

## HPHY Peer Review of Teaching Policy

Updated June 2016

### PURPOSE:

The process of peer review intends to do the following:

1. Provide an opportunity for each faculty member to engage in an open and useful dialog about teaching with their peers that would continually improve their teaching ability, and encourage the use of evidence-based teaching methods.
2. Provide a system to ensure each faculty member has the appropriate number of documented peer reviews of their teaching to be archived and used for the purpose of tenure and/or promotion and contract renewal.

### FREQUENCY:

**The frequency outlined by Academic Affairs is the following:**

*Adjunct Faculty:* one peer review every year.

*Career Instructor/Lecturer:* one peer review every year.

*Assistant Professor:* one peer review in each of the three years preceding tenure and promotion review; one peer review must have occurred before the 3-year review.

*Career Senior Instructor/Lecturer I:* one peer review every three years.

*Associate Professor:* one peer review every other year.

*Career Senior Instructor/Lecturer II:* one peer review every three years.

*Full Professor:* one peer review every three years.

### PROCEDURE:

1. The Department's Teaching Effectiveness Committee will assign trained peer reviewers by week two of fall term. The committee will track when peer reviews have occurred, and by who, to ensure that the frequency of review described by academic affairs has been met.
2. The Committee Chair will send out an email at the beginning of each term with a reminder regarding the peer review pairs assigned, and the necessary paperwork (COPUS template, Peer Review Policy, Peer Review Template, Teaching Practices Inventory link), along with the background article for both instruments (Smith et al., 2013 COPUS; Wieman & Gilbert, 2014 TPI). The **faculty being reviewed will take responsibility** for the scheduling of the date(s) to

#### DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY

1240 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1240

T (541) 346-4107 F (541) 346-2841

*An equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act*

observe the class, and the date to meet for follow-up discussion. They will also send the Reviewer a syllabus, and provide them guest access to the Canvas course site.

NOTE: reminder to the faculty member completing the Teaching Practices Inventory (TPI) that they must be only thinking about the course being reviewed when filling out the TPI. Also, once the TPI is complete – **email the Department’s Teaching Effectiveness Committee Chair to receive the calculated total score and the Report as a .pdf).**

3. The Peer Reviewers will use the Classroom Observation Protocol for Undergraduate STEM (COPUS) electronically during the classroom observation to record the activities of the students and the faculty during each 2-minute interval for at least one full class period. More than one class period may be necessary if each class session is highly diverse (i.e.: faculty led class periods vs. student presentations or in-class student project preparation).

4. Prior to the follow-up meeting, the Peer Reviewer will email COPUS data (with totals and graphs) and the TPI report to the faculty being reviewed. *The TPI report & score need to be requested from the Teaching Effectiveness Committee Chair (who can download them from Qualtrics).*

5. During the follow-up meeting, the Peer Reviewer will bring a hard copy of the TPI report and the scoring sheet to facilitate a discussion regarding evidence-based teaching practices. Then, the Peer Reviewer will ask the following questions (adapted from Ken Bain’s What the Best College Teachers Do) and document the responses:

1. How do people learn?
2. What will your students be able to do as a result of learning in your class?
3. What do you do to help students to achieve these goals (described in #2)?
4. How do you and the students get feedback about student learning along the way?
5. How do you evaluate your efforts to foster student learning?
6. What can I and/or the HPHY Department do to further support for your efforts?

6. Within two weeks of the end of the term in which the review was conducted, the Peer Reviewer will complete the report using the department template and send it to the individual being reviewer for editorials or follow-up discussion. The edited final version is then sent to the faculty being reviewed, the Department Head, the Teaching Effectiveness Committee Chair and the HPHY Business Manager to be placed in the faculty file.

7. Each Peer Review will likely create 6 hours of work for the Reviewer: 2 hour class observation, 2 hour follow-up discussion, 2 hour report completion.

**DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN PHYSIOLOGY**

1240 University of Oregon, Eugene OR 97403-1240

T (541) 346-4107 F (541) 346-2841

### **PEER REVIEW WRITTEN REPORT TEMPLATE OVERVIEW**

(see word document template for use when completing report, it has helpful language and list of all evidence-based teaching practices):

**Section 1:** Overview - Indicate whether the visit was scheduled or unscheduled, the course name/number, time and date, and the topics under discussion that day. Include the context of the course, type and level of students (majors/non-majors, freshmen/seniors, elective/required course).

**Section 2:** Data Collected - Interpretation and discussion of data collected from COPUS, TPI, and answers to the six follow-up meeting questions.

**Section 3:** Recommendations - Provide recommendations to the individual being reviewed that will continue to increase the use of evidence based teaching methods, and continue to create the best learning outcomes for the students (go back through the list of evidence based practices and consider suggesting some that were not included, but could be based on the course environment).

**Signature, name and title/rank of reviewer, date**

Appendix: COPUS & TPI results

### **References:**

Bain K. (2004) *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.

Smith M., Jones F., Gilbert S., Wieman C. (2013) *The Classroom Observation Protocol for Undergraduate STEM (COPUS): A New Instrument to Characterize University STEM Classroom Practices*. *CBE – Life Sciences Education*, 12 p618-627.

Wieman C. & Gilbert S. (2014) *The Teaching Practices Inventory: A New Tool for Characterizing College and University Teaching in Mathematics and Science*. *CBE – Life Sciences Education*, 13, p552-569.