

ADDENDUM TO COLLEGE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING POLICY

January 30, 2015

Background

In March 2002, the faculty of the Warrington College of Business Administration adopted a policy regarding Peer Review of Teaching: (<http://warrington.ufl.edu/mywarrington/tenure.asp>) – see Peer Review of Teaching PDF, including periodic peer observation (see Peer Review of Teaching Procedure PDF) and annual updating of a Teaching Portfolio (see Guidelines for Teaching Portfolio Preparation for Annual Report PDF). Over the ensuing decade, the Peer Review of Teaching policy has been implemented systematically with regard to third-year reviews, promotion cases, and teaching awards. However, implementation has been less systematic with regard to the continuing appointments of lecturers and adjuncts, and as a standard component of annual faculty evaluations.

Motivation

The recently revised AACSB standards place greater emphasis on effective teaching. Specifically, Standard 12 calls for the following:

The school has policies and processes to enhance the teaching effectiveness of faculty and professional staff involved with teaching across the range of its educational programs and delivery modes.

The bases for judgment are the following criteria:

- *The school has a systematic process for evaluating quality as an integral component of the faculty and professional staff performance review process. This process should extend beyond student evaluations of teaching and include expectations for continuous improvement.*
- *The school provides development activities focused on teaching enhancement to all faculty members, appropriate professional staff, and graduate students who have teaching responsibilities across all delivery modes.*
- *Faculty are adequately prepared to teach while employing the modalities and pedagogies of degree programs.*
- *Faculty and professional staff substantially participate in teaching enhancement activities.*

To address the overall issue of enhancing teaching effectiveness and in particular the first bullet point listed above, the deans and academic unit heads in the College should re-assert more systematic adherence to the existing Peer Review of Teaching policy. All faculty

should maintain their Teaching Portfolios as specified in the policy, and administrators should carefully review these portfolios as a component of the annual faculty evaluation.

In addition, enhancements and expansion of the policy are needed, with the goal of making the policy a more effective mechanism for ensuring continuous improvement of the College's instructional programs.

Refinements of Existing Policy

The current Peer Review of Teaching policy is detailed and comprehensive. Two modifications are necessary to strengthen the effectiveness of the review process relative to the College's objectives.

First, the current composition of an individual faculty member's review committee is three faculty, two from within the same department and one from outside. This committee should be expanded to include an instructional designer, to be appointed by the faculty member's unit head in consultation with the Director of the College's Center for Teaching, Learning and Assessment (CTLA). The CTLA did not exist at the time the policy was adopted, and in recent years the role of instructional design in the delivery of the College's courses has expanded greatly. Drawing on this expertise in the peer review of teaching seems highly desirable. In addition, the Senior and Master Lecturers in the College should be considered for inclusion on review committees, where appropriate.

Second, the Peer Review of Teaching policy specifies a formal *summative evaluation* that includes a peer review at several points, such as third-year and promotion decisions. Post-tenure summative evaluations are required every seven years (p. 3). Due to the AACSB's increased attention to the assurance of teaching quality, post-tenure summative evaluations must explicitly incorporate input from a *formative* (i.e., diagnostic) peer review of the faculty member's teaching. A formative review stops short of making an overall evaluation, but the observations included in such a review should feed into the summative evaluation required under the current policy. (See the 2002 policy for a discussion of summative and formative evaluations.)

All college administrators and teaching faculty (of any rank) should familiarize (or re-familiarize) themselves with the Peer Review of Teaching policy. This will help set expectations and also remind everyone involved of the components of the review process.

Extension of the Existing Policy

Over the past decade an increasing percentage of the College's courses are being taught by professionals other than tenured and tenure-track faculty (e.g., lecturers, adjuncts, post-docs, professors of practice, and professional staff). (Ph.D. students also account for a considerable amount of teaching, but they are being dealt with separately and do not factor into this policy.)

It is the Teaching Committee's impression that the Peer Review of Teaching policy has not been implemented systematically with respect to these other classes of faculty in the College. The policy should be enforced for those faculty as well.

Specifically, every instructor in the College (except tenured, tenure track, and clinical faculty) must be subjected to a thorough *formative* peer review during his or her first semester of teaching. If aspects of an instructor's teaching are inadequate but potentially correctable, the individual may be required to work with content experts and/or instructional designers to improve his or her teaching. All non-tenure track instructors who have ongoing appointments must maintain a Teaching Portfolio and participate in the same annual evaluation process as tenured and tenure track faculty; in addition, every five years they must undergo a full *summative* evaluation as specified in the Peer Review of Teaching.

AACSB Standard 12 also requires documentation of "continuous improvement and development initiatives" for "all faculty, appropriate staff, and graduate students" through participation in teaching enhancement activities. To that end deans and academic unit heads should support attendance and participation in teaching and pedagogical conferences, workshops, and seminars conducted both within the College (offered through the Center for Teaching, Learning & Assessment), and outside the College at the University level, and/or through professional associations. This support can be in the form of funds to support travel and presentations at teaching-focused events, bringing in outside experts, promotion and support of CTLA activities, and consideration in annual reviews of such participation by faculty and staff.

2014-2015 WCBA Teaching Committee

Richard Lutz, Chair
Larry DiMatteo
Jill Goslinga
John Banko
Adam Munson
Tawnya Means
Christopher Kurtz
Alicia Cofino