Overview

The College of Business peer review is intended to provide constructive feedback to instructors and assist them in improving their courses. The process includes a pre-review phase, the actual class website(s) review, and a post review meeting. This instrument is intended to document the first two phases and provide meaningful feedback to faculty. Part A is a content review that examines the course's organization, instructional content, and assessment of student learning via course documents, Blackboard sites, and other artifacts made available. Part B is a website review of material delivered to students during the semester. For those courses that are hybrid in nature, the review will include Part B from the face to face document combined with entire Online Peer Review document.

The face-to-face peer review of all faculty members (tenured, tenure-track, & lecturers) is required during the first and fourth years of appointment at ECU, and once every five years thereafter. Similarly, ECU policy requires that faculty teaching distance education are subject to periodic review at least once every three years. Per Faculty Senate approved procedures, the peer review instrument requires two evaluators for each review: one who is selected by the online steering committee, and one who is selected by that particular faculty member. Faculty teaching online should plan to have both face-to-face and online reviews of their teaching.

To the Instructor

A.   Phase I: Prior to the course website(s) review
The Online Steering Committee will notify the faculty member that a review is due. The faculty member will select a reviewer, preferably from the same discipline. Non-tenured, tenure-track faculty will not be expected to review tenured faculty in the College. The Online Steering Committee will assign an additional faculty member to conduct the review; instructors may appeal the assignment. It is the *faculty member's responsibility* to initiate the two reviews by contacting the reviewers and arranging to provide course access.

Prior to the class visit, instructors are required to meet with the course evaluators to share course materials that are relevant to teaching effectiveness. These can be shared in hard copy or electronically (including via access to a course Blackboard or website). Materials that must be made available include:
- Syllabus
- Course learning goals and activities that assess learning
- Instructional materials used in course (provided by publisher and material developed by instructor; please differentiate)

Assessments are often taken as a simple snapshot, with little attempt to review modifications that have been made to the course over time; however, many instructors continuously improve their courses based on a number of factors, including curriculum and content changes, student feedback, or technology enhancements. Information of this type is very helpful when evaluating teaching; please include evidence of continuous improvement of this course during the time you have taught it. Examples may include changes made:
- based on student survey responses
- to accommodate new technologies
- based on prior peer or content reviews
- based on curriculum modifications (e.g., changes in content coverage)
- to assess learning outcomes

Finally, other items can significantly strengthen your teaching portfolio and should be considered for inclusion. At your discretion, you might consider including:
- SPOTS (numbers or comments)
- Copies of completed student projects with your actual feedback visible

- Statement of teaching philosophy
- Anything else you believe is indicative of your teaching effectiveness

B. Phase II: Website(s) Review

In planning for the visit, instructors should point evaluators toward any unique/specific areas of interest. This may include SabaMeeting recordings, recorded lecturers created for students, etc. Anything the instructor wants to ensure the evaluator should visit.

C. Phase III: Debrief

After the content review and classroom observation, instructors and evaluators should meet to discuss those areas that are exemplary as well as identify areas that can be enhanced with regard to both course content and online-classroom management. The debriefing is intended as developmental in nature; our goal is to further teaching effectiveness across the college and facilitate continuous improvement!

The reviewer will <u>digitally</u> sign the final evaluation before providing it to the instructor. No further changes can be made to the document once it has been digitally signed. Don't forget to upload the signed copy of your teaching evaluation to Sedona!

<u>To the Evaluators</u>

A. Phase I: Prior to the course website(s) review

Please review all content provided by the instructor and ask any questions that may arise. Your goal is to understand the instructor's teaching process and how course content facilitates achievement of stated learning goals.

B. Phase II: Website(s) Review

Although it is the instructor's responsibility to provide you with access to his/her course in a timely manner, please reach out and remind the individual if required. Also, please take into consideration *when* you are reviewing; the nature of a course and its content early in the semester may be quite different from what you would see if you waited several weeks. If you have questions, ask the instructor before assuming content is missing; be cognizant of the fact that classroom management styles can differ significantly across faculty and across learning objectives; be open-minded when reviewing.

C. Phase III: Debrief

After completing your evaluation of the course, please meet with the instructor to discuss what you learned. Keep in mind that feedback is frequently best received if presented as a "Praise Sandwich" where you initiate the discussion with a discussion of areas where the faculty was highly effective, proceed to areas where improvement can be gained (along with specific suggestions, not just critical judgments), and conclude on a positive note with emphasis on successes. Be certain to identify innovative or uniquely engaging attributes (in the course content, organization, or otherwise) of the course that could be of interest to other faculty.

College of Business Peer Review Instrument for Online Courses

Instructor		Semester of Review	
Course Name		Number of Students in Class	
Evaluator			

*Consider how well the online course meets each of the following criteria for an effective online course. Examples of "Meets Criteria" are provided by clicking on each criterion in the table. These examples are intended to give clearer meaning to each criterion; every example need **not** necessarily be included in the course in order to earn an exemplary score.*

Category 1: Course Organization & Instructional Design

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Comments
a. Syllabus includes vital course information and conforms to COB & ECU Faculty Manual requirements.					
b. Content of course syllabus is consistent with master syllabus for course.					
c. Course meets COB stated minimum content of a Blackboard site with Announcements, Staff Information, & Course Information.					
d. Course structure effectively keeps students on task					
e. Course is structured to ensure students complete their own work.					
f. Course content must be kept current and cannot be exclusively publisher-provided.					
g. Course materials indicate efforts at ongoing enhancement and/or continuous improvement.					

Category 2: Content Delivery

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Comments
a. Clear evidence is provided of ongoing communication between faculty and students.					
b. Course uses/includes technology appropriate to the material and learning objectives.					
c. Course content is presented in a logical sequence and content for instructional sessions is provided in an organized & consistent fashion					
d. Course conveys instructor's command of the subject area.					
e. Course makes appropriate efforts to be accessible to all students.					
f. Course includes adequate methods for meeting learning outcomes/objectives.					
g. Course includes adequate graded activities to assess student learning.					
h. Course instructional and assessment activities are aligned with the course and college learning objectives.					
i. Course conveys instructor's sense of enthusiasm toward the course content.					

Category 3: Rapport & Interaction

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Comments
a. Course documents clearly establish criteria for class interaction; course conduct is consistent with these criteria.					
b. Course promotes appropriate faculty – student interaction.					
c. Course promotes appropriate student – student interaction.					
d. Course allows for and encourages different points of view as appropriate.					
e. Timely, ongoing feedback about student performance is available.					

Category 4: Other

Please identify any additional areas of note not covered in the categories or items above:

Instructor: _____

Course: _____

Evaluator: _____

Rating:

_____ Accepted

_____ Minor revisions (noted in comments)

_____ Major revisions (noted in comments)

Does this course contain innovative or uniquely engaging activities that should be shared with others? If so, please describe them in the comments section.

_____ YES

_____ NO

Overall Comments:

Instructors: If major revisions are required, you are required to submit a revision plan to your department chair. It will be the department chair's responsibility to follow-up on courses that need improvement. The course will be reviewed again two semesters after initial review.

All online faculty will be reviewed on a three-year cycle.

Evaluator's Digital Signature: Signing this document will prevent any future changes.