**College of Veterinary Medicine**

**Guidelines for Peer Review of Teaching**

The College of Veterinary Medicine and departments of Veterinary Biological Sciences, Veterinary Clinical Sciences, and Veterinary Preventive Medicine strongly endorse the use of peer review of instructional activities formatively as a way of consistently improving the quality of teaching and learning at our institution. In addition, CVM requires all faculty with teaching responsibilities to undergo two (2) formal summative evaluations of instructional activities during years of dossier review for promotion and/or tenure.

Peer review at the college is informed by evidence-based research on faculty evaluation systems and best practices/instructional innovation promoted by the Council for Professional Education. Guidelines, recommendations, and requirements established by the OAA Handbook of Policies and Procedures also inform college processes.

Faculty development in peer review for observers and instructors is supported by the Office of Teaching & Learning.

**GUIDING PRINCIPLES**

CVM seeks to sustain a culture in which teaching excellence is valued, encouraged, and rewarded. Formative evaluation of teaching is of paramount importance for developing instructional effectiveness and should be done in conjunction with and in addition to summative reviews. Guiding principles for CVM Peer Review of Instruction include the following:

* Peer review of teaching, including classroom observation, should be an integral part of faculty development efforts and teaching evaluation.
* The evaluation process itself must be presented as an opportunity to promote enhanced teaching and student learning; while there is a role for formative and summative evaluation, formative evaluation should be emphasized.  
  Peer review is only one component of a comprehensive teaching evaluation.  
  Peer review should provide a fair, effective, and uniform set of criteria for incorporation in promotion and tenure decisions.
* Peer reviewers should recognize the value of different teaching styles, techniques and approaches.
* Effective peer review incorporates elements from students, teaching teams, and the individual faculty members.
* Effective peer review should be a collaborative effort involving the reviewer and the instructor.
* Effective peer review is adapted to the type of teaching performed: didactic, team-based, laboratory, etc.
* Effective peer review and certainly summative peer review should occur as a series of events that evaluates multiple artifacts of teaching, not a one-time classroom visitation.
* Effective peer reviews contain specific, achievable recommendations for improvements in teaching in addition to summative evaluation.
* Effective peer reviews outline strategies for accomplishing recommended changes and available resources that might facilitate recommended changes.
* Summative reviews should be presented to the instructor being reviewed in writing, and instructors should be allowed to respond in writing to the reviews.

**STRUCTURES AND CONTEXTS OF TEACHING FOR REVIEW**

In departments at CVM, teaching of undergraduate, professional program, graduate students, residents, and postdoctoral trainees is recognized as an important objective. This teaching occurs in a variety of structures and contexts. While departments may have specific parameters, these components are generally eligible for peer review of instruction.

1. Teaching a university course – both credit and noncredit. Online course instruction is to be included in this category. This instruction may take the form of didactic professional and graduate classroom courses, laboratory courses, and clinical instruction in hospital or other practice contexts.

2. Developing/designing instructional materials, courses, and curricula for use in university and non-university settings.

**DEFINITIONS**

*Peer:* A faculty colleague of any rank in the same disciplinary department at the College of Veterinary Medicine, or at another institution.

*Interdisciplinary Peers:* Faculty or staff colleagues within OSU who can comment upon and give guidance and input regarding a faculty member’s pedagogy, including philosophy and approach to teaching, presentation skills, facilitations skills, assessment methods, and curriculum design and organization.

*Intradisciplinary Peers:* Faculty colleagues within a faculty member’s area of expertise (at OSU or another institution) who can comment upon and give guidance and input regarding a faculty member’s course content, including course outcomes/objectives, materials, and resources.

*Formative Evaluation:* Designed to contribute to the development of teaching. The purpose of formative evaluation is to validate or ensure that the goals of instruction are being achieved and to improve the instruction, if necessary, by means of identification and subsequent improvement of deficiencies, problematic aspects, or areas that might be more fully developed.

*Summative Evaluation:* Evaluation with the goal of assessing the quality of teaching performance/effectiveness. A summative review results in documentation that may inform decision-making on retention, promotion, and tenure.

*Teaching Philosophy:* A self-reflective statement regarding a faculty member’s conceptions of and beliefs about teaching and learning, a description of how he or she puts those into practice by providing concrete examples. Faculty seeking peer review for formative purposes are encouraged to share their teaching portfolio with a reviewer. Examination of a teaching philosophy is part of summative review processes.

*Teaching Portfolio:* A collection of work samples and reflective commentary that describes and documents teaching ability over career progression. A summary of teaching accomplishments and curation of examples of teaching and learning materials, a mechanism for reflecting upon teaching. Faculty with significant teaching duties are encouraged to keep a teaching portfolio, but portfolios are not required for submission to any VMC department. Typically, a portfolio contains:

* A statement of teaching philosophy.
* Description of teaching experiences/responsibilities.
* Evidence of teaching effectiveness: reflection on innovative instruction or scholarly teaching, summary of student feedback, department evaluations
* Teaching awards and recognition.
* Reflection on/a summary of professional development efforts.
* Course planning artifacts (sample learning modules/media, syllabi, lesson plans, assignments, exams).

**PROCESSES**

CVM faculty are encouraged to seek formative peer review on an annual basis, when implementing new instructional strategies, when designing or redesigning curriculum, or as a way of continually improving and refining instruction.

CVM faculty who are being reviewed for promotion or tenure are required to submit two (2) summative evaluations as part of their formal review process. These evaluations comprise at least two (2) separate observations of instruction by (2) peer reviewers.

Templates provided by the college are available for both formative and summative purposes, but formative evaluations are flexible and may be targeted to a focused review and processes determined by the peer reviewer and the faculty member. (For example, an instructor may request portions of a Carmen-Canvas course be reviewed, which would not require completion of any particular observation forms.)

For a summative review, the faculty member should:

* Select peer reviewers who are able to evaluate disciplinary content and/or pedagogy. (See definitions.)
* Be familiar with department guidelines, deadlines and requirements, as well as requirements for peer evaluation of teaching outlined in OAAPH.
* Identify the instructional session(s) to be reviewed during the semester.
* Request the peer review on a timeline that allows for a pre-review meeting/conference prior to the observation.
* Use the Preparing for Peer Review form to assist in thinking about areas for evaluation and gather materials to share with the peer reviewer.
* Meet with the peer reviewer to complete the Pre-observation of Instruction Form.
* Conduct the instructional session(s).
* Meet with the peer reviewer to review the Instructional Session Observation Form or Instructional Session Observation Form (Table).
* Review the formal evaluation report provided by the peer reviewer and submit responses to the peer reviewer if necessary or desired.

For a summative review, the peer reviewers should:

* Be familiar with department guidelines, deadlines. and requirements, as well as requirements for peer evaluation of teaching outlined in OAAPH.
* Work collaboratively with the faculty member requesting review to arrange pre- and post-observation meetings/conferences.
* Complete the Pre-observation of Instruction Form with the faculty member.
* Conduct the formal review.
* Meet with the faculty member to review the Instructional Session Observation Form or Instructional Session Observation Form (Table).
* Complete a formal evaluation letter or report (see Peer Reviewer Evaluation Outline).
* Submit a copy of the formal evaluation to the faculty member to review with a deadline for response if necessary or desired.
* Finalize the formal evaluation for submission to the appropriate department committee or designated official.