The College of Allied Health Sciences (CAHS) through its mission and goals values excellence in teaching and continued professional development.

To this end, the CAHS views peer evaluation of teaching as one of the methods for attaining excellence in teaching, and as a process to be used for professional development.

Execution of peer evaluation of teaching is determined within each department. All forms and processes for the evaluations should be designed to meet university requirements and departmental needs.

The College encourages instructors of all ranks to consider peer evaluation of teaching as a form of professional development.

Faculty for whom peer evaluation of teaching is required for tenure and promotion should be cognizant that continued poor performance on peer evaluated teaching may be a basis for denial of tenure, promotion or reappointment.

The entire Departmental evaluation process will be provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made. A record of these discussions will be kept in the individual's personnel file.
GENERAL PURPOSES OF PEER REVIEW

Peer review of faculty member's teaching is seen as having two purposes: (1) results can be used for evaluative purposes and as documented evidence of performance for making merit, reappointment, and tenure decisions, and (2) results can be used for faculty development purposes. Separate forms will be used for item 1 and item 2.

WHO SHALL BE REVIEWED

In accordance with University policy, all tenure-track faculty will be reviewed two times a year in the first year and third year by two observers. If possible, the two observers should try to review the same class. However, due to scheduling conflicts with a small department's faculty, some occasions will arise when observers will review different classes. The procedure for doing this is outlined in the Peer Review Process Procedure and Checklist. See Form A for review procedure.

All Occupational Therapy Department non-tenure-track, fixed-term faculty will be reviewed twice each year (two separate classes) by two observers (for a total of 4 reviews) for the first three years of appointment. Results may be used by the Chair and appropriate Personnel Action Committee(s) in making annual and merit evaluation, promotion decisions, and offer subsequent appointments if applicable. The procedure for doing this is outlined in the Peer Review Process Procedure and Checklist. See Form A for review procedure.

All tenured and fixed-term faculty who receive ratings below the unit mean (CAHS) on 25% or more on the first nine items on the Student Opinion Survey in any class will be peer reviewed in those classes the following year. Results will be used by the Chair in helping faculty identify development needs and plans. See Form B for review procedure.

All tenured faculty and fixed-term faculty beyond the three years of appointment are encouraged to request peer evaluation both internally and externally (peer review of course materials from faculty in other places, etc.), particularly when teaching a course assigned for the first time. If the faculty desires that the results be used in making annual and merit evaluation and/or promotion decisions, the faculty member should request to have Form A used for peer evaluation. If the faculty member desires to use peer evaluation for identification of development needs and plans only, Form B should be used.
WHICH CLASSES SHALL BE REVIEWED?

All required courses in the OT curriculum, including labs and seminars, may be reviewed according to these policies. It is preferred that peer review be done in those courses to which the instructor has been assigned for this semester, not as a guest lecturer.

WHO CAN OBSERVE

All College of Allied Health Sciences faculty who have been trained to do peer observation are eligible.

PROCEDURE

Please see attached document.

SELF EVALUATION FORM

A self evaluation is to be completed by the instructor being observed. This will be done using the occupational therapy peer evaluation classroom observation form. This self evaluation should be shared with the two peer reviewers during the post-evaluation conference and becomes part of the documents of the peer review record.
RECORD OF PEER EVALUATION PROCESS DISCUSSION

Occupational Therapy Department
College of Allied Health Sciences

A copy of the Occupational Therapy Department peer evaluation has been explained to me, and its provisions have been explained to me.

Faculty Member Signature

Department Chair Signature

Date

Date

1. Original to faculty member's personnel file
2. Copy to faculty member
RECORD OF PEER EVALUATION PROCESS DISCUSSION

Occupational Therapy Department
College of Allied Health Sciences

A copy of the Occupational Therapy Department peer evaluation plan and provisions has been explained to me.

Candidate for Faculty Member Signature

Department Chair Signature

Date

Date

1. Original to Department Search Committee Chair
2. Copy to faculty member
Peer Review Process Procedure and Checklist
To Be Used for Faculty Evaluation
Occupational Therapy Department
College of Allied Health Sciences

-Planning Stage
Time: One semester prior to the semester when observation will occur

Chair
______ sends the list of eligible observers to the faculty member who is to be observed
______ chooses 1 name from list of possible observers

Recipient Teacher
______ chooses 1 name from list of possible observers
______ identifies courses to be reviewed
______ notifies chair of these choices

Chair
Arranges the academic year's scheduling of classroom/lab peer reviews by:
______ notifying those chosen as observers of their selection and requesting that they
contact the recipient teacher
______ sending copies of all appropriate forms to observer and recipient teacher
______ identifying the observer's activity as part of teaching or service percent of annual load
______ keeping the calendar of scheduled observations

-Pre-observation Conference Stage
Scheduling: Occurs very early in the semester of classroom/lab peer review

Observer
______ initiates courtesy contact with
recipient teacher conference
Observer
______ gathers information on classroom/lab session's goals, students, and
teaching style.

Recipient Teacher
______ schedules time and location of pre-observation conference

Recipient Teacher
______ provides teaching and course materials to observer
______ schedules a date for the post-observation conference
______ notifies chair of the dates for the scheduled conferences and the classroom/lab observation

Preparing for In-Classroom/Lab Observation

Observer
______ completes Course Syllabus Peer Evaluation Form (after the Pre-observation Conference but before the Classroom/Lab Observation)
-Classroom/Lab Observation Stage
Recording Observations

Observer
_____ becomes very familiar with the criteria for the categories on the Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Form

Following the Classroom/Lab Observation
Observer
_____ completes (as soon as possible following the observation) Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Form

Recipient Teacher
_____ prepares self-evaluation report

-Post-observation Conference Stage
Time: conducted within 3 days after the classroom/lab observation

Observer
_____ reviews completed Course Syllabus and Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Forms with recipient teacher

Recipient Teacher
_____ discusses with observer the self evaluation form.
_____ sends copy of self evaluation to chair

-Closing Stage

Observer
_____ gives originals of completed forms to the recipient teacher
_____ sends copies of completed forms to chair within 3 days
_____ complete overall peer evaluation form and gives copies to recipient teacher and chair within 3 days.

Recipient Teacher
_____ files the peer review forms/reports and the self evaluation report in PAD or personnel file for review by Chair and appropriate personnel action committee(s).

Chair and Department PAC
_____ uses information from peer review process to make evaluation decisions

Schedule of Meetings:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Classroom/Lab Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peer Review Process Procedure and Checklist
To Be Used for Faculty Development
Occupational Therapy Department
College of Allied Health Sciences

-Planning Stage
Time: One semester prior to the semester when observation will occur

Chair
_____ sends the list of eligible observers to the faculty member who is to be observed
_____ chooses 1 name from list of possible observers

Recipient Teacher
_____ chooses 1 name from list of possible observers
_____ identifies courses to be reviewed
_____ notifies chair of these choices

Chair
Arranges the academic year’s scheduling of classroom/lab peer reviews by:
_____ notifying those chosen as observers of their selection and requesting that they
contact the recipient teacher
_____ sending copies of all appropriate forms to observer and recipient teacher
_____ identifying the observer’s activity as part of teaching or service percent of annual
load
_____ keeping the calendar of scheduled observations

-Pre-observation Conference Stage
Scheduling: Occurs very early in the semester of classroom/lab peer review

Observer
_____ initiates courtesy contact with
recipient teacher conference

Observer
_____ gathers information on classroom/
lab session’s goals, students, and
teaching style

Recipient Teacher
_____ schedules time and location of pre-
observation conference

Recipient Teacher
_____ provides teaching and course
materials to observer
_____ schedules a date for the post-
observation conference
_____ notifies chair of the dates for the
scheduled conferences and the
classroom/lab observation

Preparing for In-Classroom/Lab Observation

Observer
_____ completes Course Syllabus Peer Evaluation Form (after the Pre-observation
Conference but before the Classroom/Lab Observation)
- 

**Classroom/Lab Observation Stage**

Recording Observations

**Observer**

- becomes very familiar with the criteria for the categories on the Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Form

Following the Classroom/Lab Observation

**Observer**

- completes (as soon as possible following the observation) Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Form

**Recipient Teacher**

- prepares self-evaluation report

---

**Post-observation Conference Stage**

Time: conducted within 3 days after the classroom/lab observation

**Observer**

- reviews completed Course Syllabus and Classroom Observation Peer Evaluation Forms with recipient teacher
- Uses Post-observation conference to identify areas of strength and areas for change

**Recipient Teacher**

- discusses with observer the self evaluation form.
- sends copy of self evaluation to chair

---

**Closing Stage**

**Observer**

- complete overall peer evaluation form and gives copies to recipient teacher and chair within 3 days.
- gives originals of completed forms to the recipient teacher
- sends copies of completed forms to chair within 3 days to be used for development goals and plans.

**Recipient Teacher**

- uses information from peer review practices to assist with the development of a faculty development plan for the following year.

---

**Schedule of Meetings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-observation Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Classroom/Lab Observation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-observation Conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CLASSROOM OBSERVATION
Peer Evaluation Form
Occupational Therapy Department

Faculty Member Observed

Title or Subject of Presentation

Date Observed ____________________ Length of Observation ____________________

Observer ____________________ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member __________

Evaluation Scale: 5 points - OUTSTANDING = met 90% to 100% or virtually all of the criteria
4 points - GOOD = met 75% to 90% of all criteria
3 points - SATISFACTORY = met 60% to 75% of the criteria
2 points - MARGINAL = met less than 60% of the criteria
1 point - UNSATISFACTORY = met 10% or less of the criteria
NA/UO = not applicable/unobserved

1. CLARITY AND ORGANIZATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Begins on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. States goals and objectives of presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Briefly relates previous content to current presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presents material in an organized manner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Uses instructional media appropriately</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Summarizes key points of the presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS ________
MEAN POINTS ________

STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score - Clarity &amp; Organization (circle one)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. **PRESENTATION STYLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stimulates interest in the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Speaks clearly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Presentation style facilitates note taking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Maintains student engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS ________  
MEAN POINTS ________

**STRENGTHS**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score - Presentation Style (circle one)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

3. **CONTENT AND INTELLECTUAL BREADTH**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Activities were used to stimulate the use of presented material in problems solving-critical thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Alternative views were identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information presented included current recognized practices, research, and technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Classroom activities correspond to levels of thinking identified as appropriate to curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS ________  
MEAN POINTS ________

**STRENGTHS**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score - Content and Intellectual Breadth (circle one)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS/METHODOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching approaches (lecture, handouts, discussion, AVs) were reflective of course objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Assignments reflected appropriate course objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Planned rate of information presentation (pacing) was proportional to the significance and the complexity of topics to be covered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Various patterns of instruction (demonstration, media-illustrations, small group tasks) were planned and used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS
MEAN POINTS

STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score - Instructional Materials/Methoodology (circle one)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GROUP INTERACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Encourages participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Uses questions that encourage discussion by providing cues and encouragement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Responds to wrong answers constructively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS
MEAN POINTS

STRENGTHS
### 6. CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Presentation follows the outline and/or syllabus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Defines terminology as necessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Uses examples relevant to course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Handouts or other material reinforce key points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content is current/contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS:**

**MEAN POINTS:**

**STRENGTHS**

---

### Overall Score - Content (circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O G S M UN NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TOTAL POINTS:**

**TOTAL MEAN SCORE:**
COURSE SYLLABUS

Peer Evaluation Form
Occupational Therapy Department

Faculty Member Observed

Title or Subject of Presentation

Date Observed ________________________ Length of Observation ________________________

Observer __________________________ Date Reviewed with Faculty Member ________

Evaluation Scale: 5 points - OUTSTANDING = met 90% to 100% or virtually all of the criteria
4 points - GOOD = met 75% to 90% of all criteria
3 points - SATISFACTORY = met 60% to 75% of the criteria
2 points - MARGINAL = met less than 60% of the criteria
1 point - UNSATISFACTORY = met 10% or less of the criteria
NA/UO = not applicable/unobserved

1. ORGANIZATION and GOALS/OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Course objectives are clear and easily understood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Course outline and sequence of topics are logically organized to meet class objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Class requirements (lab, demonstrations, readings, assignments) are included in outline and clearly described, understandable, and relevant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS ________

MEAN POINTS ________

STRENGTHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Score - Organization and</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>NA/UO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. EVALUATION DEVICES PLANNED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>POINTS</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planned evaluative activities are consistent with class objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Examination content is representative of the class content and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Examination questions are clear and understandable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Activities (labs, quizzes, reports) to monitor student understanding of assigned or presented materials are planned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL POINTS: 
MEAN POINTS: 

STRENGTHS 

Overall Score - Evaluation Devices (circle one) | O | G | S | M | UN | NA/UO |

TOTAL POINTS: 
TOTAL MEAN SCORE: 

15
OVERALL PEER EVALUATION
(To be completed for faculty evaluation and development)

MEAN POINTS:

_______ Classroom/Lab Observation

_______ Course Syllabus

_______ TOTAL MEAN POINTS

OVERALL COMMENTS:

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________

Signature: ___________________________ Date: ______________

Revised: September, 2010