

PEER EVALUATION FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION GUIDANCE DOCUMENT & DESKTOP REVIEW AND CLASSROOM OBSERVATION TEMPLATES

PURPOSE

The purpose of Peer Evaluation of Teaching is to provide evidence of faculty distinction in teaching and learning for Division and University Review Committees (DRCs and URC) reviewing applications for tenure and promotion at the University of the Fraser Valley.

Peer Evaluations provide insight into an instructor's teaching philosophy, expectations, and methods. They include a written assessment of a Candidate's teaching by a tenured faculty member, herein identified as the "peer evaluator" in their division or discipline, using this approved evaluation form, which includes both a desktop review of materials used in the course and at least one in-class teaching observation on a date selected by the Candidate.

This document provides templates for both the desktop review and classroom observation components (including face-to-face and remote learning environments) of the peer evaluation process. Where there is no synchronous teaching or learning activity in a class, the in-class teaching observation will consist of a review of learning materials and activities for one unit or module, typically over the course of a week, as selected by the Candidate.

Tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are required to have completed two peer evaluations of two different courses or modules in one year for each year in the period between the end of the initial probationary period and the application for tenure. This normally results in four peer evaluations of teaching completed in years three and four prior to application for tenure.

Associate Professors applying for promotion to Professor are required to have completed peer evaluations of two different courses or modules in one year, in two of the three years preceding application for promotion. This typically results in four peer evaluations completed leading up to the application for Professor.

For semester-based programs, the peer evaluations will occur in two different semesters. In programs where a desktop review is not practical (e.g., clinical teaching), an in-class teaching observation will suffice.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Normally, peer evaluators will be tenured faculty in the applicant's own Division or discipline, but they may be chosen from a cognate discipline at UFV, from a similar or cognate discipline at another university, or, in exceptional cases, professionals with expertise in evaluating post-secondary teaching in the applicant's discipline. It is the applicant's responsibility to justify in their Dossier how or why the peer evaluator has the experience and qualifications to provide an objective, fair and transparent assessment of the course being reviewed.

Applicants should make available to the peer evaluator all documentation (e.g. syllabi, handouts,

assignments, tests and exams or any other supporting material) related to the course under review.

Materials that can be used in Peer Evaluations include, but are not limited to materials that:

- communicate course policy and practices (e.g. syllabi, rules for discussion, teaching evaluation instruments, etc.);
- communicate content (e.g. course-packs, bibliographies, handouts, multimedia, etc.);
- serve as assignments and assess student performance (e.g. tests, exams, directions for classroom exercises, etc.); and/or
- provide instructor feedback on student work (graded papers, field journals or reports, etc.).

Peer evaluators should ensure that, in addition to the materials provided by the faculty member, they have access to any contextual information (e.g. provided by the department, official calendar copy, typical student demographic, etc.), that could have a material bearing on the assessment.

PROCEDURES

For more details on peer evaluations of teaching, see the [Terms & Procedures for Tenure and Promotion](#), Definitions (g), and Section 8(b).

There are two components to this form, **BOTH** of which will be completed as part of each peer evaluation of teaching:

1) [DESKTOP REVIEW](#)

The desktop review will be implemented regardless of delivery mode. Prior to the start of the course, the instructor and the peer evaluator should meet to discuss the general background, parameters and goals of the course under review. Peer evaluators should ensure that they have access to all the course content (e.g. Brightspace Materials) required for an objective, fair, and transparent assessment of the course. Complete the desktop review on the template provided. See below for granting of Brightspace access to a peer evaluator.

2) [CLASSROOM OBSERVATION](#)

Form to be used for all classroom environments (in-person, online synchronous or asynchronous, hybrid).

In-person, Online Synchronous, and Hybrid* Courses

Before the classroom visit and following the desktop review, the instructor will indicate to the peer evaluator:

- where in the course syllabus this class fits;
- the topic and context of the class;
- the instructional methods to be used;
- the expected learning outcomes of the class; and
- comments on the general nature and characteristics of the class.

On or before the day of the classroom observation, the instructor will inform the class that a peer evaluator will be present. For in-person or synchronous online courses, the peer evaluator will enter the learning environment before the class (or equivalent) begins and remain for as long as is necessary to complete their observation (typically the duration of the class).

*For hybrid courses the Peer Evaluator and instructor can choose which format to observe (in-person observation or online evaluation).

Asynchronous / Remote Courses

For asynchronous online / remote courses, the peer evaluator will access the course for a period of one week and will observe the instructional methods during this time.

Following the desktop review, the instructor and peer evaluator agree on the dates they will have access to the course from within Brightspace: including course materials, student discussion boards and participation, (the “Brightspace Materials”).

The peer evaluator then requests access to the course through the [Faculty Course Enrolment Form](#) providing the peer evaluator with “Evaluator” status in the live course. “Evaluator” status grants the peer evaluator with access to the Brightspace materials provided for the period specified by the instructor.

Please note: Peer evaluators must not access or view the student gradebook for the course and are not permitted to copy or otherwise maintain any of the Brightspace Materials.

To ensure the peer evaluator only reviews Brightspace materials and specified content for the allotted time period – rather than reviewing the online course in its entirety and outside of the particular week designated by the instructor – IT Services is able to view a log of the peer evaluator’s movements in the course.

Peer evaluators who are not UFV Faculty will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement prior to being provided with access to the Brightspace Materials.

Submission of Peer Evaluation:

On completion of both the desktop review and classroom observation components of the peer evaluation, the peer evaluator and the Candidate will meet to discuss the results of the observation and desktop review, and the Candidate will be provided with the opportunity to respond in writing to the peer evaluator’s report within one week of the meeting. The peer evaluation and the Candidate’s response, if any, will be compiled into one form kept by the instructor for inclusion in their Tenure and Promotion File (TPF).

DESKTOP REVIEW FORM

Faculty member (instructor):	
Course:	
Peer Evaluator:	
Date(s) of review:	

Instructions

Rate the course in each of the categories and comment, as required, in the space under each heading. By completing this form, you confirm that you are aware of and agree to comply with the procedures outlined in the Peer Evaluation for Tenure and Promotion Guidance Document.

Rating	Definition
5	Exceeds Level of Expected Qualities
4	Meets Level on All Qualities
3	Meets Level on Most Qualities
2	Meets Level on Some Qualities
1	Meets No or Few Expected Qualities
N/A	Not Applicable

Course Syllabus	Rating
Has comprehensive summary description of course	
Learning outcomes are clearly stated	
Consistent with official course outline	
Contents consistent with departmental/School guidelines	
Reflects current state of the discipline	
Uses readings that reflect current scholarship in discipline	
Assignment load, including readings, is appropriate	
Prepares students for courses that require this course as a prerequisite	
Communicates helpful positive attitude	
Adequately conveys challenge of course	
Formatting is accessible	
Grammatically correct	
Indicates relevant policies on academic integrity, penalties for late work, making up missed classes, special requirements, use of electronic devices, etc.	
Grading policy is consistent with university and departmental/School guidelines	
Calendar and dues dates clearly laid out	
Calendar is realistic and assignment due dates spaced appropriately	
Assignments and class topics demonstrate focus on active student engagement	
Indicates that students receive timely feedback	
Comments:	

Course Materials / Resources	Rating
Supplement course content	
Contain accurate contents	
Pitched at appropriate course level	
Have adequate levels of detail	
Comments:	

Course Tests, Exams, Assignments, and Evaluation Methods	Rating
Clear instructions	
Appropriately weighted for course material	
Assignments, assessments, and evaluation topically reflective of the syllabus	
Aligned to learning outcomes	
Well laid-out, written clearly, legible, and organized	
Includes a variety of assessment and evaluation methods (where possible)	
Appropriately timed for successful completion	
Comments:	

Instructor Feedback and Comments on Student Work (if Available)	Rating
Feedback is clear	
Feedback is legible	
Feedback is supportive of student efforts	
Feedback is appropriate to assignment / assessment	
Constructive suggestions are provided	
Feedback is timely	
Comment is motivational	
Comments:	

Overall Desktop Review Rating	Rating
Comments and areas for further development:	

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION (IN-PERSON OR ONLINE)

Faculty member (instructor):	
Course:	
Number of students registered:	
Number of students present:	
Peer Evaluator:	
Date(s) of observation:	
Venue (in-person, online synchronous, online asynchronous, hybrid):	

Instructions

Rate the course in each of the categories and comment, as required, in the space under each heading. Indicate in the last two sections the instructor's strengths, areas for improvement, and recommendations for improvement.

Rating	Definition
5	Exceeds Level of Expected Qualities
4	Meets Level on All Qualities
3	Meets Level on Most Qualities
2	Meets Level on Some Qualities
1	Meets No or Few Expected Qualities
N/A	Not Applicable

Knowledge of Subject	Rating
Demonstrates command of subject matter	
Demonstrates ability to convey relevance of subject matter	
Engages students in knowledge development of the subject	
Draws on research / scholarship in teaching the subject	
Comments:	

Instructional Approaches / Communication Skills	Rating
<i>Presentation</i>	
Explains ideas clearly	
Shows enthusiasm	
Instruction is varied	
Instruction is at an appropriate level for students	
Language is at an appropriate level of students	
Voice is clear, audible, and dynamic	
Instructor presence and attentiveness support student engagement	

Comments on presentation:	
<i>Use of Technology & Media</i>	
Whiteboard or online material is organized, clear, and easy to read	
Whiteboard or online material is well organized	
Technology / media used is appropriate	
Technology / media is used effectively	
Comments on Use of Media & Technology:	

Question Answering / Response to Students	Rating
Responds appropriately to student questions and comments	
Uses student questions and comments to extend / enhance topics (in-person or synchronous courses)	
Accessible online for help and consultation (asynchronous courses)	
Approachable to discuss course-related matters in learning environment (asynchronous courses)	
Comments:	

Learning Environment	Rating
<i>Organization and Management</i>	
Defines learning outcomes / presents overview for the class	
Effectively organizes situations to meet the learning outcomes of the class	
Uses class time effectively / pacing is appropriate	
Creates an inclusive, welcoming, and respectful learning environment	
Comments on Organization and Management:	
<i>Student Responsiveness</i>	
Uses instructional methods encouraging student participation in the learning process	
Encourages critical thinking and analysis	
Provides opportunities for students to contribute to their learning experience	
Comments on Student Responsiveness:	

Instructor Feedback and Comments on Student Work if Available	Rating
Feedback is clear	
Feedback is legible	
Feedback is supportive of student efforts	
Feedback is appropriate to assignment / assessment	
Constructive suggestions are provided	
Feedback is timely	
Comment is motivational	
Comments:	

Overall Classroom Observation Rating	Rating
Comments and areas for further development:	