

College of Business Peer Review Instrument for Face-to-Face Courses

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-course visit review phase, the actual class visit, 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 classroom observation of the material delivered to students during a selected class meeting. For those courses that are hybrid in nature, the review will include Part B from this document combined with entire DE 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. Per Faculty Senate approved procedures, the peer review instrument requires two evaluators for each review: one who is selected by the faculty member's department chair and/or personnel committee, and one who is selected by that particular faculty member.

To the Instructor

A. Phase I: Prior to the class visit

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: Classroom observation

In planning for the visit, instructors and evaluators should agree upon approximately three viable dates for the class observation; the goal is for the evaluation to be somewhat of a “surprise” and less orchestrated than under prior models. This also allows for the two evaluators to come on different days if they desire. During the planning meeting instructors should also discuss the material being covered in the class on these days to help the evaluators understand how the lecture will be structured and how the material ties in with previous classroom coverage.

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 classroom management. The debriefing is intended as developmental in nature; our goal is to further teaching effectiveness across the college and facilitate continuous improvement!

Don't forget to upload the signed copy of your teaching evaluation to Sedona!

To the Evaluators

A. Phase I: Prior to the class visit

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: Classroom observation

Although you and the instructor will have identified several options for your attendance, please be flexible since teaching plans can frequently change during the course of a semester. You want to be as unobtrusive as possible and not negatively impact the functioning of a class. You also must be cognizant of the fact that classroom management styles can differ significantly across faculty and across learning objectives; be openminded when visiting.

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 the actual classroom) of the course that could be of interest to other faculty.

College of Business Peer Review Instrument for Face-to-Face Courses

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

Phase I: Review of Course Content & Faculty Provided Documentation

Consider how well the course meets each of the following criteria for an effective course in the College of Business.

Category 1: Course Organization & Instructional Design

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Comments
a. <u>Syllabus includes vital course information and conforms to COB & ECU Faculty Manual requirements.</u>					
b. Content of course syllabus is consistent with master syllabus for course.					
c. <u>Course content is presented in a logical sequence.</u>					
d. <u>Course structure effectively keeps students on task.</u>					
e. <u>Course instructional and assessment activities are aligned with the course learning objectives.</u>					
f. <u>Course includes adequate methods for meeting learning outcomes/objectives.</u>					
g. <u>Course content reinforces COB learning goals via assignments that require analysis, synthesis, and/or application (when appropriate) by</u>					

<p><u>using learning activities appropriate to the content and objectives of the course.</u></p>					
<p>h. <u>Course includes adequate graded activities to assess student learning.</u></p>					
<p>i. <u>Timely, ongoing feedback about student performance is available.</u></p>					
<p>j. <u>Course materials convey instructor's command of the subject area.</u></p>					
<p>k. <u>Course materials indicate efforts at ongoing enhancement and/or continuous improvement.</u></p>					
<p>l. <u>Course uses/includes technology appropriate to the material and learning objectives.</u></p>					

Phase II: Classroom Observation

Category 2: Class Content & Presentation

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Unable to Observe	Comments
a. <u>Communicates a sense of enthusiasm toward the content.</u>						
b. Selects teaching methods/activities appropriate for the content.						
c. Uses examples relevant to student experiences/course content.						
d. Adequately explains/reviews assignments.						
e. Content is aligned with learning objectives.						
f. Speaks audibly and clearly.						

Category 3: Rapport & Interaction

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Unable to Observe	Comments
a. Listens carefully to student comments and questions.						
b. Encourages students to answer difficult questions by providing cues.						
c. Responds to wrong answers constructively.						
d. Responds constructively to student opinions/comments.						
e. Treats all students in a fair and equitable manner.						
f. Is able to admit error/insufficient knowledge.						
g. Demonstrates command of subject matter while encouraging student participation/engagement.						

Category 4: Class Organization

Criteria	Does Not Meet Criteria	Partially Meets Criteria	Meets Criteria	Exceeds Criteria	Unable to Observe	Comments
a. Begins class on time in an orderly, organized fashion.						
b. Clearly states the goals or objectives for the period.						
c. Reviews prior class material to prepare students for the content to be covered.						
d. Summarizes and distills main points at the end of class.						
e. Presents topics in logical sequence and flow.						

Category 5: Other

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

College of Business Peer Review of Teaching Summary Evaluation

<p>Instructor: _____</p> <p>Course: _____</p> <p>Evaluator: _____</p> <p>Rating:</p> <p>_____ Accepted (noted in comments)</p> <p>_____ Minor Revisions (noted in comments)</p> <p>_____ Major Revisions (noted in comments)</p> <p>Does this course contain innovative or uniquely engaging activities that should be shared with others? If so, please describe them in the comments section.</p> <p>_____ Yes</p> <p>_____ No</p>	<p>Overall Comments:</p>
--	--------------------------

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.

Evaluator's Digital Signature: _____

Date: _____