

**\*\*\*OFFICE OF THE PROVOST UNIT POLICY TEMPLATE\*\*\***

**PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING**

Unit	College of Education (COE)
Previous version approval date	n/a
Faculty approved date	
Dean's revision received by OTP	
Date of OTP approval	

**[Note: Shaded text areas indicate where text is directly from the CBA or university policy and may not be altered in unit policies.]**

**I. PREAMBLE**

Peer review of teaching at the University of Oregon is the written assessment by a faculty peer of how an instructor enacts professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed teaching (and other unit standards that are part of the unit's Teaching Evaluation Rubric) based on, for example, a class observation, contextual materials like the syllabus and Canvas site, a conversation between the instructor and the reviewer, and an instructor's answer to standard questions devised by the unit. Peer review frequency should align with the CBA for Career Faculty and the Provost's recommendations for CF and TTF peer reviews:

- Pro Tem Faculty should have approximately one peer review per year
- Career Instructional Faculty: one peer review of teaching per review period
- Assistant Professor: at least one peer review before the first mid-term review, and at least two peer reviews during the three years preceding the faculty member's tenure review. Three peer reviews are necessary for the promotion and tenure dossier.
- Associate Professor: at least one every other year. Three peer reviews are necessary for the promotion to full dossier.
- Professor: one every three years. NB: Two peer reviews are necessary for 6th-year post-tenure review.

COE clinical supervisors and professors of practice are career instructional faculty and should receive one peer review of teaching or supervision per review period. Research faculty who teach COE classes should also receive peer reviews of teaching. When research faculty are regularly assigned instruction as part of their professional responsibilities, they should receive at least one peer review of teaching per review period. When research faculty teach on overload to fill programmatic needs, they should receive one peer review of teaching for every three courses taught.

## II. THE SUBSTANCE OF THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

### A. Criteria for review

The criteria for review are professional, inclusive, engaged, and research-informed university-wide standards and any additional standards or modifications made by the unit. Peer review should gather evidence related to the standards in the unit's Teaching Evaluation Rubric so that peer review is meaningful in the evaluation of teaching. Criteria must match the unit's Teaching Evaluation Rubric and Review and Promotion policies.

### B. Template for review

The Teaching Engagement Program (TEP) Peer Review Template (see appendix A) will be completed by reviewers to document peer reviews of teaching. The criteria on the TEP Peer Review Template are aligned to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards and the Teaching Evaluation Rubric. If/when the Teaching Evaluation Rubric is modified, the Peer Review Template shall be updated as needed to align with criteria on the Teaching Evaluation Rubric.

### C. Scope of review

A peer review will consist of (i) pre-observation communication, (ii) a review of class materials, (iii) observation of instruction, and (iv) post-observation communication.

- i. Pre-observation communication: Prior to the observation, the reviewer will provide an opportunity (e.g., email, discussion) for the reviewee to share relevant contextual information about the class, their goals for the instruction to be observed, any aspects of their teaching they have been developing in relation to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards, and/or any areas of teaching in which they may be seeking suggestions for improvement.
- ii. Review of class materials: Prior to the observation, the reviewee will provide the reviewer a copy of the class syllabus, access to the full Canvas site, and any materials that will be used by students during the observation of instruction (e.g., presentation slides, readings, in-class activities, clinical supervision rubrics).
- iii. Observation of instruction: The reviewer will observe instruction for 60 minutes (or equivalent), as appropriate to the class and setting.
  - a. For in-person and synchronous online courses, the reviewer will observe a minimum of 60 minutes of instruction.
  - b. For asynchronous courses, a specific observation period and instructional activities to be observed will be identified in the pre-observation communication. The peer reviewer should spend approximately 60 minutes observing course materials and asynchronous content delivery. For example, the reviewer may observe a subset of instructional activities

- occurring during Week 5 (e.g., announcements, a recorded lecture, discussion boards, an assignment).
- c. When the observed instruction involves clinical supervision of university students, the peer reviewer will observe approximately 60 minutes of group or individual supervision. The observation may consist of a single supervision session or two shorter supervision sessions. The observation should focus on the supervision of UO students, and depending on the peer reviewer's qualifications and HIPAA requirements, might not involve observation of clients (e.g., community members receiving clinic services, K-12 students or in-service teachers).
  - iv. Post-observation communication: After the observation, the reviewer will initiate a post-observation debrief, in writing and/or through a follow-up discussion. The reviewer will provide an opportunity for the reviewee to share reflections about the observed instruction and respond to any reviewer questions. The reviewer will share feedback in relation to the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards. Upon completion of the peer review, the COE peer reviewer will provide a copy of the peer review evaluation to the reviewee to review and sign. At the request of the reviewee, a meeting will be held between the reviewee and peer reviewer to discuss the review prior to signing the Peer Review Template. The reviewee may submit a written response to the peer review to be retained as an attachment to the peer review evaluation.

### **III. THE REVIEW PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT OF REVIEWS**

#### **A. Organization**

A Human Resources (HR) Coordinator will be responsible for tracking peer reviews and notifying Department Heads of the faculty in need of review in the upcoming year. The HR Coordinator will maintain centralized records of peer reviews. The frequency of peer reviews will align with the CBA for Career Faculty and the Provost's recommendations for CF and TTF peer reviews. Faculty needing a peer review of teaching will be notified by their Department Head by June 15<sup>th</sup> of the academic year prior to the review. Faculty hired after that date who need a peer review of teaching will be notified during fall term of their first year.

By the end of spring term, Department Heads will nominate faculty from their departments to serve as peer reviewers in the upcoming academic year and the Dean will appoint faculty to serve up to a 2-year term as a COE Peer Teaching Reviewer. The number of anticipated peer reviews will be considered when determining the service responsibilities in the upcoming academic year for faculty who serve as COE Peer Teaching Reviewers.

Once peer reviewers are appointed, an Associate Dean for Faculty Development will be responsible for prompting Department Heads to match and notify reviewer-reviewee

pairs, coordinating an annual training for peer reviewers, coordinating the upcoming year's peer review schedule, and providing support to peer reviewers throughout the year as needed. Training for peer reviewers will occur annually during fall term and will minimally include an overview of the UO Teaching Evaluation Standards, the COE Peer Review of Teaching Policy and implementation guidance, and instructions for completing the TEP Peer Review Template.

Department Heads are responsible for matching peer reviewers and reviewees, and identifying the courses to be observed, with a goal of rotating the courses observed for any given faculty member. By the start of fall term, Department Heads will match peer reviewers to faculty in their department needing a review in the upcoming academic year. They will also collaborate to match reviewers and reviewees across departments, when applicable (e.g., faculty who teach classes outside their home department; to access a peer reviewer with online teaching experience; to access a peer reviewer with relevant professional/clinical experience), and to match reviewers to faculty needing reviews who are not assigned to an academic department (e.g., EDUC faculty, research faculty with appointments in research units). When matching reviewers and reviewees, Department Heads will account for potential conflicts of interest. It is recommended that over time, faculty receive peer reviews from colleagues who hold a range of classifications and ranks (i.e., TTF/CF, above/below rank of the reviewee).

## **B. Personnel**

All faculty who hold a Tenure-Track Faculty appointment or a Career-Instructional Faculty appointment (i.e., Instructor, Lecturer, or Clinical Professor classification) at any rank within the College of Education are eligible to serve as COE peer reviewers. In some instances, faculty who hold a Career Research Faculty appointment with teaching responsibilities may be nominated and appointed to serve as COE peer reviewers, with approval of their direct supervisor and research unit director.

When nominating peer reviewers, Department Heads will consider faculty from all ranks who have a demonstrated record of quality teaching in one or more of the UO teaching pillars of *professional, inclusive, engaged, and research informed*.

When the teaching assignment for a faculty member undergoing review consists of clinical supervision, the peer review of teaching may involve an observation of clinical supervision. In this case, the COE peer reviewer will either hold a faculty appointment in the Clinical Professor classification (any rank), have clinical teaching/supervision as a part of their assigned professional responsibilities, or have experience or knowledge in the delivery of clinical supervision.

### **C. FERPA**

In establishing the scope of peer reviews, units may wish to include Canvas-based teaching—for example, peer reviewers might consider the organization of Canvas site, or how faculty interact with students on discussion fora or respond to student assignments using Speed Grader. UO considers peer review a legitimate educational reason to access colleagues' Canvas courses and therefore for their incidental access to students' educational records, under the Federal Education Rights Privacy Act (FERPA).

### **D. Role of Reviewee**

Department Heads will provide faculty undergoing review with an opportunity to identify potential conflicts of interest with assigned reviewers (e.g., family member, in a close personal relationship, reviewer has a student in the program, etc.). When a conflict of interest exists, a different peer reviewer will be assigned.

The reviewee will be provided the opportunity to review and/or discuss their feedback with their peer reviewer, and to provide a written response to the peer review evaluation. See section II.C.iv. of this policy for detail.

Faculty who would like formative feedback on their teaching outside of the formal peer review of teaching process may request individual consultation through the UO Teaching Engagement Program.

## APPENDIX A. TEACHING ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM (TEP) PEER REVIEW TEMPLATE



# Peer Review Template

## Course Observation Context

1. Instructor name:
2. Reviewer name:
3. Observation date:
4. Key contextual information about the course (e.g., name/number, course modality, type and level of students [majors/non-majors, first-years/seniors, elective/required course]):
5. If you had a conversation with the instructor prior to the observation, what did they ask for feedback about or note that they were working on?
6. What materials, beyond the in-class observation, did you consider?
7. If you reviewed parts of the Canvas site, which did you review (welcome module, home page, syllabus, discussion board, announcements, gradebook, assignments, videos, weekly modules etc.)?

The University of Oregon defines teaching excellence as professional, inclusive, research informed, and engaged in reflective practice.

This template defines these broad standards through lettered “conditions” and provides an abbreviated list of teaching practices as examples of each condition (For more information on the origins of these definitions, please visit the Provost’s [“Revising UO’s Teaching Evaluations”](#) webpage.) We hope these examples draw attention to concrete practices, even as we know there are many more examples than what’s listed.

You can use this template to “check off” practices you observe, add in any notes you wish to make, and use the reflective questions after each table to convey feedback.

Find out more about using this Peer Review Template as part of the peer observation process by visiting the [Peer Review of Teaching webpage](#).

## 1. Professional Teaching Practices and Observation Notes

### Professional Teaching includes:

- A. Readily available, coherently organized, and high-quality course materials; syllabi that establish student workload, learning objectives, grading, and class policy expectations.
- B. Respectful and timely communication with students. Respectful teaching does not mean that the professor cannot give appropriate critical feedback.
- C. Students' activities in and out of class designed and organized to maximize student learning.

### Examples of Professional Teaching Practices

The following practices are examples of A-C, listed above.

The instructor:

- ☐ Has organized course material into an obvious, explicit, and logical framework. [A]  
For example:
  - Organizes Canvas using modules or pages, with the beginning of each module or page outlining the learning objectives, activities to complete, and content to engage.
  - Gives lesson outline (learning objectives, key topics, etc.) at beginning of class, verbally and visually.
- ☐ Provides a course syllabus in Canvas with learning objectives, grade and absence policies, and [other elements required by Senate policy](#). [A]
- ☐ Presents instructions and guidelines transparently, explaining the purpose of the assignment or activity, the tasks needed to complete it, and the criteria for success. [A]
- ☐ Invites student questions and participation through multiple modes (ex: in class, on Canvas discussion board, etc.). [B]
- ☐ Responds to questions in a timely fashion. [B]
- ☐ Employs methods (activities, examples, audio-visual aids) broken down into steps to “scaffold” student learning. [C]
- ☐ Provides necessary materials and adequate time for completion of activities. [C]

### Observation Notes

- Please identify and comment on two specific examples of professional teaching practice you observed:
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
  
- Please comment on one area of professional teaching you suggest for improvement or enhancement:



## 2. Inclusive Teaching Practices and Observation Notes

### Inclusive Teaching includes:

- A. Instruction designed to ensure every student can participate fully and that their presence and participation is valued.
- B. The content of the course reflects the diversity of the field's practitioners, the contested and evolving status of knowledge, the value of academic questions beyond the academy and of lived experience as evidence, and/or other efforts to help students see themselves in the work of the course.

### Examples of Inclusive Teaching Practices

The following practices are examples of A and B, listed above.

The instructor:

- ☐ Has designed the course materials to be accessible and welcoming. [A]  
For example:
  - Photos, examples, and other representations reflect diverse social identities and experiences.
  - There are multiple ways to access materials, such as audio and/or visual media, and/or text.
- ☐ Has designed multiple options for student engagement. For example, there are opportunities for student a) choice, b) connection to course goals and c) self-assessment and reflection. [A]
- ☐ Has designed multiple options for students to demonstrate their learning. For example, students might communicate learning through their choice of audio and/or visual media, and/or text. [A]
- ☐ Encourages and facilitates respectful dialogue, discussion, and student-student interaction for all students. [A]  
For example:
  - Structures activities with clear tasks that promote equal participation.
  - Helps people find partners or create groups.
  - Ensures there are explicit expectations or guidelines for interaction.
- ☐ Formats materials (Canvas, slides, documents, etc.) accessibly using headings, readable fonts, and alt-text. Readings are text-based files, not image-based files. [A]
- ☐ Uses captions and/or transcripts for videos and audio clips. [A]
- ☐ Has chosen course content that reflects diversity in the field or discipline including in the identities of the scholars/practitioners/creators included on the syllabus and different perspectives on or approaches to issues/methods. [B]
- ☐ Connects class content to students' prior knowledge or experience; and/or to current events, real-world phenomena, or other disciplines; and/or to prior class lessons, assignments, or readings. [B]

### Observation Notes

- Please identify and comment on two specific examples of inclusive teaching practices you observed:
  
- Please comment on one area of inclusive teaching you suggest for improvement or enhancement:

### 3. Research-Informed Teaching Practices and Observation Notes

#### Research-Informed Teaching includes:

- A. Instruction models a process or culture of inquiry characteristic of disciplinary or professional expertise.
- B. Evaluation of student performance linked to explicit goals for student learning established by faculty member, unit, and, for core education, university; these goals and criteria for meeting them are made clear to students.
- C. Timely, useful feedback on activities and assignments, including indicating students' progress in course.
- D. Instruction engages, challenges, and supports students.

#### Examples of Research-Informed Teaching Practices:

The following practices are examples of A through D, listed above.

The instructor:

- ☐ Has developed course content by drawing on relevant scholarly works, including current research/developments in the field or discipline. [A]
- ☐ Invites students into the subject matter, for instance through storytelling, compelling case studies, or explicit commentary about the skills, values, or formation of the field/discipline. [A]
- ☐ Shows how disciplinary experts approach problems, either by modeling the process or by explicitly guiding students through it. [A]
- ☐ Aligns course content (knowledge, skills, or abilities) and engagement activities with relevant learning objectives, such as those for assignments, class sessions or modules, the overall course, or relevant department or university core education objectives (when applicable). [B]
- ☐ Incorporates low-stakes assessment to help students gauge their learning. Examples include polling questions, short Canvas quizzes, one-minute papers, muddiest point statements, questions embedded in lecture content, end of week or module metacognitive reflections, etc. [C]
- ☐ Provides timely, actionable, and goal-oriented feedback on activities and assignments. [C]
- ☐ Asks a variety of types of questions (factual, application, critical, etc.) and allots time for students to respond to/discuss questions in class or in postings such as discussion boards. [D]
- ☐ Teaches the class at a level appropriate for most students. [D]

#### Observation Notes

- Please identify and comment on two specific examples of research-informed teaching practice you observed:
  
- Please comment on one area of research-informed teaching you suggest for improvement or enhancement:

## 4. Engaged Teaching Practices

Engaged Teaching includes:

Demonstrated reflective teaching practice, including through the regular revision of courses in content and pedagogy.

- Please identify and comment on one or two ways the reviewee has been demonstrating engaged teaching:
- Please identify and comment on one area of their teaching that the reviewee has chosen for improvement or enhancement moving forward: