

COLLEGE OF EARTH, OCEAN, AND ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES POLICY STATEMENT

EVALUATION OF TEACHING AND ADVISING

In response to University peer teaching review requirements, the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences has initiated the following policy.

Teaching and advising performed by each faculty member who has these responsibilities should be evaluated by peer review at least once every five years. This review is intended to supplement the evaluation of individual courses by students and the annual merit review conducted by the Dean, and will become part of the files of those individuals who are under review for promotion and tenure. For faculty where promotion and tenure is not a consideration, a somewhat less vigorous review will be held.

Faculty members who are new to CEOAS and who have less than five years teaching experience at an Assistant Professor rank or higher, will be reviewed in their second or third year in order to provide peer review at an early stage when it might be most useful in improving effectiveness.

PURPOSE

The purpose of the evaluation is to promote the highest possible quality of teaching and advising by (1) recognizing superior performance, (2) providing a peer-review basis for promotion and tenure decisions, as required by the University, and (3) providing feedback to individual faculty members regarding course content and materials, classroom activities, student consultation and advising, post-doctoral and graduate teaching assistant, and other matters related to the successful conduct of instructional and advising duties.

OVERVIEW

There are four classes of information used in a review:

1. Information and materials obtained from the faculty member being reviewed, such as class syllabi, reading lists, eSETs, etc.
2. Written statements from current and former students, GTA's and GRA's, and post-Postdocs (where possible), concerning teaching and advising.
3. In-class reviews by a sub-panel of the Peer Review of Teaching Committee (PRTC)
4. Sub-committee meeting with the faculty member

The review process is carried out by the PRTC, a faculty committee elected by the discipline groups. The review is intended to be constructive in its tone and effects. The review process is intended to minimize the demand on faculty time while providing a fair, consistent and comprehensive evaluation.

Each individual review will be initiated by the PRTC Chair, and carried out by a sub-panel of the Committee. Each review will result in a confidential written report. It will provide a record for the faculty member and will serve as the basis for recognition of outstanding achievement, used in promotion and tenure reviews, as well as for any counseling by the Dean and/or Associate Dean for Academic Programs (ADAP). All reports will be assembled by the PRTC Chair and given collectively to the Dean/ADAP after the last review of the academic year. The Dean and/or ADAP may choose to discuss the PRTC review immediately with the faculty member, or concurrent with the Dean's annual faculty review. Conducting the PRTC review is viewed as a collegial responsibility of the faculty, and an impartial and constructive manner should be maintained at all times.

In-class reviews to evaluate the faculty member's classroom activities normally will be an integral part of each evaluation. For some small-enrollment classes an in-class review may be inappropriate, in which case the PRTC may decide to conduct the evaluation without a review.

A brief statement explaining such a decision should be included in the evaluation.

CRITERIA

1. Teaching

- a. The objectives of each course should be appropriate to the course's level and intended student audience, and should be clearly communicated to all students.
- b. Each course should cover the subject matter with at least the breadth and depth that are considered necessary by the faculty of the appropriate discipline group.
- c. The course material should be well suited to the objectives, and up to date.
- d. The teacher should foster enthusiasm for the subject matter, and for learning in general.
- e. The teacher should be aware of his/her lecturing pace and clarity, and what constitutes good classroom use of audio/visual/electronic media.
- f. The teacher should interact sensitively with students to track their progress and to help them when they are having difficulty.
- g. The teacher should treat all students fairly and honestly.

2. Advising

- a. The faculty member should be readily available for student counseling and advising.
- b. The advisor should be sensitive to individual student goals, familiar with OSU/CEOAS requirements, and should provide advice that is in the best interest of the student.
- c. The advisor should respond within a reasonable time when advisees ask for reviews of written material or other assistance.
- d. The advisor should promote timely establishment of a program, initiation of research, completion of degree requirements and publication of results.
- e. The advisor should foster a spirit of excellence, and should serve as a personal example of scientific creativity and rigor.
- f. The advisor should treat every student fairly and honestly.

PROCEDURES

1. Annually, the Dean and/or ADAP will:

- a. Identify all candidates for review of teaching and advising. These will normally include new faculty after their second or third year of teaching, all faculty members being considered for promotion or tenure (if not reviewed within the previous two years) and others whose teaching has not been reviewed in the previous five years.
- b. The PRTC chair is appointed by the Dean and the committee members are elected by each discipline group. The chairperson oversees and coordinates the PRT process. For each faculty member whose teaching is to be evaluated that year, this panel will select a sub-panel to carry out the review. It is expected that each sub-panel will contain one member knowledgeable in the subject matter of the course.

2. The Chair of the PRTC, with concurrence from the Dean, will inform the faculty member being reviewed that the review is taking place and will tell that person the names of the colleagues appointed to his or her review sub-panel. The faculty member being reviewed will have the opportunity to discuss the makeup of this sub-panel with the chair and/or the Dean before the review begins, but will not have veto power over its composition.
3. The sub-panel conducting the review will:
 - a. Evaluate all written materials provided by the instructor.
 - b. Review the letters of evaluation solicited by the Chair. These letters will be from former Postdocs, graduate advisees, GTA's, who were advised and mentored no more than 5 year from the review process. Letters will also be from current and former graduate and undergraduate students who took courses from the faculty member under review. Frank appraisals of the faculty member's effectiveness in teaching and (if applicable) advising will be sought. Those writing letters will be asked specifically to address the long-term benefits and lasting value of the faculty member's teaching and advising. Letters of this kind would not be appropriate in cases where the faculty member has been at OSU for less than three years, and will not be sought in those situations.
 - c. Meet informally with the faculty member being reviewed to discuss his or her teaching philosophy, objectives, methods, eSETs, etc.
 - d. Attend class meetings at time(s) agreeable to the faculty member requesting 15 minutes at the end of class to hold a discussion with students in attendance.
 - e. Conduct its review in a constructive, helpful manner.
4. The review sub-panel will not:
 - a. Engage in any activity that might interfere with effective classroom teaching. It will not attend class meetings without prior arrangement with the instructor.
 - b. Make any recommendation, formally or informally, that is contrary to the spirit of open inquiry in an atmosphere of academic freedom.
5. The Chair of the PRTC will provide the Dean and ADAP with a written report of its findings and recommendations. The Dean will then provide individual PRT reports to the faculty members under review. Faculty members in turn may submit a response to the review or elements of it. This response will be filed with the review. The report, along with any response from the faculty member under review, will be available to that year's full PRTC, and to the Promotion and Tenure Committee during that year or any subsequent year when the faculty member is being considered for promotion.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE FACULTY MEMBER BEING REVIEWED

It is the College's intent that the review process should involve very little additional work or record keeping on the part of the faculty member being reviewed. Specifically, no dossier similar to those used in Promotion and Tenure review will be required. The faculty member will be requested to provide the review sub-panel with:

1. A list of current and former Ph.D., M.S., and undergraduate students advised, Postdocs advised and other graduate students on whose committees you have served; and other students advised or mentored in less traditional ways such as REU and GTA's.
2. An up-date curriculum vitae that includes all teaching related activities and eSET ratings. include: a list of other teaching activities that you have been involved in over the past 5 years,

including any textbooks you have written, graduate committees you have served on, curriculum development work, student recruitment efforts, summer courses you have taught, seminar courses you have taught, and reading and conference courses you have taught.

3. Copies of written materials that are normally prepared for courses to include:
 - a. course syllabi (making sure that all the requirements from OSU are included)
 - b. reading lists (both required and optional readings, if both are provided to the students)
 - c. lists of potential topics for term papers or oral seminars, if part of the course
 - d. handouts of other kinds that are provided to the students
 - e. examinations.

In addition, the faculty member may provide a brief written overview of a given course's objectives and intended student audience, a description of how the course has evolved over time, ideas for future changes or anything else that he or she may consider relevant to the evaluation of that course by colleagues on the faculty.