

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

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. For the review the first time a large-enrollment course is taught, the faculty mentors of the instructor will carry out the review, and no report will be forwarded beyond that to the instructor. For third year and tenure reviews, two faculty committee members from the Curriculum Committee are assigned to each faculty member to be reviewed.
2. The two raters 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.
3. The raters observe the first class and independently fill out class observation rating forms (Table 1). Soon afterward (within a week) they meet to reconcile their ratings of each of the ten items on the form and enter the reconciled ratings on a consensus form. If the raters cannot agree on how to rate an item, an average of their individual ratings is entered. The same procedure is subsequently used for the second class observation.
4. After the classroom visits, the raters independently fill out course material rating forms (Table 2) and reconcile them to arrive at a consensus rating.
5. The Curriculum Committee members or the mentors draft a letter that summarizes and discusses the instructor's strengths and areas that need improvement. The draft is delivered to the instructor with an invitation to meet with the evaluators to discuss the findings. For third-year and tenure review, the evaluators may then choose to modify the draft letter, in light of this discussion with the instructor.
6. For third-year reviews, the final letter is then sent to the Promotion and Merit Committee, with a copy to the mentors. For tenure reviews, the final letter is then sent to the Tenure Panel.
7. All reviewed instructors are encouraged to meet with the Curriculum Committee to discuss the evaluations and to formulate measures they might take to improve their teaching.

Each rater spends about seven hours on this process per faculty member: two meetings with the faculty member, two observing classes, three reviewing course materials, reconciling forms, and preparing or proofreading a report. This is roughly the amount of time spent in a semester on a college or university committee that meets once a month for two hours.

Approved by the Curriculum Committee: October 23, 2009

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.

	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
The instructor						
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						

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.

	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inadequately	Not at all	No basis for assessment
The instructor						
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 notes are well organized and clearly written	5	4	3	2	1	
Supplementary handouts and web pages 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 CTOOLS 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) _____