

Ontario Faculty Association Agreements: Student Questionnaires and Peer Evaluation of Teaching

July 2019

OCUFA

Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations
Union des associations des professeurs des universités de l'Ontario

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Student questionnaires and the language of evaluation.....	2
Student questionnaires and evaluation of teaching performance.....	3
Student questionnaires and career progress	6
Student questionnaires and confidentiality.....	8
Student questionnaires and student harassment of faculty members.....	10
Teaching evaluation and in-class peer observation	12
Context/purpose/occasion	14
Evaluator selection.....	15
Evaluator qualifications.....	16
Evaluation logistics.....	18
Evaluation criteria/standards.....	18
Evaluation results and report.....	19
Support for in-class peer evaluation	21
Conclusion	22
Appendix A: SQCT working group Principles for Student Questionnaires.....	23
Appendix B: Documentation for/evidence of/methods of evaluation of teaching.....	24
Appendix C: Documentation/Contents of teaching dossier	25
Appendix D: Factors to be accounted in assessing documentation/student questionnaires	28
Appendix E: Characteristics/descriptors of teaching effectiveness	29
Appendix F: In-class evaluation rubrics	30

Introduction

This report on faculty agreements and Student Questionnaires on Courses and Teaching (SQCT; also student questionnaires) is a companion to the [Report of the OCUFA Student Questionnaires on Courses and Teaching Working Group](#) released February 2019.¹ Having regard to issues of methodology, research ethics, and human rights, the public report proposes principles and general recommendations for the use and administration of student questionnaires – listed in Appendix A to this report. The key principles are that student questionnaires should be used for formative, developmental purposes only, and that the results should be confidential, except at member discretion. The public report is a strong statement to a wide audience, and therefore refrains from proposing specific measures which might be interpreted as proposals for “best practice.”

The working group did affirm, however, that best practice is respecting the terms of faculty agreements, and the rights of faculty associations to negotiate terms and conditions. As legacy instruments of Senate policy, student questionnaires are likely here to stay, albeit subject to the constraints on their use that faculty associations are able to secure in their agreements with employers.² This report provides a thematic summary of different provisions which circumscribe the use of student questionnaires found in Ontario agreements, including those of non-OCUFA contract faculty. It is a complement to the summary tables and agreement excerpts on teaching evaluation in the OCUFA collective agreement database.³

In addition to examining student questionnaires, the working group was asked to identify alternative methods of assessing teaching effectiveness. An exhaustive survey was impractical, but the working group did conclude that peer review should apply equally to teaching evaluation, and that in-class peer observation is the practice most consistent with that principle. Its operationalization in faculty agreements is covered in the final section, on teaching evaluation and in-class peer observation.

¹ The term faculty agreement is used to refer to both collective agreements and memoranda of agreement between faculty associations and employers. Although most are collective agreements, some memoranda of agreement include provisions applicable to student questionnaires and to teaching evaluation.

² The BC Court of Appeal upheld arbitrator McPhillips’ ruling that he did not have jurisdiction to hear a *policy* grievance over a new university policy on “student evaluations of teaching,” because the policy was issued by Senate rather than the Board of Governors. See *University of British Columbia and Faculty Association of the University of British Columbia (Policy grievance)*, (L.A., 2008-03-12), SOQUIJ AZ-51135634; *Faculty Association of the University of British Columbia v. University of British Columbia (B.C.A.C., 2010-04-20)*, 2010 BCCA 189, SOQUIJ AZ-50628510. The decision turned partly on the specific statute governing the university and on the terms of the collective agreement: rights grievances on the *application* of policy could still proceed. In Ontario, most faculty agreements include definitions for “University” and for the local variant of Board of Governors and Senate, sometimes by reference to governing statute. Many agreements define “Employer,” most often as the Board (and designates) but in one case the Employer is the University “acting through” the Board. Some collective agreements stipulate that University policies, others that Board policies, and their application must be consistent with the agreement. The range of other provisions bearing on student questionnaires is broad, and agreement-specific.

³ Where reference is made in this report to details not necessarily included in the database, OCUFA member associations are identified by institution name; for those with more than one bargaining unit for faculty members, the full-time tenure stream is designated by FT as a suffix, and the contract faculty by CF; non-OCUFA contract faculty agreements are denoted by the institution and union acronym, e.g., Ryerson-CUPE.

This report is based in part on a confidential survey of faculty associations, discussions of the OCUFA Grievance Committee, and informal conversations with faculty association representatives. It is specifically for OCUFA member associations, and is not for general distribution. With respect to student questionnaires, this report is organized according to vectors of potential hazard for association members and of corresponding provisions in faculty agreements which offer protection to members. The section on in-class peer observation is longer than the others, and organized in sub-sections corresponding to the types of issues with in-class observation identified by faculty association representatives.

Particular provisions and their combination vary between agreements. Coverage of them is intended neither to be exhaustive nor to offer illustrative examples of effective language. Appendices do list teaching evaluation related items compiled from Ontario faculty agreements, but no attempt is made to assemble a single model. How well different pieces will combine with existing language depends on the unique document that is each faculty agreement. The closest thing to a single vision for student questionnaires is the set of seven principles proposed by the working group. This report, like the public report by the working group, is intended as a resource for faculty associations to advance a vision for teaching and teaching evaluation that is suited to their own circumstances and priorities.

Student questionnaires and the language of evaluation

Terminology is often a holdover from or reflective of Senate policy on student questionnaires. Although they were commonly called Student Evaluations of Teaching or SETs, it is accepted now that students do not “evaluate” teaching in a manner compatible with performance evaluation, and that student questionnaires do not directly measure teaching effectiveness. The questionnaires might be as valid and reliable as claimed by advocates selling them (sometimes literally), but they measure student satisfaction, not teaching performance. Even supporters are settling on “Student Ratings of Instruction” as a less problematic label. The first decision of the working group was to adopt the term Student Questionnaires on Courses and Teaching, and SQCT or student questionnaires, in lieu of SETs.

Names aside, student questionnaires are expected to serve two purposes which are not necessarily compatible. There is the “formative” nature, which is to provide faculty members with feedback useful for the self-improvement of their teaching and development of their courses. There is also the “summative” use to which they are put – as summaries of putative performance evaluation at a particular moment in time. The questionnaires themselves include both formative questions ostensibly for the faculty member’s attention, and summative questions intended to elicit students’ composite summary opinion, e.g., “Overall the course...” or “I would [or not] recommend...”. It is the results from summative questions, or a summary report of them, which most often are designated for use in evaluating teaching performance.

Among faculty agreements in Ontario, there are different ways of framing student questionnaires as formative feedback for instructors rather than summative evaluations of performance. These include:

- Nomenclature: Evaluation is the most commonly used term in Ontario faculty agreements, but there are instances of others: student feedback, opinion survey, questionnaire, and ratings. Even if employers claim that student questionnaires are a proxy indicator of teaching performance, a name change does not, by itself, force them to alter that position.
- The report of a joint Ryerson University-Ryerson Faculty Association (Ryerson-RFA) committee, which proposes immediate discontinuation of the existing student questionnaire and its replacement with a “formative assessment tool” called the Assessment of Student Experience in a Course (ASEC).⁴ It follows an arbitration award by William Kaplan, in which he declared that student questionnaires could not be used to assess teaching effectiveness.⁵
- Statement of purpose: Provisions stipulating that student questionnaires are only for formative purposes are rare, but some faculty association agreements include language to the effect that:
 - The primary purpose is to aid faculty members’ self-assessment and improvement (Brock, Carleton, Nipissing-FT);
 - Questionnaires provide information to others (e.g., head of department), as prompted by questionnaire scores, to provide advice and support to members on improving their teaching (Wilfrid Laurier-CF, Carleton-CUPE, King’s-CUPE). The working group discussed a variation on this theme – that a member may be having other difficulties which are reflected in poor or decreasing scores, and which require support and/or accommodation for the member.
- Explicit recognition of the limits of student questionnaires: Some agreements acknowledge:
 - Student questionnaires are not tools for teaching evaluation on their own (Trent, Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Trent-CUPE);
 - The questionnaires are subject to (respondent) bias (Western);
 - Not all opinions expressed are relevant to the assessment of teaching (Trent-CUPE).

Student questionnaires and evaluation of teaching performance

The working group concluded that teaching evaluation requires a suite of tools, and that peer review should be the norm in evaluating teaching. For career steps leading to tenure or continuing status and promotion or contract renewal, teaching evaluation is consequential, and assessment methods should be commensurate. For members of equity-seeking groups, the implications for career progress and salary increments are especially acute. For the working group, student questionnaires do not meet the tests of methodological validity or peer review. Faculty association agreements frequently do provide for multiple methods to be used in evaluating teaching, but undue weight given to SQCT scores (and sometimes student comments) continues to be a factor in some cases of tenure denial.

⁴ Ryerson University and Faculty Association, *Report of the Joint FCS Committee*, June 7, 2019. NB: The authors included two Deans, an Associate Dean, and three faculty association representatives; as of the date of publication of this report, adoption of the Joint FCS Committee report by the university administration is pending.

⁵ Ryerson University v Ryerson Faculty Association, 2018 CanLII 58446 (ON LA), <<http://canlii.ca/t/hsqkz>> [William Kaplan]; cited hereafter as “Kaplan.”

Under faculty agreements, the variety of activities recognized as teaching is broader than the aspects of undergraduate teaching that student questionnaires purport to address.⁶ Teaching contributions may be identified in provisions specific to teaching evaluation (similar to the CAUT Evaluation of Teaching Performance Model Clause), or listed elsewhere with respect to the types of activities or evidence to be considered in evaluating teaching performance. It is peers, of course, who are best placed to assess the performance and effectiveness of a faculty member's unscheduled teaching, teaching innovations, and various contributions to course and program development, and to pedagogy. This report returns to peer review later; it suffices here to mention that the working group endorses in-class peer observation as a method more appropriate than student questionnaires for assessing the effectiveness and appropriateness of faculty members' pedagogical approaches and course material in practice, in class.

Mindful that many faculty members do like to use student questionnaire scores to illustrate their teaching expertise, and that reporting them is not discretionary in most cases, the working group discussed how the use of scores would be consistent with the principles articulated in the public report.⁷ The working group favours members' self-reporting about student responses and the inferences to be drawn – taking the formative purpose of student questionnaires at face value, and explaining how the insights provided are reflected or incorporated in pedagogical practice. The numbers do not “speak for themselves.” This is a variation on documentation already recommended for teaching dossiers.

Appendix B identifies the methods and types of documentation for evaluating teaching performance identified in Ontario faculty association agreements, and Appendix C lists contents of teaching dossiers described in agreements. The following are types of provisions in faculty association agreements which either set out to limit the influence of student questionnaires, or to provide a foundation for validating and incorporating the member narrative supported by the working group. These include:

- A stipulation that student questionnaires are not the exclusive method used for purposes of teaching evaluation (Brock, Laurentian, NOSM, Trent, Wilfrid Laurier-FT). A variation, and sometimes in addition, is to require that reviewers balance all aspects of teaching (NOSM, Queen's, Wilfrid Laurier-FT). Several contract faculty agreements specify that student questionnaires cannot be the sole basis for refusing reappointment (Guelph-CUPE, Ryerson-CUPE, UOIT-PSAC, York-CUPE). Two non-OCUFA contract faculty agreements have a limitation on the use of student questionnaire results as evidence in cases of discipline for failure to perform (Ryerson-CUPE, Toronto-CUPE).
- A stipulation that student questionnaires may not be used to assess teaching effectiveness: In his award in an interest arbitration, William Kaplan accepted expert evidence that student questionnaires do not measure teaching effectiveness and are inherently and systemically

⁶ Some institutions also administer them for graduate courses, depending on enrolment figures.

⁷ For many faculty, whether assembling annual reports or reviewing teaching dossiers, student questionnaire scores may be an easy shorthand in the face of workload issues. It is in that light the working group concludes that more resources for universities and faculty renewal should be forthcoming from the provincial government if its commitment to teaching quality is to be more than rhetorical.

biased, and therefore disallowed their use in this manner.⁸ While limiting the manner in which they are reported, he did not prohibit inclusion of SQCT results in files under review.

- The Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* proposes a three-stage instrument to solicit student feedback about their expectations and experience over the life of the course they are taking. There is no provision for students to rate the course or the instructor; faculty members would incorporate summaries of the ASEC responses in their teaching dossiers (Ryerson).
- A limit on the weight given to student questionnaires within the broader teaching evaluation: For example, an interest arbitration award by Kevin Burkett prescribes that they “count for no more than 10% of an individual professor’s assessment” for tenure, promotion and evaluation.⁹ Scoring rubrics which include weighting for student questionnaire scores are found in some per course contract faculty agreements, typically for right-of-first-refusal or seniority type review processes.
- Inclusion of student questionnaire scores at the option of the member. Still, even if student questionnaire results are not required documentation for teaching evaluation, they might still end up in the files being reviewed by committee members by virtue of being included in other required documentation such as annual reports or personnel files.
- Inclusion of the results from other survey instruments or questions of members’ own choosing (Carleton, NOSM, Ryerson, Queen’s, Wilfrid Laurier-FT).
- Evidence the member is responding to student feedback (Brescia). It is more common to suggest inclusion of examples of “course revision” in teaching dossiers. The form or content is not prescribed, but a member narrative of the type contemplated by the working group would be suitable. It is open-ended with respect to how members choose to describe how student questionnaires fit into their pedagogical practice, the factors they deem relevant to the interpretation of student responses, and how they did, or did not, assimilate the responses.
- A right to comment on/respond to contents of a member’s personnel and/or other files, such as tenure and promotion (Algoma-CF, Carleton, Ottawa, Ottawa-APTPUO). This is usually a right to rebuttal of negative material in a file, but not always (or not expressly) with respect to the student questionnaire results or student comments (where these may be included in the relevant files). As with the previous point, a member-generated narrative may address the administration and use of student questionnaires as part of pedagogical practice.
- Identification of factors to be taken into account: These typically are to be taken into consideration for teaching evaluation more broadly, but they are relevant to student questionnaire results specifically (Ottawa), and *a propos* for the next section. See Appendix D for a list of such factors identified in Ontario faculty association agreements.
- Required training for academic administrators and members of peer review committees regarding incipient and endemic bias in student questionnaires, so that results “can be

⁸ Kaplan, op. cit.

⁹ Mount Allison University v Mount Allison Faculty Association, 2015 CanLII 94980 (ON LA), <<http://canlii.ca/t/gp3c6>> [Kevin Burkett]; cited hereafter as “Burkett.”

considered in light of their actual and inherent limitations and with necessary context.”¹⁰ This is an extension, and more specific feature, of training which includes a component on equity (Ryerson, UOIT, Wilfrid Laurier-FT).

- The Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* recognizes that replacement of a quantitative, summative survey instrument with a qualitative, formative questionnaire will require initial support for faculty members incorporating ASECs into their teaching practice and reporting, and training for review committee members with respect to interpretation of ASEC feedback reported in teaching dossiers (Ryerson).

Student questionnaires and career progress

When the OCUFA Grievance Committee discussed student questionnaires in 2010 and again in 2016, the main concerns were with the misinterpretation and misuse of scores, and the consequences for career progress – contract status and contract renewal, tenure or continuing status and promotion, and salary increments. Student questionnaire scores also have been cited in cases of discipline for alleged failure to fulfill teaching responsibilities.

Common problems include the inappropriate use of “average” and unsuitable comparator groups.¹¹ By 2016, increasing use of online instruments and corresponding declines in response rates added concern about reliability of results to the ongoing questions about the validity of the uses to which the data were put. In its review of the methodological issues, the working group found that the problems run much deeper than the simplistic use of average scores and compromised response rates.

The working group is persuaded that student questionnaires are not valid for “summative” evaluation of teaching performance, full stop. Not only do they not measure teaching effectiveness, but there are too many confounding variables – notably respondent bias and the “halo effect” – to be taken into account to warrant use other than as feedback to members. Even ostensibly neutral matters like the length of time returning assignments become stand-ins for students’ desire to make a more general statement about their satisfaction.

¹⁰ Kaplan, op. cit. Advocates of student questionnaires for evaluation of teaching performance recommend training about the questionnaires and how to interpret results, presuming that problems with their use derive from lack of knowledge rather than from the instruments themselves. It follows from the working group’s position that training on the questionnaires would not be necessary if they were not used for evaluation, and, if they are used, that the training should be about bias and the unreliability of the results.

¹¹ In the context of student questionnaires, “average” is problematic in two principal ways. First, although it is commonplace to average scores from ordinal-categorical scales like those used for student questionnaires, doing so is not a valid mathematical operation. On its own and as long as the only scores being averaged are those of a single member, it is not an especially egregious error. It is the second use of average that is most detrimental – comparing a member’s scores against either a fictive average abstracted from the scale itself or an average of aggregated individual scores, and assessing a member’s scores as “below average.” In the latter case, depending on the actual distribution of scores, half of all faculty members could have less than average scores.

The working group therefore recommended that no comparisons should be made between one member's scores and those of any other instructor or group. At most, the only comparison should be a member's own scores over time. The stakes are disproportionately high for female, racialized, and LGBTQ2S+ members. The iterative effect of bias in student questionnaires on career progress and earnings is demonstrable; less obvious is the added workload many such members undertake to compensate for bias and attain acceptable scores. Faculty agreements do of course have clauses on discrimination that apply in these circumstances, but there appear to be no documented cases where grievances involving student questionnaires have been decided specifically on the question of whether student questionnaires are discriminatory in effect.

There are faculty agreements (e.g., Algoma, Ryerson) which append a copy of the student questionnaire. Another requires consultation with the faculty association on change to the instrument (Ottawa, Wilfrid Laurier-FT) and its consent for use of the results (Ottawa), while consultation through the Joint Committee is stipulated elsewhere (Nipissing). Two require the questions themselves be consistent with Academic Freedom and Discrimination and Harassment provisions in the agreement (Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF). And more recently several have provided for consultation on revised surveys, including the Ryerson-RFA joint committee prompted by Arbitrator Kaplan's award.

Not least because there were relatively few available, the working group did not analyze survey instruments, but did discuss the framing of the questions. They concluded the language should reflect the perspective of students as learner-participants, not as passive "observers" of faculty members as objects of evaluation. The three-stage, formative tool for soliciting and assessing students' experience developed and proposed in the Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* offers one example of what that might look like (Ryerson).

In the absence of language limiting student questionnaires to formative purposes, or prohibiting summative uses and comparative analyses, there is a variety of examples of faculty association agreement language which circumscribes the use of data from the questionnaires. These include:

- A requirement that statistical summaries include an explanation of terms used where the reader is evaluating teaching (Queen's).
- Specifying which questions may be used for purposes of evaluating an individual member, or which questions may be included in the statistical summary. These typically are summative questions such as "Overall the instructor..." rather than formative questions which also are included in the questionnaires. One contract faculty agreement prohibits inclusion of the "overall" rating from individuals' records for teaching assessment (Wilfrid Laurier-CF).
- The permissible content and forms of aggregation/analysis which may be included in the statistical summary. These variously include: mean; median; mode; standard deviation; distribution, number or frequency, and/or percentage of responses for each question; number of registered students and number of responses or response rate. One agreement (Ottawa) effectively prohibits the determination of a single, average score for a question.

- Provisions to inoculate against the misuse of “averages”: Arbitrator Kaplan also ruled that the numerical scale used in the Ryerson student questionnaires should be replaced by an alphabetical one, and that only the distribution of responses could be included in the file under review.¹²
- Permissible comparator(s), e.g., department, faculty.
- Provisions designed to address the reliability of the results:
 - The minimum number of responses;
 - The minimum response rate;
 - That the survey be conducted in class;¹³
 - That paper or online version is at discretion of the member (Carleton, Guelph, Ryerson).
- Exclude statistical analysis, but designate scores according to where they fall within a range: The Burkett award identified three – Above satisfactory, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory.¹⁴ This is similar to, but more specific than, statements for teaching evaluation overall are identified in a number of faculty agreements in Ontario. Additional categories include “outstanding” or similar, more commonly used terminology for teaching intensive faculty or for promotion.
- A minimum number of years of results to be included (Ottawa, Western);
- Time limits for retention of the data, or limits on the number of years of data which may be included (Laurentian, Saint Paul).

Student questionnaires and confidentiality

If student questionnaires were for formative purposes only, there would be little point in providing the results to any person other than the member. One challenge is the publication/dissemination of student questionnaire results. Even if they are available only on university intranets for the ostensible purpose of providing students with information to guide course selection, this continues to be an issue at some institutions. In this respect, the Ontario Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act (FIPPA) does not ensure that the results of student questionnaires are confidential and available only to faculty association members, and perhaps a limited number of others.¹⁵

A slightly different question is posed with respect to custodianship of the responses and the reports drawn from them. In both cases, of publication and custodianship, it falls primarily to language in faculty agreements to establish and maintain the confidentiality of the responses and results. Among the provisions that are directly relevant in this regard are those that:

¹² The working group did comment in the public report that, as positive a development the Kaplan award is, even a measure such as this underestimates the halo effect. The instrument proposed in the *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* does not include Likert-type scales at all; student responses are of a textual short answer type instead.

¹³ The Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* recommends ASECs be administered in-class, and that they initially be on paper, with plans to make them available for in-class, online completion in the future.

¹⁴ Burkett, op. cit.

¹⁵ On FIPPA: University of Windsor and University of Windsor Faculty Association (Policy grievance), (L.A., 2007-02-19), SOQUIJ AZ-51135637; University of Windsor Faculty Association v. University of Windsor, 2008 CanLII 23711 (ON SCDC), <<http://canlii.ca/t/1wzvvg>>

- Deem student questionnaire responses to be the property of the member (Brock).
- Stipulate results will not be released publicly without prior consent of member (Algoma-CF, Guelph, Nipissing-CF, NOSM). One non-OCUFA contract faculty agreement also states that members shall not suffer reprisal for refusing such consent (McMaster-CUPE).
- Stipulate that anonymous comments are for the faculty member only (Carleton, Nipissing-FT, Nipissing-CF, Western).
- Bar anonymous material in personnel file: exemptions for student questionnaire scores are common.
- Restrict access to personnel file (a.k.a. employee, member, official, or performance and conduct file) to designated persons.
- Specify the authorized audiences/recipients of scores.

Two other challenges have arisen with the increased use of online instruments and the employment (by some institutions) of third party providers to administer the surveys. One is the prospect that third parties are storing questionnaire responses and anonymous comments contrary to existing provisions in faculty agreements. It is compounded by the prospect that the data are vulnerable to hacking or subject to the laws of other countries if they are included in traffic under those jurisdictions – the United States Patriot Act, for example.

A second potential source of concern is the possibility – facilitated and made attractive by proliferation of online platforms used by universities – that the third parties or institutional analysis staff may make “secondary use” of the data for commercial or internal purposes.¹⁶ The *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* (TCPS2) does not require that student questionnaires be subject to research ethics review, but does set out criteria for secondary use and data linkage.¹⁷ It is not certain that use of SQCT data by institutional analysis personnel in that fashion – predictive analytics for student support services, say, or linking student outcomes and SQCT data at the level of individual faculty members – would constitute research as defined by the TCPS2 and therefore be subject to ethics review. If it is, the prospect that an institution could lose Tri-Council funding for failing to adhere to TCPS2 guidelines would provide one layer of protection.

In both cases, faculty agreement language on the confidentiality of personnel files, limitations on access to the information on student questionnaires and related provisions are the obvious protective measures, but the first step is simply to obtain the necessary information. The questions are much the same whether the issue is data storage or secondary use of student questionnaire data. Whether under

¹⁶ No instances of selling these data have come to light, but some third party providers in the United States evidently do incorporate data into existing proprietary databases, which might be used to test their product for quality control purposes. The results are then used commercially to tout the validity and reliability of their product.

¹⁷ The [*Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans*](#) (2014) lists “[q]uality assurance and quality improvement studies, program evaluation activities, and performance reviews...” as activities not requiring research ethics board review; student questionnaires are identified as an example. Secondary use and data linkage require that ethics review criteria regarding consent and confidentiality be satisfied.

faculty agreement provisions or through meetings of a Joint Committee, the type of information faculty associations might seek includes:¹⁸

- A copy of the agreement with the third party.
- Information on how the student questionnaires are administered, including:
 - Confidentiality protocols covering such items as:
 - Identification of persons eligible for access;
 - Criteria for access;
 - Anonymity for respondents;
 - Security measures and hacking prevention;
 - Data management, including:
 - Location(s) of storage;
 - Number of copies stored;
 - Management of multiple entries;
 - Traffic between sites, including provision to avoid the United States;
 - Data retention, including:
 - Length of time;
 - Provision for data deletion.

Student questionnaires and student harassment of faculty members

A problem which was not flagged in 2010, but was at the forefront for the OCUFA Grievance Committee in 2016 is the rising incidence of abusive language in the anonymous comments portion of online student questionnaires. One member referred to the questionnaires as “institutionally sanctioned instruments of harassment.”

There are existing statutory protections under the Occupational Health and Safety Act (OHSA) and the Ontario Human Rights Code which impose legal obligations on employers to provide workplaces free of harassment. All university employers are required to have policies and procedures in place to address workplace harassment, of which harassment via student questionnaires is an instance. There also is developing case law in analogous situations regarding an obligation on employers to protect employees from harassment on social media, where the exposure arises as a consequence of employer-mandated use.¹⁹

Faculty association agreements typically have provisions dealing with discrimination and harassment, although the manner varies with respect to which university policies and procedures are referenced or substitute language is provided. There appears to be only two instances in which student questionnaires must conform to academic freedom and discrimination and harassment provisions (Wilfrid Laurier-FT,

¹⁸ Following advice provided by Stephen Stuart, Professors Association of Saint Paul University.

¹⁹ *Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 113 v. Toronto Transit Commission (Use of Social Media Grievance)* [2016] O.L.A.A. No. 267.

Wilfrid Laurier-CF), and none in which student behaviour in completing student questionnaires is addressed specifically in articles on harassment and discrimination.

As a more preventive measure, the working group advocates the adoption of the principle of informed, active consent by students each time they complete student questionnaires. Among other things, such consent would advise them of the institution's policies on harassment and violence and warn them that, in the event of an investigation, their identity would be confidential but no longer anonymous. The closest examples of faculty agreement language along these lines include:

- A stipulation that students are instructed to treat the questionnaire seriously, and an admonition that comments which are vexatious and harassing are inappropriate (Western).
- Requirements that the instrument or changes to it be subject to consultation with or agreement of the faculty association (Ottawa, Nipissing-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-FT).

There is a further consideration. According to reports received by the working group, at least two institutions had been removing offending comments from the documentation provided to faculty members. As the public report outlines, this practice is problematic in two different ways. For one thing, without clear rules and commitments there is no certainty that the corresponding scores are removed from the sample. For another, in the absence of requirements that the affected faculty member is informed of the comments, and given an opportunity to determine whether and how to proceed, their legal rights under the OHSA and their faculty agreement rights will have been abridged, and, perhaps their safety jeopardized.

There is no exemplary language in faculty agreements in Ontario, and faculty associations may wish to consult with legal counsel, but a task force established jointly by UOIT and the UOIT Faculty Association (UOIT-UOITFA) has issued several recommendations on these and related issues.²⁰ Drawing on the recommendations from the UOIT-UOITFA report, and the working group's own discussion of student questionnaires and harassment, considerations include establishing:

- A process for redaction or deletion of inappropriate, discriminatory, abusive or offensive comments.
- A method and set of criteria for identifying harassing comments.
- Actions to be taken when such comments are identified, including;
 - Redaction or deletion of comments;
 - Whether, how and when the affected member is notified;
 - The information provided to the member;
 - Members' rights to review the withheld comments;
 - Support provided to the member, including right to representation by the faculty association.

²⁰ *Student Course Evaluation Working Group Final Report* (Posted on July 12, 2017)
<https://www.uoitfa.ca/student-course-evaluation-working-group-final-report/>

- A mechanism for faculty members to initiate a review of comments and affected surveys and responses.
- A procedure for removing corresponding scores, and for confirmation of their removal.
- Provision for the retention of respondents' identities to enable an investigation if required. In the context of a prohibition against the use of unattributed comments, one contract faculty agreement specifies that comments in online student questionnaires are deemed attributable (McMaster-CUPE).

Some of these points are also applicable to situations in which members do receive unexpurgated student questionnaire results.

Teaching evaluation and in-class peer observation

The final and foundational principle identified by the working group for teaching evaluation and student questionnaires is that "Peer evaluation should be the rule." There are two main reasons, corresponding to two modes or levels of peer evaluation: 1) review committees evaluating teaching performance generally with respect to teaching responsibilities, and assessing course materials and content, and; 2) in-class observation specifically to assess teaching skills, methods, modes, materials, and to evaluate teaching effectiveness directly.

First, peer evaluation is the rule for assessing faculty members' research and service activities. There is no contracting out of collegial responsibility for those aspects of faculty performance; for the working group, it should be no different for evaluating teaching. Teaching and Learning Centre staff, including as in-class observers, and students can be valuable sources of formative feedback. The working group believes that formative use of student questionnaires is more conducive to a productive, mutual exchange between faculty and students, but this is very different from the mutual responsibility that is the hallmark of peer review. In human resources-speak, "accountability" is a two-way street between reviewed and reviewer.

Second, while student questionnaires can be important sources of information about students' perception of their experience, the questionnaires do not and cannot actually measure teaching effectiveness. SQCT scores, moreover, are skewed by student bias which cannot be filtered out. Because they are anonymous, sources of bias are unspecific and untraceable. In these respects, student questionnaires are "unconstrained." They are also unaccountable, in the sense that anonymous respondents need not take responsibility for their scores and comments; the sole onus is on the member and the faculty association to justify results that deviate from a presumptive norm. Except where students' bias is egregious and clearly demonstrable, there also is little prospect of a remedy for individual members through the grievance procedure.

The working group recognizes that peer evaluation is not immune to bias. This is true also for in-class peer observation as an alternative to student questionnaires. Unlike student questionnaires, however, in-class peer observation is or can be as "constrained" as peer evaluation of teaching more generally. In

the first instance, assessors' terms of reference, required expertise and training, and the content and scope of their reports set constraints which hold them responsible and ensure the process is accountable. It might then still be incumbent on a grievor and the faculty association to show bias on the part of one or more reviewer, but the viability of recourse to the grievance procedure is greater when the source and nature of bias is traceable.

In addition to a common recognition of the problem of bias, faculty association representatives have outlined a number of issues that warrant consideration with respect to teaching evaluation and in-class peer observation. Anecdotally and informally, these include an emphasis on the formative value of in-class observation, a preference that they be undertaken voluntarily and the reports be confidential, and the need to ensure they are not used to discipline members. Also highlighted is the potential impact, including effective termination, for contract faculty because there is greater reliance on teaching evaluation for subsequent appointments; a succession of steps in the evaluation process to provide remedial opportunities are positive backstops.

Other observations include: the adverse reports of in-class reviewers who think the purpose of the exercise is to find what is wrong rather than assess all aspects of teaching; inadequate or lack of training, including on equity, and; questionable qualifications with respect to field expertise and reviewers' own teaching effectiveness. Among the measures faculty association representatives identified to constrain the process are: limiting the number of class visits; establishing clear parameters for evaluation regarding terms of reference, the content of the report, explanation of the evidence and rationale for the conclusion; requiring that reports be signed; giving members the opportunity to respond, and; providing a mechanism for dropping lowest scores if a scoring template or rubric is used. Finally, there are concerns that requirements for peer evaluation of teaching will mean additional, rather than substitute, workload for members.

As with student questionnaires, there is a spectrum of Ontario faculty agreement provisions that bear on peer evaluation of teaching generally, and on in-class peer observation specifically. There is occasional ambiguity as to whether language which evidently applies to teaching evaluation generally also extends to in-class observation.²¹ Although language regulating in-class peer evaluation is less common than provisions governing peer evaluation of teaching more generally, the latter can provide a framework or guidance where in-class evaluation is not a practice – terms of reference, content of report, constraints on summative judgement, members' rights to respond, for example. Rather than trying to capture all the variations on peer evaluation of teaching generally, some of which is reflected in several of the appendices, the following sections primarily identify provisions pertaining to in-class observation.

To capture as many variations within Ontario as possible, the survey extends to non-OCUFA contract faculty agreements. It is possible that some relevant provisions were overlooked, or that practice may vary from what the language may suggest. Bearing in mind that the thematic organization of these

²¹ For such cases, references are included below as though the principles extend to in-class evaluation.

provisions does not convey how the provisions interact, the provisions are organized in roughly the same order as the issues identified by faculty association representatives, listed above.

Context/purpose/occasion: For the working group, the primary value of any teaching evaluation is formative, i.e., to provide feedback to a faculty member for the purpose of improving their courses and teaching. The Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* similarly suggested that further development of peer evaluation should be guided by formative assessment as the primary value. The report recommends ensuring that a “peer evaluation protocol does not simply replicate the shortcomings” of the student questionnaires that have now come under question.

In as much as in-class peer observation is a method for (summative) performance evaluation, the working group stresses it should be one of several instruments in the toolkit. In a similar vein, snapshots of a single course or a single year of instruction provide only a partial picture: two agreements (Ottawa and Wilfrid Laurier-FT) require teaching evaluation to cover a minimum of three years (or from time of appointment if less). Some agreements stipulate that strong performance in one or more areas may offset weak performance in other areas of teaching responsibilities.

There appear to be no agreements which expressly exclude the use of in-class peer observation, and a number of agreements implicitly or explicitly allow for faculty to include peer observer reports in their teaching dossiers or annual reports. A number of contract faculty agreements provide for informal teaching assessments by unit heads or Deans; these do not explicitly include in-class observation, but neither is it excluded. Faculty agreement provisions addressing in-class observation are relatively rare, at least compared to the ubiquity of student questionnaires. Where it is featured, peer observation is used for formative and summative purposes. In a couple of cases formative evaluations lay the groundwork for summative evaluation, but there is no consistent pattern about use for either or both approaches.

- **Formative:** In-class peer observation for formative purposes is prompted in several ways:
 - Individual request: the entitlement to seek a formative assessment, which obliges the employer to comply, is typically in contract faculty agreements (Algoma-CF, Wilfrid Laurier-CF, Toronto-CUPE, UOIT-PSAC, York-CUPE). Stipulations may apply, e.g., it must occur before half of the course is completed.
 - Mandatory: the number and frequency of in-class observations varies, but they are a feature of pre-tenure monitoring and mentoring in some cases (Huron, Ryerson, Wilfrid Laurier-FT [for Professional Teaching Positions (PTP)]). Not explicitly in-class, one contract faculty agreement (Guelph-CUPE) includes mandatory performance evaluations which are to be “constructive and developmental in nature.”
 - Discretionary: in-class observation may be initiated by an academic administrator, with the consent of the member (Wilfrid Laurier-CF), or by mutual agreement (York-CUPE).
 - Remedial: prompted by specified criteria, e.g., SQCT scores below designated threshold (Carleton-CUPE).

- **Summative:** In-class peer observation is mandatory for career milestones in some cases, and may be undertaken on a discretionary basis or for disciplinary reasons:
 - Tenure and continuing or permanent status for full-time faculty, right-of-first-refusal (ROFR) and seniority status for contract faculty.²²
 - Mandatory (Algoma-CF, Huron, Ryerson, St. Michael's, UOIT, Wilfrid Laurier-FT [for PTP]; Wilfrid Laurier-CF, York; Toronto-CUPE).
 - Included only if all members of committee conduct in-class review (Brescia).
 - May be used (Carleton).
 - Periodic post-tenure/continuing/ROFR-seniority:
 - May be used for CDI/PTR/Merit (Carleton).
 - May be conducted for annual report (OCAD [sessionals]).
 - May be part of annual or occasional review (King's-CUPE, Toronto-CUPE, UOIT-PSAC).
 - Promotion (Toronto-CUPE)
 - Discretionary:
 - For contract renewal for contract faculty (Huron)
 - May form part of investigation by teaching evaluators after interview with member (Ottawa).
 - Other (Wilfrid Laurier-CF, King's-CUPE)
 - Disciplinary:
 - In the event of deficient performance of teaching responsibilities (Ottawa, Ottawa-APTPUO, Ryerson-CUPE, York-CUPE).
 - Formal teaching evaluation is explicitly non-remedial (Ottawa)
 - Prompted following a (signed and dated) written student complaint and preliminary procedures (Ottawa-APTPUO).²³
- **Other provisions:**
 - Except for the Dean, no other guests permitted in classroom without member permission; if permitted, visits cannot be used for other matters (Algoma-CF).
 - Use for purposes other than as provided is subject to permission of the member (Carleton).
 - No electronic monitoring without written consent (Guelph-CUPE, McMaster-CUPE).
 - The results of mandatory performance evaluation cannot be used for disciplinary proceedings (Guelph-CUPE).

Evaluator selection: Unlike student questionnaires, some steps can be taken to mitigate or triangulate the probability of bias on the part of peer observers through the selection process. As with teaching evaluation generally, more data points are better than fewer. Across faculty agreements currently, the number of and source of mandate for designated peer observers varies. Opportunities for the member or the faculty association to influence who conducts in-class observation also varies.

²² Pre-tenure renewal reviews may include in-class peer observation; anecdotally, teaching performance must be egregiously bad for termination at this point that, practically, in-class observation is formative.

²³ Some agreements indicate discipline may follow, not the review, but failure to perform according to a performance remediation plan based on the review (Carleton-CUPE, Guelph-CUPE, King's-CUPE).

- **Individual observer:**
 - Designated academic administrator – typically for annual or periodic review, and by virtue of supervisory role (King’s-CUPE; UOIT-PSAC).
 - Departmental Chair or designate (Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF); if designate, mutual agreement of Chair and member (Wilfrid Laurier-FT).
 - Selected by academic administrator (Huron).
 - Selected by member, but must be acceptable to hiring unit (York-CUPE).
- **More than one observer:**
 - Designated by academic administrator (Algoma-CF, Ottawa-APTPUO).
 - Two nominated by member (St. Michael’s).
 - Selected from roster of teaching evaluators – one nominee by member, two by review committee (Ottawa).
 - Selected from list jointly nominated by Dean and member (UOIT).
 - Two selected by review committee, one by member (York).
- **Committee responsibility:** in several cases, in-class peer observers are selected from members of a review committee – as few as one, as many as the whole committee:
 - Teaching evaluation specifically; practically any committee reviewing contract faculty performance (Algoma-CF, Guelph-CUPE, Ryerson-CUPE, Toronto-CUPE).
 - Academic unit review committees responsible also for evaluation, including teaching, e.g., tenure and promotion committees (Brescia, Ryerson, UOIT Teaching).
 - Members of the review committee itself may be selected by:
 - Virtue of their role as academic administrator (Algoma-CF, Ryerson, Guelph-CUPE, Toronto-CUPE).
 - Appointment by an academic administrator (Algoma-CF, Ryerson, UOIT [Teaching], Guelph-CUPE, Ryerson CUPE, Toronto-CUPE).
 - Election by academic unit members (Ryerson).
- **Member or faculty association input:** In addition to cases where members nominate or select in-class observers (Ottawa, St. Michael’s, UOIT, York, York-CUPE), other agreements provide for some kind of member feedback on observer selection. Typically, no assurances other than “best efforts” to accommodate are offered.
 - Members may identify a conflict of interest or prejudice, lack of qualifications, or otherwise object to proposed observers (Algoma-CF, Ottawa, UOIT, Toronto-CUPE)
 - An objection may not be raised without reasonable cause (Ottawa).
 - Member’s written objections to de-identified nominees shared with review committee (UOIT)
 - Member provides input into selection (Huron).

Evaluator qualifications: One of the objections to student questionnaires noted by the working group in its main report is that students lack the background to assess teaching effectiveness. The working group also acknowledged that, even for faculty members, it is not as simple as “I’ll know it when I see

it.” As commonly accepted as it is for peers to review other aspects of faculty members’ teaching responsibilities – without requiring specialized training to do so – it cannot be assumed in-class observers will not require some preparation. The Ryerson-RFA *Report of the Joint FCS Committee* indicates that unevenness in the quality of in-class peer evaluation is attributable in part to the limited amount of training the in-class reviewers may have received.

The working group stressed that the priority of peer evaluation of teaching would entail some measure of additional training, including coaching on the recognition of bias, as is offered by the Tri-Council for reviewers of research proposals. Diversity amongst review committee members is another measure which may be found in Ontario faculty agreements. At present, language on training of these sorts in Ontario faculty agreements mostly is directed towards evaluation generally, including of teaching. Where in-class peer observers are also members of those committees, they too will receive it. Qualifications of in-class observers specifically is mostly with respect to their field of expertise and tenure status.

➤ **Expertise:**

- Tenured faculty (Algoma-CF, Brescia, Wilfrid Laurier-CF, Ottawa-APTPUO).
- In the department/field (Huron, Wilfrid Laurier-CF [or cognate discipline], Ottawa-APTPUO, Ryerson-CUPE).
- Minimum number of assessments [half] by faculty in same field of expertise (Ryerson).
- Not specified (Carleton)
- One agreement (Toronto-CUPE) also provided for contract faculty representation on the review committee.

➤ **Training:** provisions affecting review committees responsible for in-class peer observation include variations regarding mandatory nature, content, and responsibility for delivering:

- Mandatory training for review committee members:
 - Review committee (UOIT).
 - Exclusion from the committee if the member does not complete required training without sufficient reason (Ryerson, Ryerson-CUPE).
 - Chair and at least one other of review committee; others encouraged to attend (Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF).
 - Refresher training every 4 years (Ottawa).
- Content:
 - Requirements of relevant articles (Algoma-CF).
 - Roles and duties of teaching evaluators (Ottawa).
 - Legal obligations and duties pertaining to collective agreement and university policies (Ryerson, Ryerson-CUPE).
 - Equity or employment equity (Ryerson, UOIT, Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Ryerson-CUPE).
- Responsibility:
 - Developed jointly by faculty association and employer (Ottawa, UOIT).
 - Conducted or presented jointly by faculty association and employer (Ottawa, Ryerson, Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF).

➤ **Equity:**

- Equity appointments to review committee – “taking into account university equity, diversity and inclusion obligations” (Ryerson, Ryerson-CUPE).

Evaluation logistics: The working group did not consider the logistics of in-class peer evaluation, but these do pertain to the investments of time on the part of observers and reviewers, and to the number of observations appropriate for a useful assessment of in-class teaching. With respect to frequency, timing and notice to members being reviewed, variety of in-class settings, and other considerations, language in Ontario faculty agreements include:

➤ **Frequency:**

- Once per each course (Algoma-CF).
- Twice (once each by two reviewers) per semester in first two semesters of appointment; once per semester for subsequent pre-tenure appointment; conditions for fewer (Ryerson).
- During first 6 semesters of departmental appointments: Twice (once each by two reviewers) per semester in first two semesters of appointment; once per semester for subsequent semesters for total of 8 assessments; review committee Chair discretion to reduce to total number of assessments to six (Ryerson-CUPE).

➤ **Timing and notice:**

- First 8 weeks (Algoma-CF).
- Not in first 2 weeks or last 2 weeks of course (Ryerson, Ryerson-CUPE).
- In consultation with member (Ottawa, Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF).
- Member receive advance notice of dates (Algoma-CF, Toronto-CUPE).
- Approval of member not required, but entitled to consultation re. scheduling (Brescia).
- Specified minimum notice (Ryerson, Guelph-CUPE, Ryerson-CUPE, UOIT-PSAC, York-CUPE).

➤ **Variety:**

- At least one class for each course (Algoma-CF).
- In consultation with member (Ottawa).
- All teaching formats, e.g., lecture, seminar, studio, etc. (York).

➤ **Other provisions:**

- Criteria for assessment to be provided to member (Ryerson-CUPE).
- May be conducted via video conference for teaching at off-campus locations (Algoma-CF).
- For online courses, a reviewer may:
 - Enrol as student for one class (Algoma-CF).
 - Request equivalent course materials from member (Algoma-CF).

Evaluation criteria/standards: The working group did not conduct extensive research on in-class observation methods of evaluating teaching effectiveness. As with qualifications and training, criteria and standards require something more than “I’ll know it when I see it.” From the working group’s perspective, they also serve to constrain the evaluation. Some of the elements of faculty agreements applicable to teaching evaluation generally – scope and definition of teaching responsibilities, evidence

adduced (see Appendices B and C), factors to consider (see Appendix D) – may be applied to in-class observation. Other provisions include: definitions of teaching effectiveness (Appendix E), and; in-class evaluation tools or rubrics appended to faculty agreements (Appendix F).

- **Criteria in collective agreement:** some faculty agreements stipulate that academic units set their own standards. Articulated criteria include:
 - Teaching effectiveness definition (see Appendix E: Characteristics/descriptors of teaching effectiveness).
 - Limited to topics addressed in student questionnaires (Carleton).
 - Methods and material used in achieving course objectives, which may not violate Academic Freedom (Carleton).
 - Factors and/or standards particular to the course [outlined in written notice to member] (Ryerson-CUPE).
- **Rubrics:** rubrics entail more than simple checklists, and vary with respect to the amount of written feedback which may be provided, and whether comments are provided for each item or overall. They also include provision for scores (on which see the next section regarding reports). Appendix F includes templates from Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of California-Berkeley for comparison.
 - Teaching Behaviour Inventory (Algoma-CF); Appendix C Tenure and Promotion Committee Evaluation of Teaching [agreed by Joint Committee] (Brescia); Contract Lecturer Assessment Form (Ryerson-CUPE).
 - Solicit comment specifically on strengths of member (Ryerson-CUPE).
- **Other:**
 - Materials in addition to course syllabus provided to in-class observers at member option (Algoma-CF).
 - Scope and nature to conform to general pattern of teaching evaluations, allowing for special circumstances (Ottawa).
 - Meeting with member prior to visit (establish “relevant facts” – Ottawa; to discuss evaluation process and member’s teaching methodology – Wilfrid Laurier-CF).

Evaluation results and report: The working group’s positions on SQCT scores also applies to any scores which might be generated from in-class evaluation rubrics: teaching effectiveness is not reducible to a single summative score, and even distributions lend themselves to specious comparison against some notional or fictive benchmark. The working group also cautioned against unrealistic expectations of “excellence.” For in-class observation, variations on the “above satisfactory/satisfactory/unsatisfactory” summative conclusion typical for teaching evaluation generally is more in keeping with the working group’s position.

To reiterate, the working group also holds that teaching evaluation should be formative in the first instance, which requires substantive feedback. If teaching evaluation and in-class peer observation are used for summative purposes, explanations or rationales and members’ rights to respond also constrain the evaluation process and facilitate the practice of mutual responsibility that is essential for collegial

governance. Some features of faculty agreement provisions regarding teaching evaluation reports might be applied to in-class observation reports. These include: a statement of the scope of the assessment; the sources of information used; summary of the information gathered; analysis of the information gathered, and; a summative assessment. Ontario faculty agreement provisions pertaining specifically to in-class peer evaluation reports or remedial review reports include:

- **Content:**
 - Completed evaluation rubric (Algoma-CF, Brescia, Ryerson-CUPE).
 - Comments on selected aspects (Algoma-CF).
 - Which topics [from student questionnaires] covered (Carleton).
 - Summative conclusion, e.g., outstanding/meets expectations/unsatisfactory (Algoma-CF, Brescia).
 - Summative conclusion explicitly excluded (Ottawa).
 - Identify problems/deficiencies and seriousness/significance, and viability of remedial action. (Ottawa).
 - Performance improvement plan, timelines, etc. (Carleton-CUPE, Guelph-CUPE, King's-CUPE).
- **Disposition:** the path by which in-class observer reports used for summative purposes become part of the formal record depends on the selection method for observers and report flow. There do not appear to be any instances where such reports are not included in members' files. With respect to in-class observation for formative or remedial purposes, specific provisions include:
 - Formative feedback oral only, preliminary review cannot be used for formal review (Algoma-CF).
 - For evaluations which may be formative or summative, only reports used for summative (e.g., ROFR) purposes permitted in personnel file (Wilfrid Laurier-CF).
 - Inclusion of formative evaluations in personnel file at member discretion (NOSM, Toronto-CUPE).
 - Formative leading to summative evaluation: assessor report to academic administrator, administrator report to review file (Ryerson).
 - Formative evaluation leading to recommendation of formal evaluation placed in personnel file, removed after two years or retained in the event of review period (York-CUPE).
 - Optional reports: strongly encouraged for summative processes (Huron).
- **Member rights/response:** the norm is to provide members with a copy of observer report(s); other provisions include:
 - In-class observer reports provided to member in advance of review; member response included in file under review (Algoma-CF, Brescia, Carleton, Wilfrid Laurier-FT).
 - Author(s) of observer report(s) de-identified (Brescia, Ottawa).
 - Observer reports confidential, limited to review committee (York [Teaching Stream]).
 - Member may request meeting with observers to seek feedback (Algoma-CF).
 - Member may respond to evaluation material included in file under review (Algoma-CF, Carleton, Ryerson, Guelph-CUPE, King's-CUPE, Ryerson-CUPE, Toronto-CUPE).
 - Prohibition against grievance against evaluation conducted under the agreement, unless about discrimination or procedural irregularities (Toronto-CUPE).

Support for in-class peer evaluation: The working group recognizes that in-class peer observation requires more time and resources for faculty members than do student questionnaires. Funding, resource allocation, and recognition of faculty members' workload are necessary not just to ensure the peer review of in-class performance is effective, but to secure the support of faculty members. This may be the least fully developed of the necessary conditions for generalizing in-class peer evaluation. Apart from urging the provincial government to dedicate more funding and universities to allocate that funding in good faith, the only specific recommendation from the working group in this regard is that contract faculty members should also be eligible to serve as peer reviewers of their contract faculty colleagues.

The level of resource and time commitments will depend on how intensive, and extensive, the use of in-class peer observation is. Is it used primarily as is most often the case currently, i.e., in the early stages of faculty members' appointments, and no longer required once the member has attained tenure or equivalent, or analogous status for contract faculty? Will it be used at regular intervals after that status has been achieved? And would the intensity be the same for periodic performance reviews as for salary increments, for example? In the absence of language on workload for membership in a teaching evaluation committee or for in-class evaluations, a partial course release for example, areas addressed in faculty agreements include:

- **Training and professional development:** training and professional development required for the performance of workload responsibilities may be provided and/or paid for by the employer:
 - For contract faculty for whom service is not part of their workload, the most common contract faculty agreement provision is eligibility to receive Professional Development Funds: increased expectations would require increased funds.
 - There are several agreements which require training specific to teaching evaluation, almost exclusively for full-time faculty:
 - Faculty and Department Chairs, annually (Algoma-CF).
 - Teaching evaluators, refresher every four years (Ottawa).
 - Review committee members, annually (Ryerson [in conjunction with the faculty association], Ryerson-CUPE).
 - Designated review committee members, annually; optional for other members; in conjunction with the faculty association (Wilfrid Laurier-FT, Wilfrid Laurier-CF).
- **Recognition of workload:** for full-time faculty, duties and time for in-class peer observation require recognition if they are not simply to add to existing responsibilities and workload. There appear to be no faculty agreements which explicitly identify in-class observation as part of faculty members' workload. The most obvious areas in which this may occur are:
 - Service: work as a member of a review committee which encompasses evaluation of teaching, perhaps also including responsibility for in-class observation.
 - Teaching: "contributions outside the classroom" and "educational leadership" are the portion of teaching dossiers closest in nature to in-class observation.

- **Remuneration:** for contract faculty, recognition is in the form of remuneration rather than workload. The model already exists in contract faculty agreement provisions for overload rates for duties outside term of contract, or hourly rates for replacement instruction (Trent-CUPE). The two agreements that recognize contract faculty as peer evaluators include provision for compensation for that role:
 - Per peer evaluation (Carleton-CUPE).
 - Per hour, for a number of hours agreed between the observer and academic administrator (Toronto-CUPE).

Conclusion

The *Report of the OCUFA Student Questionnaires on Courses and Teaching Working Group* was a report to, not by, OCUFA. Where that report sought to articulate what the working group believes are good principles for student questionnaires and for teaching evaluation, without compromise to employers, this report starts with the premise that any progress towards putting those principles into practice must take for its point of departure what already exists in Ontario faculty agreements. There is no one-size-fits-all model, and the working group is not proposing one.

Only faculty associations can assess what works best for them and their members, and only they can determine how to incorporate any of the provisions pertaining to student questionnaires and teaching evaluation identified in this report. What works in one agreement may not work with something else in another agreement. Whatever such functional and legal or political realities are for any faculty association, the working group does hope that these two reports provide useful navigational aids, wherever next faculty associations and their members wish to take teaching evaluation.

Appendix A: SQCT working group Principles for Student Questionnaires

1) Limit the use of SQCTs to formative purposes

SQCTs are only suitable for informing faculty about students' understanding of their learning experience, and most valuable for the further development of courses and teaching. Summative versions for performance evaluation are not equitable and not appropriate for determining pay, tenure, permanency, or promotion for full-time faculty, or appointment and renewal for contract faculty.

2) SQCTs should provide useful feedback for instructors

How different the design of formative questionnaires will be from summative end-of-course versions currently in use will vary, but summative questions do not have a place. Nor will a one-size-fits-all model provide instructive feedback if SQCTs are intended to shed light on different iterations of a course. Common questions follow from, rather than guide, the design of formative instruments.

3) SQCT results should be confidential except at the instructor's discretion

Results and scores should not be made public, or shared with anyone other than those whom the instructor chooses. They are dubious guides for students choosing courses. If the questionnaires are formative, the responses should matter to no more than the faculty member, and perhaps those competent to help interpret them and inform teaching strategies. Any departure from this default must be subject to the terms of faculty association agreements.

4) SQCTs must seek informed and active consent from students

If harassment is to be challenged wherever it appears, student comments on questionnaires cannot be an exception. Students must be advised of their institution's policy on harassment, and the scope of confidentiality in the event of an investigation of alleged harassment or threat of violence.

5) Surveys for other reviews should be separately administered

To avoid double counting, canvassing respondents not in the relevant population, and tainting results with bias endemic to SQCTs, surveys for program and institutional reviews should be administered separately. Further, no other methods of teaching evaluation should be reduced to numeric scores and used as metrics for program or institutional performance.

6) Teaching evaluation requires a suite of tools

If SQCTs are included as part of teaching evaluations, they should be only one tool in a bigger toolkit. The principal methods are the careful examination of teaching dossiers and in-class observation by peers. If SQCT results feature, it is not the scores which are informative but the instructor's explanation of how the responses figure in the faculty member's own evaluation and development of their courses.

7) Peer evaluation should be the rule

No student graduates with a university credential having taken courses from only one professor: university education is a collective responsibility. Evaluating teaching is a collegial responsibility that should not be contracted out. There is no substitute for peer knowledge of the content, the nature and value of teaching activities outside the classroom, and differences between courses and modes of delivery.

Appendix B: Documentation for/evidence of/methods of evaluation of teaching

Before articulating the procedures and methods of evaluating teaching, the CAUT Evaluation of Teaching Performance Model Clause (November 2017) outlines a (non-exclusive) list of teaching activities which together define *what* is being evaluated. A number of agreements include similar language. Faculty agreements frequently also define teaching responsibilities, to: maintain scholarly competence and teaching effectiveness; deal fairly and ethically with students; be conscientious with respect to course content and conduct of courses; follow established procedures, etc.

The CAUT model clause and similar provisions in faculty agreements also identify documentary sources, and some of the considerations to be taken into account (see also Appendix D, below), for assessing teaching performance. The following list of documentation and evidence is assembled from Ontario faculty agreements and (and some related sources, e.g., McMaster Faculty Handbook; Waterloo Policy 77 [on] Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members). It includes items which are also listed in Appendix C as possible elements of a teaching dossier. The main sources vary between agreements, but span:

- Current *curriculum vitae*.
- Annual reports (which may include student questionnaire scores).
- Teaching dossier.
- Course syllabi and related materials (see also Appendix C).
- Student questionnaire scores (variations permit aggregated scores only).
- Reports from peer in-class observation, which may include an in-class observer evaluation/scoring rubric in some cases.
- Written comments by, interviews with:
 - The candidate;
 - Students (manner and procedure for selection varies);
 - Teaching assistants.

More specific direction to peer reviewers about what to assess is less common. Examples include (directly quoted, *sans* quotation marks):

- Whether methods and materials met course objectives set by faculty member.
- Quality and utility of instructional materials.
- Integration of technology in teaching.
- Educational leadership.
- Accomplishments and strengths in teaching.
- Commitment to teaching and professionalism.
- Excellent communication skills.
- Curriculum and course design and delivery skills.
- Self-evaluation and reflective practice.
- Ability to function well as part of a teaching team, or in the context of multi-sectioned courses.

Appendix C: Documentation/Contents of teaching dossier

The *CAUT Teaching Dossier booklet* (November 2018) includes a list of items to consider including in the dossier. The following list is organized by the categories named in the CAUT guidebook, but is comprised of items identified in faculty agreements (and some related sources, e.g., McMaster Faculty Handbook; Waterloo Policy 77 [on] Tenure and Promotion of Faculty Members). Please note that it is compiled from any clause which identifies activities to be documented and the type of documentation to be used for teaching evaluation, not just those entitled Teaching Dossier. It includes some direct quotes, without attribution.

1. “Teaching responsibilities and practices”

- ✓ Statement of teaching philosophy; goals/objectives and methods of teaching (may include examples of implementation and/or adaptation);
- ✓ List of courses taught (number of academic years varies); other details identified include:
 - Graduate and undergraduate designation;
 - Course numbers and titles;
 - Credit values;
 - Number of scheduled student contact hours;
 - Enrolments;
 - Whether in the classroom, online or off campus;
 - Independent study/reading course;
 - Whether first time teaching it.
- ✓ Course syllabi (number of courses, academic years to include varies).
- ✓ Course materials, samples of, e.g.:
 - Exams and assignments, instructions for assignments;
 - Guides, instructional materials, reading lists;
 - Multimedia materials developed by the member;
 - Video recording of teaching or course activities;
 - Course notes, lesson plans;
 - Student workbooks and laboratory teaching materials.
- ✓ Information about the programs of study of students enrolled in the courses.
- ✓ Independent study courses and directed reading supervision.
- ✓ Supervision of graduate and undergraduate work:
 - Student practica, clinical work, and/or internships (including identification of those requiring professional credentials required of the supervisor for student certification or licensure);
 - Experiential learning activities (nature of activities and instructor role);
 - Undergraduate theses or project research and graduate theses, completed or in-progress, and nature of activity, e.g., principal advisor, examining committee (including at other universities), etc.

2. “Products of good teaching”

- ✓ Student outstanding achievements, evidence of member role in – e.g., Bibliographical information pertaining to publications by students on course-related work.
- ✓ Student work, samples of.

3. “Evaluating and improving one’s teaching”

- ✓ Teaching-related professional development activities, e.g.:
 - Explanation of maintaining currency in field of teaching;
 - Research on pedagogy, and application;
 - Participation in seminars, work-shops, etc. on improvement of teaching;
 - Pedagogical/instructional development grants.
- ✓ Teaching/pedagogical innovation, e.g.:
 - Development of new teaching methods and materials;
 - Attempting instructional innovations and evaluating their effectiveness.
- ✓ Use of formative evaluation in courses and evidence of response to student input.
- ✓ Examples of course revision, illustrated in course outlines, assignments, final examinations and other materials.
- ✓ Self-assessment; reflections on pedagogical strategies.
- ✓ Professional affiliations (where applicable).
- ✓ Professional certifications (if required by accreditation bodies).

4. “Contributions outside the classroom” (examples of “educational leadership” – loosely organized by: a) teaching; b) scholarship; c) service)

- ✓ Innovative methods in teaching and other contributions shared beyond the classroom.
- ✓ Organization of workshops on pedagogy, departmental and elsewhere.
- ✓ Assistance to peers, e.g., through mentorship program.
- ✓ Training and orientation of teaching assistants.
- ✓ Development of textbooks, teaching materials.
- ✓ Guest lectures (details may include where, when given, length/scope/topic, paid/unpaid).
- ✓ Research, publications, presentations on teaching and learning and professional development.
- ✓ Participation in, contributions to conferences and seminars on teaching and learning.
- ✓ Publishing articles, commentaries or reviews related to teaching.
- ✓ Course, curriculum, program development, individual and/or administrative or committee role in, e.g.:
 - Design and development of new courses or modules; or modification of existing ones;
 - Development of new programs; or modification of existing ones;
 - Direction and coordination of programs;
 - Academic counselling.
- ✓ Program accreditation activities.

- ✓ Program review activities.
- ✓ Contribution to the academic and cultural life of students (e.g., assistance with student clubs, special events, student conferences and exchanges, off-campus trips, etc.).
- ✓ Outreach to high schools.
- ✓ Contributions to internationalization of curriculum, programs and/or courses.

5. "Information from [current] students"

- ✓ Written comments, testimonials of students.
- ✓ Student comments selected from student questionnaires (may be subject to request for originals).
- ✓ Student questionnaire scores.
- ✓ Student responses and/or scores for questionnaires initiated by the member (may require information on procedures to ensure student confidentiality).
- ✓ Comments by the member about university-mandated and/or member-initiated questionnaires.

6. "Information from colleagues"

- ✓ Reports of classroom evaluation/observation by peer reviewers/observers; may be internal or external reviewers, at invitation of member or in accordance with agreement.
- ✓ Peer review assessments, other sources, e.g.:
 - Peer evaluation of grading practices;
 - Peer summary of student comments from student questionnaires.
- ✓ Written comments by colleagues regarding the candidate's reputation amongst peers.

7. "Information from others"

- ✓ Alumni letters, testimonials.
- ✓ Teaching assistant letters, comments.
- ✓ Teaching awards and honours.
- ✓ External invitations to teach or act as an advisor on program development.
- ✓ Pedagogical/instructional development grants. (see also 3. Evaluating and improving one's teaching).

Appendix D: Factors to be accounted in assessing documentation/student questionnaires

Faculty agreement provisions on teaching evaluation often include a variety of considerations to be weighed by reviewers when examining the documentation identified in the clause. A number of them are essentially variables recognized as having a bearing on any individual's teaching responsibilities and performance. The possible combinations require each person's teaching to be judged on its own terms. Other factors such as those about questionnaires are cautions or reminders. The following list of variables and factors to consider is compiled from Ontario faculty agreements.

Course-specific factors:

- ✓ Nature, size, type and scope of courses taught:
 - Introductory/advanced;
 - Service courses;
 - Small/large enrolment;
 - Compulsory/optional;
 - Mode of delivery;
 - Undergraduate/graduate;
 - Jointly taught;
 - Subject matter.
- ✓ Departmental and disciplinary variations in teaching methods/approaches and norms.

Instructor-specific factors:

- ✓ Number of new teaching assignments.
- ✓ Experience of the member with the material/course.
- ✓ Type of appointment and role in delivery of courses.
- ✓ The complexity and risk entailed in pedagogical development and innovation.
- ✓ Special circumstances which may affect teaching performance.
- ✓ Pertinent accommodation arrangements (subject to confidentiality requirements).
- ✓ Evidence member has taken steps to improve.

Questionnaire-specific factors:

- ✓ That student questionnaires may be biased.
- ✓ Member's submission on factors which may bias or affect student questionnaire scores.

Appendix E: Characteristics/descriptors of teaching effectiveness

Guidance for the judgement of peers with respect to teaching is provided in some faculty agreements or related documents by providing descriptions of teaching effectiveness (Huron; OCAD U; Queen's; St. Michael's; Trent; Trent-CUPE; Waterloo [Policy 77]). Other descriptors may be found in rubrics or checklists used for in-class evaluation (see Appendix F); the characteristics identified in faculty agreements as part of terms of reference for teaching evaluation include:

- ✓ Command/mastery over subject matter.
- ✓ Familiarity with recent developments in the field.
- ✓ Currency of course material.
- ✓ Preparedness/preparation.
- ✓ Presentation; clear, interesting, enthusiasm.
- ✓ Organization of subject matter.
- ✓ Effective communication.
- ✓ Accessibility to students.
- ✓ Responsiveness to student needs.
- ✓ Influence on the intellectual and scholarly developments of students.
- ✓ Ability to stimulate and challenge the intellectual capacity of students.
- ✓ Ability to stimulate student interest and scholarship.
- ✓ Inspiring students to excel.
- ✓ Suitability of assignments and examinations.
- ✓ Willingness to provide individual feedback and help outside the classroom.

Appendix F: In-class evaluation rubrics

Three faculty agreements include a rubric or worksheet for use by in-class peer observers: Algoma contract faculty, Brescia, and Ryerson contract faculty represented by CUPE. Each is reproduced in the following pages. Although not formally part of the Wilfrid Laurier full-time faculty and professional librarians collective agreement, a series of forms used for evaluation of Professional Teaching Position appointees have been shared, and are included in this collection for illustrative purposes.

Also appended is an instrument used at the University of California, Berkeley, the home institution of Richard Freishtat and Philip Stark. They are critics of the use of student questionnaires for summative teaching evaluation, and authors of pivotal expert reports in the Ryerson v Ryerson Faculty Association arbitration award from Arbitrator Kaplan. Their literature reviews and critiques also were influential for the working group's deliberations. Including the Berkeley form is not intended to suggest Freishtat and Stark endorse it, but to add perspective from an institution where serious consideration has been given to peer review alternatives to student questionnaires.

The appended instruments supplement the list of characteristics and descriptors of effective teaching, and demonstrate the variation of possible content and organization – for example, explicit provision for comment on positive aspects of members' classroom teaching, and space for members' comments parallel to reviewers' notes. In order, they are:

Appended to collective agreements:

- Algoma contract faculty agreement, Appendix A – Teaching Behaviour Inventory.²⁴
- Brescia faculty agreement, Appendix C – Tenure and Promotion Committee Evaluation of Teaching.
- Ryerson contract faculty agreement, Appendix V – Contract Lecturer Assessment Form.

Other examples:

- Wilfrid Laurier University In-Class Evaluation of Professional Teaching Faculty: Guidelines for Department Chairs.
- Berkeley Peer Review of Course Instruction – Form (form and other related material available at <http://teaching.berkeley.edu/peer-review-course-instruction>).

²⁴ The version attached is from the "Part-Time Contract Evaluation Policy and Procedures," negotiated according to the terms of the 2016-2019 agreement.

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

Algoma University (The University)

And

**Algoma University Faculty Association
(Representing Part-Time Contract Faculty)**

JULY 1, 2016 TO JUNE 30, 2019

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Teaching Behaviour Inventory

PTCF Member Being Evaluated:	
Course:	
Date and Time of Evaluation:	
FT Member Completing Evaluation:	

Instructions for Evaluators:

1. You are being asked to evaluate the PT Contract Faculty (PTCF) Member's classroom teaching effectiveness by assessing nine (9) specific Categories listed below.
2. Your assessments should reflect the type of teaching you think is best for this particular course.
3. Each Category begins with a definition, followed by typical "examples" of teaching behaviours associated with that Category. Please check off the examples that the instructor exhibits, or document other examples exhibited in the space provided. Based on your observations, you are required to provide an overall rating of the Category using a scale of 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), keeping point 4 below in mind.
4. When assessing a specific Category, it is not necessary for the instructor to exhibit all listed "examples" in order to be effective in that Category – please use your judgement as appropriate.
5. A space has been provided for your feedback in each Category. Please try to be both thoughtful and candid in your written responses/justification to maximize the value of your feedback to the instructor.
6. Following your assessment of Categories 1 through 9 you will be asked to provide an overall rating of the instructor's classroom teaching effectiveness, keeping in mind points 2 and 4 above.

Category 1: CLARITY*Methods used to explain or clarify concepts and principles***Examples of Clarity:**

- ☐ Gives good examples of each concept
- ☐ Defines new or unfamiliar terms
- ☐ Repeats difficult ideas several times
- ☐ Stresses the most important points
- ☐ Uses graphs or diagrams to facilitate explanation
- ☐ Points out practical applications of concepts
- ☐ Answers students' questions thoroughly
- ☐ Highlights key terms
- ☐ Explains subject matter in familiar, conversational tone
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):****Category 2: EXPRESSION***Use of non-verbal behaviour to solicit student attention and interest***Examples of Expression:**

- ☐ Speaks in a dramatic, expressive way
- ☐ Moves about while lecturing
- ☐ Gestures with hands or arms
- ☐ Makes eye contact with students
- ☐ Gestures with head or body
- ☐ Tells jokes or humorous anecdotes (if appropriate)
- ☐ Effectively uses prepared notes or text
- ☐ Smiles or laughs while teaching
- ☐ Avoids distracting mannerisms
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):**

Category 3: INTERACTION*Techniques used to foster students' participation in class***Examples of Interaction:**

- ☐ Encourages students to ask questions or make comments during lectures
- ☐ Offers constructive criticism
- ☐ Praises challenging, thought-provoking ideas from students
- ☐ Asks questions of individual students
- ☐ Asks questions of the class as a whole
- ☐ Incorporates students' ideas into the lecture
- ☐ Presents challenging, thought-provoking ideas to the class
- ☐ Uses a variety of activities in class (e.g. group work, guest lecturers, etc.)
- ☐ Asks rhetorical questions
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):****Category 4: ORGANIZATION***Ways of structuring the course's subject matter***Examples of Organization:**

- ☐ Uses headings and subheadings to organize lectures
- ☐ Puts outline of lecture on blackboard or overhead screen
- ☐ Clearly indicates transition from one topic to the next
- ☐ Gives preliminary overview of lecture at the beginning of class
- ☐ Explains how each topic fits into the course as a whole
- ☐ Reviews topics covered in previous lecture at the beginning of each class
- ☐ Periodically summarizes points previously made
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):**

Category 5: PACING*Rate of presentation of information; efficient use of class time***Examples of Pacing:**

- ☐ *Stays with major theme of lecture*
- ☐ *Covers adequate amount of material in class sessions*
- ☐ *Asks if students understand before proceeding to next topic*
- ☐ *Sticks to the point in answering students' questions*
- ☐ *Other:* _____
- ☐ *Other:* _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):****Category 6: DISCLOSURE***Explicitness concerning course requirements and grading criteria***Examples of Disclosure:**

- ☐ *Advises students as to how to prepare for tests and exams*
- ☐ *Provides sample exam questions*
- ☐ *Provides clear expectations for all assessed work*
- ☐ *States objectives of each lecture*
- ☐ *Reminds students of test dates or assignment deadlines*
- ☐ *States objectives of course as a whole*
- ☐ *Other:* _____
- ☐ *Other:* _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):**

Category 7: SPEECH*Characteristics of voice relevant to classroom teaching***Examples of Speech:**

- ☐ *Speaks at an appropriate volume*
- ☐ *Speaks clearly*
- ☐ *Speaks at an appropriate pace*
- ☐ *Avoids disfluencies (such as stammering, use of “um,” “uh,” etc.)*
- ☐ *Speaks with voice modulation (fluctuates)*
- ☐ *Other:* _____
- ☐ *Other:* _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):****Category 8: RAPPORT***Quality of interpersonal relations between teacher and students***Examples of Rapport:**

- ☐ *Addresses individual students by name*
- ☐ *Announces availability for consultation outside of class*
- ☐ *Offers to help students with course-related problems*
- ☐ *Shows tolerance of other points of view*
- ☐ *Talks with students before or after class, when possible*
- ☐ *Other:* _____
- ☐ *Other:* _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):**

Category 9: TEACHING AIDS*Use of non-verbal behaviour and resources to solicit student attention and interest***Examples of Teaching Aids:**

- ☐ Uses visual teaching aids
- ☐ Makes effort to ensure readability of visual aids
- ☐ Uses audio, video, and computer equipment
- ☐ Uses presentation software
- ☐ Uses video programs
- ☐ Other: _____
- ☐ Other: _____

Feedback (if applicable):**Category Rating (1 – Poor; 2 – Weak; 3 – Satisfactory; 4 – Good; 5 – Excellent):****Overall Rating (based on evaluation of all nine Categories):**

- ☐ Poor
- ☐ Weak
- ☐ Satisfactory
- ☐ Good
- ☐ Excellent

Comments:

Signature of FT Member Completing Evaluation

Date



COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

between

BRESCIA UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

(hereinafter called “Brescia” or “the Employer”)

and

BRESCIA FACULTY ASSOCIATION

(hereinafter called “the BFA” or “the Faculty Association”)

July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2020

APPENDIX C

Tenure and Promotion Committee Evaluation of Teaching (CA 11.3.3.3, 11.4.3)

Name of Tenure and Promotion Committee observer: _____

Name of candidate: _____ Date: _____ Class: _____ Location: _____

Observation	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	N/O
Gave an overview of class activities at beginning of class								
Conducted the class session in an organized, well-planned manner								
Explained the subject matter clearly and understandably								
Used examples and illustrations effectively								
Provided a learning environment in which students were encouraged to speak freely (for example, to ask questions, to express their thoughts)								
Fostered the view that it is legitimate to challenge the ideas encountered in the class								
Encouraged students to think independently and critically about the subject matter								
Handled students' questions and comments effectively								
Displayed enthusiasm in conducting the class								
Overall, taught the class effectively								

Key: 7 Outstanding 6 Very good 5 Good 4 Satisfactory 3 Borderline 2 Unsatisfactory 1 Very poor N/O No opportunity to observe

Note: It may be the case that not all items above will be appropriate for the class observed. If in a particular class it is not possible to assess the applicant on a given item, please select the N/O (no opportunity to observe) response. It is understood that N/O responses are a reflection of the type of classroom activity being assessed, and are not an indicator of poor teaching and will not be held against the candidate.

Comments:

COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

between

**THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF
RYERSON UNIVERSITY**

and

**THE CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES
LOCAL 3904, UNIT 1**

Part-Time and Sessional Contract Lecturers

Effective: August 16, 2017 to August 15, 2021

APPENDIX V. CONTRACT LECTURER ASSESSMENT FORM

CUPE LOCAL 3904, UNIT 1 CONTRACT LECTURER ASSESSMENT FORM							
CONTRACT LECTURER'S NAME:					TERM AND YEAR:		
ASSESSOR'S NAME:							
DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL:							
CLASS:					DATE OF ASSESSMENT:		
COURSE NUMBER (IF APPLICABLE):							
CLASS FORMAT: Lecture <input type="checkbox"/> Studio <input type="checkbox"/> Lab <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER (Please specify): _____							
<p>The Assessor is required to assess the Contract Lecturer by completing this form. The primary purpose of this assessment shall be to assist with the professional development of the Contract Lecturer. As such, the assessor and the CL must first have a conversation prior to the assessment in order to clarify the nature of the class format/delivery and to identify areas of specific focus, if applicable. Following the actual evaluation, both the Assessor and the Contract Lecturer must sign and date the form, after a discussion has taken place. Please use the following guide to rate the Contract Lecturer's performance in each of the areas.</p> <p>N/A = Not applicable 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Needs Improvement 3 = Satisfactory 4 = Good / accomplishes tasks diligently and well 5 = Excellent / accomplishes all tasks at a high level</p>							
A) SCHOLARSHIP (demonstrated through lecture or classroom/ online discussion or resource materials developed for course. Note that if material is online, the assessor is expected to view it prior to the class assessment)							
	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
1. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter.							
2. Integrates current situational examples, developments, and/or research findings into the content.							
3. Provides relevance and context for course content.							
4. Includes appropriate resource material and references with no copyright violations.							
5. Refers students to additional resource material, where appropriate.							
B) COURSE DELIVERY	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	SPECIFIC COMMENTS

APPENDIX V. CONTRACT LECTURER ASSESSMENT FORM

1. Is well prepared and organized.							
2. Is effective in facilitating/maintaining a positive class learning environment.							
3. If using, audio-visual tools (e.g. ppt, visio, etc.) are clear, effective and enhance learning.							
C) LEARNING	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
1. Stimulates critical thinking and analysis through lecture, discussion, online or in class activities.							
2. Assists students to connect course content with prior learned knowledge.							
3. Actively engages students in the learning process through discussion, questions and/or in class activities.							
4. Provides opportunities for students to learn from one another through discussion or in class activities.							
5. Adjusts pedagogy to individual and/or group needs, as appropriate.							
D) COMMUNICATION & INTERACTION	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	SPECIFIC COMMENTS
1. Expresses ideas clearly and audibly.							
2. Exhibits enthusiasm and a positive attitude toward students.							
3. Encourages student inquiry/class discussion/ student engagement.							
4. Is open to alternate viewpoints from students.							
5. Responds to student questions and incorporates feedback.							
6. Treats students fairly and with respect.							
E. USE THIS SPACE FOR ADDITIONAL/GENERAL COMMENTS. If you have concerns about the physical space impeding effective teaching, please forward these separately to your Chair/Director – they are not part of the evaluation process.							

F. STRENGTHS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
G. CONTRACT LECTURER'S RESPONSE	
CONTRACT LECTURER'S SIGNATURE: _____	
DATE: _____	
H. SIGNATURES: Both the Assessor and the Instructor shall sign this form to indicate that a discussion took place.	
ASSESSOR'S SIGNATURE: _____	
DATE: _____	
CONTRACT LECTURER'S SIGNATURE: _____	
DATE: _____	
Note: Pursuant to Article 18 of the CUPE Local 3904 Unit 1 Collective Agreement any ongoing discussions regarding this evaluation shall be with the Contract Lecturer and the Chair/Director.	

Copies: Contract Lecturer
Chair/Director
Service Record File
CUPE Local 3904 Unit 1

Wilfrid Laurier University
In-Class Evaluation of Professional Teaching Faculty
Guidelines for Department Chairs

Prepared by Pat Rogers, Associate Vice-President: Teaching and Learning

Introduction

Laurier's Vision and Mission statements encompass an expectation that faculty members will engage in quality teaching that provides students with an integrated and engaged learning experience. Currently, the University uses two primary assessment tools to evaluate the quality of teaching: course evaluations and the teaching dossier. In addition, faculty members holding Professional Teaching Positions (PTP) must undergo in-class peer review. For this purpose, the WLUFA Collective Agreement (Articles 13 and 15) requires that:

- The department chair or delegate make in-class observations at two stages:
 - In the second year; and
 - In the year prior to tenure application (normally the fourth year).
- Such classroom observations must involve at least one and no more than three visits and should be scheduled by mutual agreement.
- A final written report is presented to the Member, copied to the Dean and Member's Official File.
- Further, in evaluating a PTP faculty member for tenure, committees will look for consistent evidence of satisfactory academic performance, demonstrated professional growth, and the promise of future development, including a satisfactory record as a teacher, including in-class peer reviews.
- Any evaluation of teaching must be flexible and take into account the varied nature of the academic and professional disciplines.

This document outlines a model for the peer review of faculty members in professional teaching positions. A consistent process will facilitate fair assessment across the university.

Because the in-class observation reports are used in the tenure and promotion process, it is important to note that this form of evaluation is intended for *summative* purposes (i.e. it focuses on information needed to make personnel decisions). *Formative* evaluation, by contrast, is designed to help faculty improve their teaching. The distinction between these two forms of evaluation is important and the literature is clear on two things:

1. Those who provide formative feedback should not also be summative evaluators (Centra, 1993)
2. For summative evaluation of teaching to be fair and reliable, data needs to be gathered from multiple sources (ex. students, peers, self), by multiple methods (ex. teaching dossiers, review of course materials, letters of evaluation, course evaluations, in-class review) and at multiple points in time (ongoing formative feedback and scheduled summative feedback) (Chism, 1999).

A Model for Peer Review

For the process envisioned by the WLUFA Collective Agreement to meet the criteria noted above, it will be important that the department chair or delegate is not also involved in providing formative

feedback and that professional teaching faculty members be offered opportunities for receiving formative feedback on their teaching (see Appendix A on Mentorship) before and between the two periods of summative evaluation. The model recommended here takes into account these factors. The following steps are important in establishing the model:

1. Develop departmental standards and criteria

The first task of the department chair in developing a system of peer review should be to lead a conversation in the department designed to come to a common understanding of the standards and criteria on which faculty will be evaluated, consistent with those set out in Article 13.2 of the CA. Some guidance in having such a conversation is available in the literature (see Appendix B). At the very least, the chair should have a discussion with new colleagues about how department goals are designed to align with the University's UDLEs.

2. Offer candidates opportunities for formative feedback on teaching

Ensure that the faculty member is aware of the professional development and mentoring opportunities available to them for obtaining formative feedback on their teaching (Appendix A). This may include departmental faculty willing and able to mentor new colleagues, formal mentoring and other teaching development programs available through Teaching Support Services, and self-initiated activities such as classroom research, classroom buddies or student focus groups.

3. Decide who will conduct the summative in-class reviews

The CA requires that the department chair or delegate will conduct reviews. It may be a good idea to establish a list of potential delegates for use in cases where there is a conflict between the chair and the faculty member or where the chair's obligations conflict with the evaluation schedule.

4. Determine timelines for the review process

As outlined above in the introduction, for summative evaluation of teaching to be fair and reliable, data needs to be gathered from multiple sources, by multiple methods, and at multiple points in time. Any timeline should account for these various forms of feedback. Appendix C provides a suggested timeline.

Steps for conducting a summative in-class observation

The following steps are encouraged for making in-class observations. It is recommended that those conducting an observation for the purpose of providing formative feedback follow the same process, with the exception that the final report would be confidential and not used for personnel purposes.

Optional templates are provided in Appendix D (Forms 1, 2, 3 and 4) to assist observers in this process.

1. Pre-observation discussion

Before the in-class observation, the chair (delegate or mentor) and PTP faculty member meet to:

- Determine a mutually acceptable time and class to be observed
- Discuss course learning outcomes and how they meet and align with the program outcomes, if applicable

- Discuss the instructor's goals for the particular class in the context of the course learning outcomes
- Discuss the classroom layout, student demographics, any other issues the instructor feels are important for understanding the context of her/his teaching
- Discuss the chair's observation practices, e.g. where you will sit, how you will reduce the impact of your physical presence; how you will introduce yourself to the students

Form 1 may be used to focus the discussion and record important information for understanding the class to be observed. If a meeting such as this is not possible, the Form could be filled out by the instructor and sent to the chair by email.

2. Pre-observation preparation

Prior to the observation, the chair should review the course syllabus, learning outcomes, readings and any necessary class materials provided by the faculty member.

3. In-class observation

During the class, the observer takes notes to capture both small details and the big picture. At this stage it is very important to observe rather than assess. When observing another teach, it is far too easy to see only what you are looking for and only what confirms your own preconceptions. Form 2 is provided to help you capture as much raw data as possible about what happens in the classroom. Be prepared to stay for the entire class if it meets for one hour. In the case of a longer class, pick a suitable one-hour segment in consultation with the faculty member during the pre-observation meeting. Try to be as unobtrusive as possible. The instructor might wish to refer to your presence at the beginning of the class, but should avoid making any comments that might affect the behavior of the students (Chism, 1999).

4. Analysis

Before debriefing with the instructor, the observer reviews the notes through the lens of the agreed upon standards of effective teaching. It is critical at this stage that any interpretations and conclusions made refer back to specific examples. Form 3 may be useful for this purpose – the feedback on this form is to be derived from specific, concrete actions that took place during the observation. Form 4 may then be used to record strengths and opportunities for growth, recalling specific examples as illustrations. Forms 1-3 are for the observer's use only. Form 4 may be shared with the instructor during the debriefing meeting.

6. Debrief

Meet with the instructor as soon as possible after the class observed to debrief:

- Ask an open-ended question about the instructor's perceptions of how the class went. Note gaps to better create congruence between their perceptions and your own observations.
- Discuss the strengths of the instruction and how they could be better leveraged.
- Discuss opportunities for growth that would yield the greatest benefit.
- Selectively review key moments or turning points in the classroom experience.

- Decide whether an additional observation would be useful at this point in order to more fully understand and represent the instructor's teaching performance. (If so, repeat this process at most twice)

7. The written report

Based on the debriefing discussion, a report should be written that indicates the date(s) of the observation, the context of the evaluation, a brief description of the class observed including class objectives etc., and an assessment of the instructor's strengths and areas for improvement. This is the only report that is retained from the process in the instructor's personnel file and should conclude with an assessment of the instructor's teaching using the terms "unsatisfactory", "satisfactory", and "highly satisfactory." A template for this report is attached.

References

- Angelo, T., & Cross, P. (1993). *Classroom assessment techniques* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Centra, J. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation: Enhancing teaching and determining faculty effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A., & Gamson, Z. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in higher education. *AAHE Bulletin*, 39 (7), 3-7.
- Chism, N. (1999). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company.
- Kuh, G.D. & O'Donnell, K., with Case Studies by Sally Reed. (2013). *Ensuring Quality and Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Sbrizzi, S. (2002). Peer pairing. In J. Newton *et al* (Eds), *Voices from the classroom* (pp. 338-9). Aurora, ON: Garamond Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Mentorship

A mentor could be someone from the department, outside the department, or could be arranged by TSS. The University of Waterloo's Centre for Teaching Excellence has a useful guide for mentors and mentees, which can be accessed at <https://uwaterloo.ca/centre-for-teaching-excellence/teaching-resources/teaching-tips/professional-development/enhancing-your-teaching/faculty-mentoring>.

Other ways in which faculty members can obtain formative feedback include: using classroom assessment techniques (Angelo & Cross, 1993), student focus groups, appointing course representatives (often called classroom buddies), a reciprocal peer-pairing arrangement with a trusted colleague (Sbrizzi, 2002), teaching squares, or consultation with a TSS professional (see the TSS website).

Appendix B: Criteria for assessing teaching

The Collective Agreement (Art. 15.7) provides some guidance on what should be considered in assessing teaching:

- Demonstrated competence and responsibility in teaching and a commitment to the facilitation of student learning including contributions to the development of curriculum and programs of study within a Member's academic unit or sub-unit
- A satisfactory record as a teacher, including in-class peer reviews.

However, the terms satisfactory and competence are not defined.

Ideally, in-class review begins in the department with a conversation about its values and teaching mission leading to the development of program learning outcomes and criteria and standards for evaluating teaching performance. There is no single definition of effective teaching and the criteria will vary from discipline to discipline. However, the literature does provide some guidance, which can be used to structure the departmental conversation. TSS can assist in this process.

There is consistent agreement in the literature that the characteristics of effective classroom teaching include:

- Content knowledge
- Organization preparation
- Clarity
- Rapport with students
- Enthusiasm
- Student engagement.

In the suggested templates, I have used these characteristics as the criteria for assessment. Departments that have had a conversation about the characteristics of good teaching should use their own criteria.

Further guidance from the literature includes, for example, a seminal study by Chickering & Gamson (1987), which describes the characteristics of good practice in undergraduate education as:

- Encouraging contact between students and faculty
- Developing reciprocity and cooperation among students
- Encouraging active learning
- Giving prompt feedback
- Emphasizing time on task
- Communicating high expectations
- Respecting diverse talents and ways of learning.

With the emphasis at Laurier on high impact practices, the following quality dimensions, which are more or less common to all HIPs (Kuh & O'Donnell, 2013), may also be taken into account:

- Performance expectations set at appropriately high levels
- Significant investment of time and effort by students over an extended period of time
- Interactions with faculty and peers about substantive matters
- Experiences with diversity
- Frequent, timely and constructive feedback
- Periodic structured opportunities to reflect and integrate learning
- Opportunities to discover relevance of learning through real-world applications
- Public demonstration of competence.

Appendix C: Suggested Timeline

Year	Date	Task
First year	By the end of second term	Assign mentor Formative feedback provided, including review of materials and classroom visit Begin development of teaching dossier
Second year	Oct	Chair or designate undertakes formal in-class review
Second year	Jan	Mentor and PTP discuss chair's report, develop plan for future development, and review teaching dossier
Third year	As required	Formative feedback, including review of materials and classroom visit, review of teaching dossier
Fourth year	Oct	Chair or designate undertakes formal in-class review
Fourth year	Jan	Mentor and PTP discuss chair's report and review dossier and other tenure materials
Fifth Year	September	Faculty member initiates tenure application

Appendix D: OPTIONAL Classroom Observation and Feedback Tools

The attached templates are adapted from those used at Brigham Young University-Idaho (BYUI)¹ for the peer observation of classroom teaching. They are intended to help with capturing, organizing and reporting data relevant to instruction. There are four forms, which may be useful in preparing for observation, taking notes on classroom observation, analyzing the raw data, and in reporting.

Form 1: Pre-observation notes

This form may be used to guide a pre-observation conversation or may be completed by the instructor in advance of the planned observation.

Form 2: In-class observation

This form will help you capture as much raw data as possible about what happens in the classroom. The interpretive step (see analysis below) is left until later and Form 3 is provided to assist at that stage.

- In the first column of Form 2, record the time of key transition points in the classroom experience. This will enable you later to determine the duration of various activities, the ratio of instructor-led to student-led discussion, the alignment of learning objectives to learning activities etc.
- In the second column describe the transition or activity noted by the time.
- In column three, record instructor behavior and actions using descriptive but not interpretive language.
- In column four, note those student behaviors that seem relevant or that seem to be results of the instructor-initiated action.
- The line numbers at the far right of Form 2 may be used as a reference number in the interpretative stage of the review.

Form 3: Analysis

Before debriefing with the instructor, the observer reviews the notes through the lens of the agreed upon standards of effective teaching. It is critical at this stage that any interpretations and conclusions make reference back to specific examples. Form 3 is provided for this purpose – the feedback on this form is to be derived from specific, concrete actions that took place during the observation.

Form 4: Feedback to the Instructor

Form 4 is then used to record strengths and opportunities for growth, recalling specific examples as illustrations. Forms 1-3 are for the observer's use only. Form 4 may be shared

¹http://www.byui.edu/Documents/instructional_development/Instructional%20Tools%20Page%20PDFs/Classroom%20Observation.pdf)

with the instructor during the debriefing meeting.

FORM 1: Pre-observation Notes

Instructor:

Date:

Course Number:

Course Title:

Level of students:

Time and date of observation:

Questions:

1. What are your learning goals for the class I will observe? What do you expect students to learn?
2. What are your plans for achieving these goals?
3. What teaching/learning activities will take place?
4. What have students been asked to do to prepare for class?
5. Will this class be typical of your teaching style? If not, why?
6. Are there other things I should be aware of prior to the observation? (For example, types of students, previous challenges with the particular group.)

Form 2: Classroom Observation Notes

Instructor _____ Observer _____ Course _____ Date _____

TIME Note distinct events and transitions	TOPIC/ACTIVITY/ACTION (Including transition activities)	INSTRUCTOR ACTIONS (Direct instruction, questioning, evaluation, Q&A, flow, timing, transitions, flexibility, rapport, etc.)	STUDENT ACTIONS (Asking questions, responding, attention level, group work etc. note gender of students responding to questions)	
				1
				2
				3
				4
				5
				6
				7
				8
				9
				10
				11
				12
				13
				14
				15
				16
				17
				18
				19
				20

TIME Note distinct events and transitions	TOPIC/ACTIVITY/ACTION (Including transition activities)	INSTRUCTOR ACTIONS (Direct instruction, questioning, evaluation, Q&A, flow, timing, transitions, flexibility, rapport, etc.)	STUDENT ACTIONS (Asking questions, responding, attention level, group work etc. note gender of students responding to questions)
			21
			22
			23
			24
			25
			26
			27
			28
			29
			30
			31
			32
			33
			34
			35
			36
			37
			38
			39
			40

Form 3: Classroom Observation — Organization/Analysis of Data

For each applicable standard below, note the line number from the far right of the data sheet to indicate examples of the occurrence or non-occurrence of the standard. **Note:** These standards are meant as a suggestion and for illustration only. You are free to use your department's approved standards.

STANDARD

Line no.	Comments
----------	----------

A. KNOWLEDGE OF THE SUBJECT

- The faculty member clearly knows the discipline, going beyond mere facts in presenting important concepts using appropriate examples and illustrations
- The disciplinary knowledge includes knowing how to teach it to a broad range of students with concepts presented in a variety of ways.
- The faculty member is able to respond appropriately to students' questions

--	--

B. COURSE PREPARATION AND ORGANIZATION

- The faculty member clearly communicates the purpose of the class session and instructional activities.
- The concepts are clearly linked to course and/or class objectives.
- The session progresses logically with clear transitions and/or references to material covered earlier or coming up.
- Visual aids and/or learning technologies are skillfully executed and designed to enhance learning.
- Classroom management skills are evident.

--	--

C. CLARITY AND UNDERSTANDABILITY

- The faculty member speaks clearly and distinctly.
- S/he uses examples, provides equations, or relates topics to relevant examples or experiences drawn from students' field or workplace experiences (if appropriate).
- The faculty member uses examples to ground abstract concepts.

--	--

D. ENTHUSIASM FOR SUBJECT AND TEACHING

- The faculty member displays passion for the subject matter, the students' learning and for teaching itself.
- The faculty member clearly wants to be present and is keen to have the students present and engaged.

--	--

E. SENSITIVITY TO AND CONCERN FOR STUDENTS' LEVEL AND LEARNING PROGRESS

- The faculty members knows and uses students' names (in a small class)
- The faculty member interacts with respect for student identities and learning.
- The faculty members "reads" students' comprehension as the class progresses with appropriate pacing.
- S/he listens carefully to student comments and asks probing questions, paraphrasing and referring to previous contributions.

--	--

F. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT WITH LEARNING

Given different challenges with engagement in small and large classes, how well did the faculty member:

- Involve students in the class?
- Motivate them to prepare?
- Challenge them to exhibit critical skills, if appropriate?
- Initiate student-student exchange?
- Keep students focused on the material being explored.

--	--

(Adapted from

http://www.byui.edu/Documents/instructional_development/Instructional%20Tools%20Page%20PDFs/Classroom%20Observation.pdf)

Form 4: Feedback Form for Discussion with Instructor

Instructor _____ Observer _____ Course _____ Date _____

SUMMARY

Strengths (list at least two):

1.

2.

Areas for improvement:

1.

2.

Comments:

Use this space to summarize parts of the raw data that you wish to share with the instructor. This material should be given not as positive or negative feedback, but without comment as a way to allow instructors to track aspects of their course as they see fit. Examples include:

- Type and distribution (M/F) of student participation
- Ratio of total speaking time used by instructor to that used by students
- Number, duration and type of discrete activities
- Number and types of questions posed
- The level of the class discussion (for example, per Bloom's Taxonomy)

(Adapted from

http://www.byui.edu/Documents/instructional_development/Instructional%20Tools%20Page%20PDFs/Classroom%20Observation.pdf)

Final report (for personnel file)

Name of faculty member: _____

Observer (chair or delegate): _____

Department: _____

Course observed: _____

Date(s) of observation: _____

Context of the evaluation (e.g. you may include items from your pre-observation notes):

Brief description of the class observed including class objectives, etc.

Assessment of the instructor's strengths:

Assessment of areas for improvement:

Final assessment (check one):

☐ unsatisfactory ☐ satisfactory

Comments:

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____



PEER REVIEW OF COURSE INSTRUCTION – FORM

Sources and Methods for Evaluating Teaching
Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching (for Advancement and Promotion), 1987
Committee on Teaching – Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

Faculty: _____
_____/_____/_____

Date of Review:

Peer Reviewer: _____

HOW TO USE THIS FORM:

Peer Reviewer - This Peer Review of Course Instruction Form is designed to guide your observation and evaluation of a peer's class. Please note teaching strengths as well as provide suggestions for pedagogical improvement, whenever possible, as a supplement to evaluative comments. This form is not meant to be used as a checklist to observe and evaluate, rather it should generally frame the evaluation and serve as a starting point for identifying appropriate areas to address given the discipline, instructor teaching style and individual class session goals. The areas of focus listed in the form are not limited or exhaustive—feel free to comment on additional relevant components not included here.

Faculty – Your assigned peer reviewer will provide comments and suggestions on your classroom instruction using this Peer Review of Course Instruction Form. The *Faculty Self-Assessment* column to the far right is provided so that after the review, you are able to provide remarks of your own in response to the reviewer's comments.

-This form is intended to focus reviews on the mechanics of the classroom instruction and interaction, not on the content of the course.

Areas of Focus	Reviewer Comments & Suggestions	Faculty Comments & Response
Preliminary Activities <i>Potential areas for comment:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setup (i.e., materials, information projected on board/screen, physical arrangement) • Class Start (i.e., on time, overview of class session w/ clearly stated goals or portrayed in an obvious fashion) 		
The Main Event <u>Instructional Methods</u> (i.e., lecture, discussion, small-group work) <i>Potential areas for comment:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well-suited for teaching the content covered • Have a clear purpose • Encourage general attentiveness and consider attention spans in the timing of classroom activities • Provide opportunities for student participation and encourage engagement with the course content, instructor, and/or peers • Emphasize and summarize important points • Attend to the intellectual, emotional, and/or physical needs of students • Prompt students' to draw on prior learning and experiences • Examine student achievement of goals (i.e., questioning students on course material, observing student performance, discussion, quizzes) <u>Class Flow</u> <i>Potential areas for comment:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well organized and easy to follow • Transitions between units, sections, concepts and/or topics • Allows time for questions • Uses time management to cover content • Concludes and reviews of day's topic 		
Interaction with Students		

*Center for Teaching and Learning, UC Berkeley, 2013 - Adapted from a "Checklist for Peer Observation" by Tollefson 1993, 2001, UC Berkeley

<p><i>Potential areas for comment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation techniques are well utilized (i.e. movement, lecturing from notes vs. manuscript, eye contact) • Tone of voice indicates interest in the subject, students, and student questions • Creates a participatory classroom environment • Responsive to student nonverbal cues (i.e., excitement, boredom, confusion, apprehension) • Uses student names whenever possible • Encourages student questions • Provides clear explanations to student questions 		
<p>Integration of Technology (if applicable)</p> <p><i>Potential areas for comment:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology is used to engage students, enhance learning, and/or generally enrich students' class experience as part of lecture, activities, or discussion • Technology is leveraged to facilitate a learning experience that would otherwise not be possible • Student work done via technology outside of class is integrated into the class session (i.e. homework, discussion board) 		

General Comments, Summary & Suggestions: *(to be filled out by peer reviewer)*

-This space could be used to describe the setting in which the lesson took place, relevant information about the makeup of the class, and any other descriptive characteristics that would provide appropriate context to the review. This space could additionally be used to highlight areas for suggested pedagogical improvement, along with concrete strategies.

Response: *(to be filled out by faculty member)*

-This space should be used to articulate goals for the next peer review of course instruction and outline concrete steps to reach those goals.