask questions, or asking the students questions? If so was the "wait time" appropriate?
13. Were diagrams and figures easy to follow and useful in explaining concepts in the course?
14. Did the faculty member take time to explain diagrams and put them in the context of the lecture topic?
15. Did the instructor acknowledge the sources of materials used?
16. Did the instructor integrate research into the lecture? If so, was it effective?
17. Were the students engaged during the course of the lecture? What did you see that would indicate involvement?
18. What are the strengths of the lecturer?
19. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?
20. Was the WebCT site used appropriately?
21. If other technology was used (e.g. clickers), was it effective?



## Appendix C: Peer Review of Teaching

### Post-observation meeting:

In the post-observation meeting, the evaluator will share his or her findings with the faculty member either verbally or in written form. If suggestions for improvement were given after the first lecture, the evaluator will discuss the success of the improvements at the second meeting.

### Questions for the faculty member:

1. How do you think the class went?
2. Do you think this was a good representation of your teaching style and ability (explain)?
3. Were there any problems or difficulties that you had during the class?
4. If you were to teach this class over again, would you do anything differently? If yes, what would you change?
5. What will you be working on next to further improve your teaching?