

ECOLOGY AND EVOLUTIONARY BIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN PEER REVIEW PROTOCOL FOR UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING

Peer reviews of undergraduate teaching are used in EEB as part of the third year and tenure review processes for tenure track faculty, as well as for major reviews of Lecturers. In the past, they were also routinely used when a new assistant professor was first teaching a course. The CRLT midterm student feedback process has largely replaced this, but any faculty in the department, including assistant professors teaching their first course, are welcome to request a peer review of teaching; these are referred to as 'self-initiated' reviews below. The goal of the peer review of teaching is to help identify the strengths of a course and instructor, and areas that might be modified and improved. The peer reviews of teaching provide information about teaching from colleagues with experience teaching EEB courses.

The procedure used for the peer review of teaching is as follows:

1. Faculty to be reviewed are identified by the Chair at the beginning of the term in which peer review is to be carried out. The timeline for peer reviews of teaching that are associated with tenure reviews should be discussed by the faculty member and the Chair at the start of the academic year before the tenure dossier is submitted (e.g., early Fall semester for a submission the following Fall). Because of the timing of the tenure review process (including College deadlines), the peer review of teaching should be carried out during the academic year prior to when the candidate submits their dossier to the College. Peer reviews of teaching that are associated with third year reviews will generally take place during the same academic year as the third year review. Peer reviews of teaching that are associated with major reviews of Lecturers will generally occur during the semester in which the major review is being submitted. Third year, tenure, and major reviews should be done for an instructor's larger enrollment course when possible.
2. For major, third year, and tenure reviews, two faculty committee members from the Undergraduate Affairs Committee are assigned to each faculty member to be reviewed. For tenure reviews, both of the reviewers must be tenured faculty; if it is not possible to identify two tenured faculty who are on the Undergraduate Affairs Committee for a particular peer review of teaching that is part of a tenure review, other tenured faculty should be identified by the Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. Similarly, for major and third year reviews, if it is not possible for two faculty from the Undergraduate Affairs Committee to carry out the review, other faculty should be identified by the Chair in consultation with the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. For self-initiated reviews, the two reviewers can be chosen from members of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee, from a faculty member's departmental mentors, or other appropriate faculty in the department who have taught similar courses.

3. The two reviewers meet with the instructor to arrange two dates on which classes will be observed, discuss the instructor's plans for those classes, request course materials to be reviewed, and go over the two rating forms with the instructor. The instructor should add the reviewers to the course Canvas site as observers to facilitate review of course materials.
4. The reviewers observe the first class and independently fill out class observation rating forms (Table 1). The same procedure is subsequently used for the second class observation. After the classroom visits, the reviewers independently fill out course material rating forms (Table 2). The reviewers then meet and reconcile any differences in rating to arrive at a consensus rating.
5. Soon after the second class observation (within a week), the reviewers meet to reconcile their ratings of each of the items on the form and enter the reconciled ratings on a consensus form; this should result in one consensus version of Table 1 and one consensus version of Table 2. If the reviewers cannot agree on how to rate an item, an average of their individual ratings is entered.
6. The reviewers draft a letter that summarizes and discusses the instructor's strengths and areas that need improvement. The draft is delivered to the instructor, along with the consensus tables, with an invitation to meet with the evaluators to discuss the findings. For major, third-year, and tenure reviews, the evaluators may then choose to modify the draft letter in light of this discussion with the instructor; the instructor will receive any updated letter.
7. For third-year reviews, the final letter and consensus tables are then sent to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies. The Associate Chair then sends the letter and consensus tables to the Chair who sends them to the Promotion and Merit Committee, with a copy to the faculty mentors. For major reviews, the final letter and consensus tables from the reviewers are sent to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies who then forwards them on to the Chair, who forwards them to the Major Review Panel. For tenure reviews, the final letter and consensus tables from the reviewers are sent to the Associate Chair for Undergraduate Studies who then forwards them on to the Chair, who forwards them to the Tenure Review Panel.

Approved by the Curriculum Committee: October 23, 2009

Revisions approved by the Undergraduate Affairs Committee: January 16, 2024

Revisions approved by the Executive Committee: January 19, 2024

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
 PEER REVIEW TABLE 1
 Class Observation Checklist

Course Number _____ Course Name _____

Instructor: _____ Date of Observation _____

Rough Estimate of Class Size on Date of Observation _____

Circle your responses to each of the ten questions, then add comments below the table.

The instructor	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
1-was well prepared for class	5	4	3	2	1	
2-was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	
3- was enthusiastic about the subject matter	5	4	3	2	1	
4-spoke clearly, audibly, and confidently	5	4	3	2	1	
5-made effective use of relevant illustrations/ examples/ visual aids	5	4	3	2	1	
6-asked stimulating and challenging questions, achieving active student involvement	5	4	3	2	1	
7-effectively held the class's attention	5	4	3	2	1	
8- treated students impartially and with respect	5	4	3	2	1	
9-left sufficient time for questions both within the lecture and afterwards	5	4	3	2	1	
10- shows awareness of students' reactions to course material and is aware when students struggle with topics	5	4	3	2	1	

Overall rating: add the circled responses and divide by 10: _____ (note divide by appropriate number if there was no basis for some answers)

What worked well in the class? (continue on back as needed)

What could have been improved? (continue on back as needed)

Rater(s) _____

Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
 PEER REVIEW TABLE 2
 Course Material Checklist

Course Number _____ Course Name _____

Instructor: _____ Date of Evaluation _____

Circle your responses to each of the ten questions, then add comments below the table.

The instructor	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
Course content includes the appropriate topics	5	4	3	2	1	
Course content reflects the current state of the field	5	4	3	2	1	
Course learning objectives are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1	
Course policies and rules are clear and appropriate	5	4	3	2	1	
Lecture materials are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1	
Supplementary handouts and materials are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1	
Assignments are consistent with objectives and appropriately challenging	5	4	3	2	1	
Tests are consistent with learning objectives and appropriately challenging, clearly written and reasonable in length	5	4	3	2	1	
Student work demonstrates fulfilling the learning objectives	5	4	3	2	1	
Use of Canvas is appropriate and adequate	5	4	3	2	1	

Overall rating: add the circled responses and divide by 10: _____ (note: divide by appropriate number if there was no basis for some answers)

What are the strengths of the course materials? (continue on back as needed)

What could have been improved? (continue on back as needed)

Rater(s) _____