

## **Peer Evaluation of Teaching in the College of Pharmacy**

Data collected from peer evaluation of teaching represent a key measure for evaluating the effectiveness of a faculty's instructional effort. Peer evaluation of teaching is not intended to replace students' evaluations of teaching, but instead represents a method for evaluating aspects of teaching that cannot be evaluated by students. All faculty members who have any level of instructional effort, professional or graduate, shall have their teaching evaluated. In addition, all faculty members with instructional effort are expected to occasionally serve as peer reviewers to ensure universal participation and representation of all faculty members in the program.

### **Formative Evaluation**

Formative evaluation is a prospective process that examines a faculty's current teaching competence and develops a plan for improvement in the future. Formative peer evaluation is done by faculty for faculty. The purpose of formative peer evaluation is to improve the quality of teaching; not to determine the rewards that are appropriate for faculty.

Each faculty member is responsible for assuring that s/he is the subject of a formative peer evaluation for teaching in a required departmental professional course or in a core departmental graduate course, at least once every six years during periods when the faculty member has a teaching commitment. Generally, a formative evaluation will alternate with a summative evaluation so that each faculty member receives either a summative or formative evaluation at least once every three years. A chair may ask a faculty member to be evaluated more frequently.

A formative peer evaluation of teaching should be done by at least two faculty. A third reviewer may be selected who has expertise in measuring the process of teaching (e.g., from OIR). Peer reviewers should be selected by the faculty member who is to be evaluated based on whomever s/he believes to be potentially most beneficial to him/her. Peer reviewers may observe the teaching of the faculty member to be evaluated by watching the faculty member on videotape or by attending at least two lectures, discussions, seminars, or laboratories of the professor being evaluated. Peer reviewers should also review syllabi, reading assignments or other assignments, exams and other assessment materials, and the results of assessments (both the aggregate results and a representative sample of individual results). Peer reviewers should meet with a group of students in the course and perform a small group instructional diagnostic (SGID). It is important for the faculty member who is being evaluated to provide the reviewers with evidence that the course objectives have been met. If possible, this evidence should be based on predetermined criteria.

The two faculty reviewers should meet with the faculty member being reviewed to discuss results of the evaluation. During the discussion, a plan for improvement should be developed to include evaluation criteria that can be used by future peer reviewers. A written evaluation should be provided to the evaluated faculty member by the evaluators. This written evaluation is to be maintained in the evaluated faculty member's own personal file, and it is to be labeled "Personal and Confidential."

After a formative peer review of teaching has occurred, the reviewing faculty should report to the reviewed faculty member's department chair that the formative peer review has been completed. However, the substance of this review should not be reported to the faculty member's department chair.

Suggested SGID Questions:

1. What do you feel it was that Faculty X intended to teach you?
2. What do you feel you learned from Faculty X?
3. What do you feel you should have learned from Faculty X, but did not?
4. Were the things you learned from Faculty X consistent with what you understood to be the objectives of the course?
5. What aspects of Faculty X's teaching made it easier for you to learn?
6. What aspects of Faculty X's teaching made it more difficult for you to learn?
7. What recommendations do you have for improvement in Faculty X's teaching?

### **Summative Evaluation**

Summative evaluation is a retrospective process that examines a faculty's teaching over time, and it summarizes the faculty's competence as a teacher. Summative peer evaluation is done by faculty for administration. Its purpose is to provide a basis for determining the appropriate rewards for faculty.

Departments are encouraged to handle the summative evaluation by blinding the faculty member to be evaluated to the identity of the reviewers. However, it is recognized that there are situations where blinding will not be possible or even desirable.

Each faculty member and his/her department chair is responsible for assuring that, during any "critical" year, s/he is the subject of a summative peer evaluation for teaching in a required departmental professional course or in a core departmental graduate course. If the faculty member does not teach in a required course, then the evaluation shall occur in an elective course. A "critical" year is defined as one in which it is anticipated that there will be teaching-related administrative evaluation (tenure, promotion, teaching award) during the following year. A faculty member may, of course, decide to be the subject of a summative evaluation any time s/he wishes to do so. Since annual raises in salary may be based in part on teaching performance, and since department chairs will have the results of student evaluation of teaching every year, faculty may elect to have their own summative peer evaluation done each year. Generally, a summative evaluation will alternate with a formative evaluation so that each faculty member receives a summative or formative evaluation at least once every three years.

The department chair selects peer reviewers. A summative peer evaluation should be done by at least two faculty, including the department chair (or designee) and another faculty member (either from within the department, college, or outside the college). A department, at their option, may include a third faculty member from outside UF with expertise in the same field as the faculty member who is being evaluated. A fourth reviewer may be selected who has expertise in measuring the process of teaching (e.g., from OIR).

Peer reviewers should meet together and agree at this meeting as to the standard of performance against which the faculty's teaching is being measured. Generally, consistent criteria shall be used throughout the college as described in the attachment. Peer reviewers may observe the teaching of the faculty member to be evaluated by watching the faculty member on videotape or by attending at least two lectures, discussions, seminars, or laboratories of the faculty member being evaluated. The classroom meetings chosen for the observations may be announced or unannounced. Peer reviewers should also review syllabi, reading assignments or other assignments, exams and other assessment materials, and the results of assessments (both the aggregate results and a representative sample of individual results). Peer reviewers should examine materials from previous years in which the faculty member being evaluated has taught and determine to what extent improvements have been made over time. It is important for the faculty member being evaluated to provide the reviewers with evidence that improvement in teaching has occurred over time.

If a peer reviewer from outside the University is included then s/he will be asked to evaluate structural elements of teaching, as represented by a course syllabus (including, e.g., objectives, outline, assignments, and readings) and student evaluations. The following are examples of areas in which the peer reviewer should provide comments:

1. Are objectives present? Are they clear and apparently congruent with the course title?
2. Given the objectives of the course, what is your summary evaluation of the course organization, e.g., outline, sequence, lecture schedule, time allocations?
3. Given the objectives, course organization, and instructional materials, what is your summary evaluation of the instructional materials, text, reading, case studies, etc.?
4. Given the objectives, course organization, and instructional materials, what is your summary evaluation of the testing and examination materials?
5. Overall, would you judge the "structure" (items 1-4) as inadequate, adequate, good, or excellent? What recommendations do you have for improvement?
6. In addition, if you have seen Professor's teaching, your general impressions of as a teacher will be most welcome.

	Formative	Summative
Purpose	Prospective process examining a professor's current teaching. It is done by faculty for faculty. It is conducted to improve the quality of teaching; not to determine rewards.	Retrospective process examining professor's teaching over time and summarizes the professor's competence as a teacher. It is done by faculty for administration for the purpose of determining appropriate re-wards for faculty.
How often is an evaluation conducted?	At least once every six years but generally alternating with a summative evaluation so that each faculty member receives a summative or formative evaluation every three years. A chair may require more frequent evaluations.	During any "critical year" or anytime a professor requests one. Generally, alternating with a formative evaluation so that each faculty member receives a summative or formative evaluation every three years.
Who is responsible for ensuring that the evaluation is conducted?	The faculty member	The faculty member and the department chair

Who conducts the evaluation?	At least two faculty. A third reviewer may be selected who has expertise in measuring the process of teaching.	By two to four reviewers – including the department chair (or designee) and another faculty member (either from the department, college, or outside the college). Optional: a third faculty member from outside UF with content expertise in the same area as the faculty member being evaluated or a reviewer from OIR.
Who selects the peer reviewers?	The faculty member to be evaluated.	The chair. Blinding of the reviewers to the professor to be evaluated is encouraged.
What assessment elements do the peer reviewers consider?	By videotape or attending at least two lectures/discussions, seminars/laboratories; review syllabi, assignments, exams and results; meet with group of students.	COP reviewers meet to agree as to the standard of performance against which teaching is being measured (see guidelines for criteria); Watching a videotape or attending at least two