

**ORIGIN: AD HOC COMMITTEE ON TEACHING EVALUATION**

**TITLE: TEACHING EVALUATION**

**PREAMBLE:**

The Faculty of the School of Veterinary Medicine, in the continued interest of fostering effective teaching and faculty development, hereby approves a policy for evaluation of teaching offered in the various curricula of the school under the following conditions.

1. Evaluation Process

a. Evaluation by Students

Each course and its principal instructors shall be evaluated by enrolled students completing an evaluation form. To protect student confidentiality, courses with small enrollment may not be required to complete evaluations. The Teaching Evaluation Committee will design, in optional consultation with the Division of Instructional Services, the evaluation instrument most appropriate for the course and instructor(s). Evaluation will be conducted at the end of the course or instructional unit.

Formative evaluation processes will be used by instructors to assess and improve teaching, including clinical block evaluations, and exit interviews.

Instructor evaluation in new courses will be formative only for the first two offerings of the course.

b. Evaluation by Peers

All instructors involved in substantial teaching commitments will have periodic peer evaluation of their teaching, including review of teaching materials (e.g., course syllabi, handout materials, examinations). Peer evaluation will also include classroom visitation and review of documentation of teaching scholarship (e.g., papers, book chapters, books, multimedia programs). An evaluation form for implementation of the peer review process is attached.

c. Self-evaluation

As a part of the peer evaluation process, instructors will provide written reflections on their teaching contributions and effectiveness, including formative efforts to improve.

2. Use of the Results of Evaluation (From University Senate Document 97-9)

a. Formative Use

Opportunities should be available for instructors to conduct formative evaluations.

b. Summative Use

The teaching evaluation process should be the source of summative evaluations; that is, evaluations that are used for personnel decisions. Department heads will receive the results of summative evaluations and will maintain appropriate records for use of these evaluations. As appropriate,

these summative evaluations will be made available to committees responsible for matters of personnel management and specifically for issues of reappointment and promotion. The evaluations will be provided to members of appropriate peer evaluation teams.

### 3. Teaching Evaluation Committee

The Teaching Evaluation Committee is an SVM administrative committee composed of a faculty member named from each department, two students from the Curriculum Committee, and the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Each faculty member will serve a three-year term (arranged in staggered pattern). The Committee will be chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. The Teaching Evaluation Committee should play an oversight role in the evaluation process, but does not have access to the evaluations. If problems occur with the functioning of a peer evaluation team, this should be brought to the attention of the Committee.

### 4. Instructor Peer Teaching Evaluation

#### a. Objectives

The primary goal of the SVM instructor peer teaching evaluation program is to provide feedback to individual instructors in an effort to improve teaching within the school. Documentation of teaching effectiveness will be required for promotion and tenure documents. Thus the goal is to develop a formative system of peer evaluation that can easily be converted into a summative evaluation.

#### b. Considerations

We recognize that the School has multiple educational needs and a diversity of types of instruction. The instructor peer teaching evaluation program principally addresses formal classroom teaching for which the instructor is either an instructor of record or is in charge of a substantial portion of the course material. The evaluation should be tailored to accommodate different course characteristics, including class size and course format (lecture, laboratory). The evaluation should not dictate teaching style.

Instructor evaluation in new courses will be formative only for the first two offerings of the course.

#### c. Procedure

In the interest of fairness and objectivity, teams of four instructors will be created. Each instructor will select a course in which they currently teach for evaluation. All four instructors on a team will mutually evaluate each others' teaching efforts.

To accomplish this, the team will plan the following meetings:

- 1.) Instructors meet to share and review their course material. Written information should be provided by each of the team members describing the course, educational objectives, enrollment characteristics of the students, and a self-evaluation of the individual's teaching efforts. Copies of student evaluations and course materials will be provided to the team members. This may include course outlines, syllabi, reading lists, assignments, quizzes and exams, and any material the instructor deems pertinent to his/her teaching efforts.
- 2.) The instructors visit each others' classrooms. If feasible, the team evaluators should visit during the same class period. The timing of the classroom visits will be mutually agreed upon.
- 3.) The instructors meet to discuss their observations. After this meeting, the SVM Instructor Peer Teaching Evaluation form (attached) is completed by each evaluator.

d. Teams

The teaching evaluation teams are composed by the Teaching Evaluation Committee. Each team is composed of four instructors. Each team containing a non-tenured faculty member should also contain a tenured faculty member. When feedback deals with teaching activities, a colleague's detailed knowledge of the course content may hinder rather than help. Realizing this, but also recognizing that relevance is hard to judge without knowledge of the subject matter, an instructor will be evaluated by at least one team member familiar with the course material and at least one team member who is less familiar with the material. Evaluation teams will be interdepartmental.

If problems occur with the functioning of a teaching evaluation team, this should be reported to the Teaching Evaluation Committee. The Committee may opt to add an additional member to the team.

e. Frequency of Evaluation

All non-tenured faculty involved in substantial teaching commitments should be evaluated annually. All tenured associate professors involved in substantial teaching commitments should be evaluated every other year and all tenured full professors involved in substantial teaching commitments every third year. When a new team is formed, mutual evaluation of all members of the team should take place. Additional evaluations may be requested by any team member and are at the discretion of the team. Students, through the class Student/Faculty Liaison Committees and with the support of a majority of the class, may request to the Teaching Evaluation Committee that any faculty member be reviewed at a time in addition to the regularly scheduled review. Instructors who receive low evaluation ratings will be evaluated the following year regardless of their rank.

f. Standard Form

The standard form for use in reporting the SVM Instructor Peer Evaluation is attached. The reports are to be fair and accurate and emphasize constructive criticism. Each instructor may respond to their evaluation.

g. Uses and Confidentiality

The complete reports for each Student Evaluation, Self Evaluation, and Instructor Peer Evaluation will be provided to the Department Head, the instructor evaluated, and will be available for review by the committees responsible for matters of personnel management and specifically for issues of reappointment and promotion. Parts of the teaching evaluations may be released for other purposes only with agreement of the instructor. Other than these uses, the complete reports and the summary statements will be treated as confidential information.

SVM Instructor Peer Evaluation Form

**I. General Information**

Instructor evaluated \_\_\_\_\_  
 Semester \_\_\_\_\_  
 Course evaluated \_\_\_\_\_  
 Evaluation performed by \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date of evaluation \_\_\_\_\_

**II. Self-Evaluation - Address the following in a narrative form and attach (maximum 2 pages)**

- Give a description of your general teaching philosophy
- Describe your short- and long-term teaching goals
- Provide a self-assessment of your teaching effectiveness

**III. Evaluation of Course Materials**

All questions conform to the following 5-point scale:

- SA (5) Strongly Agree
- A (4) Agree
- N (3) Neither agree nor disagree
- D (2) Disagree
- SD (1) Strongly Disagree
- U Unable to assess

**Mastery of course content = Content expertise**

- |   |     |     |     |     |     |   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
|   | (5) | (4) | (3) | (2) | (1) |   |
| • The instructor keeps abreast of current developments in the areas covered by this course. | SA  | A   | N   | D   | SD  | U |

**Selection of course content**

- |   |    |   |   |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| • The materials are balanced in their approach to the subject-area                        | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
| • The course content is appropriate for the curricular requirements                       | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
| • The level of the material is appropriate for students in this phase of their curriculum | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
| • The amount of material presented is appropriate for the time allocated to the course    | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |

**Course organization**

- |   |    |   |   |   |    |   |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| • The course materials follow a logical progression | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|---|

**Course objectives**

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |   |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| • The course objectives are appropriate for the course description in the curriculum | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|---|

**Appropriateness of instructional materials**

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |   |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|---|
| • The instructor has a current and relevant syllabus that includes the following components: course objectives, sequential outline of the course content, methods of evaluating student achievement, listing of text and other resource material | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
| • The reading material assigned is appropriate for the objectives of the course  | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |
| • Homework and other course assignments are appropriate for the objectives of this course  | SA | A | N | D | SD | U |

**Student evaluation methods**

- The instructor uses evaluation methods that are appropriate for the course SA A N D SD U

**Supplemental resources**

- The instructor provides the students with appropriate reference material or multimedia resources to assist their learning process SA A N D SD U

**Commitment to teaching**

- The instructor shows a concern for student learning through his/her efforts in course preparation SA A N D SD U
- The instructor has an effective teaching style. SA A N D SD U

**Mean Score**

**Comments**

**IV. Class Room Visits**

	(5)	(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)	
	Excellent	Satisfactory		Needs Improvement		N/A*
• Organization of lecture/discussion/laboratory:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Clarity of presentation:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Active involvement of students:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Use of teaching aids, demonstrations, audio-visual materials:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Knowledge of subject:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Answers questions effectively:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Consistency with course objectives, materials, schedule:	5	4	3	2	1	NA
• Recognition of diverse styles of learning:	5	4	3	2	1	NA

\*Not Applicable or was not or could not be evaluated.

**Mean Score**

**Comments**

**V. Scholarly Activities Related to Teaching (attach to form)**

- Publications or other scholarly efforts related to teaching
- Teaching awards
- Attendance at workshops or lectures related to teaching
- Teaching innovations
- Development of courses
- Tutoring or mentoring activities
- Invited presentations related to teaching
- Publication of textbooks or instructional material adopted at other institutions
- Other

**VI. Summary Evaluation and Recommendations**

**VII. Response to Evaluation by Faculty Member (Optional)**