



A Summary and Analysis of
**Written Guidelines for
Evaluating Teaching
Effectiveness at
UNC-Chapel Hill**

Prepared for the Committee on Appointments,
Promotion, and Tenure

David Schwartz and Eric Muller
UNC-CH Center for Faculty Excellence

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS	5
COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES	10
SCHOOL OF BUSINESS	13
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY	14
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION	16
SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT	17
SCHOOL OF INFORMATION AND LIBRARY SCIENCE	18
SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION	19
SCHOOL OF LAW	20
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE	21
SCHOOL OF NURSING	23
SCHOOL OF PHARMACY	25
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH	26
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK	29
APPENDIX 1: COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES PEER OBSERVATION REPORT FORM	30
APPENDIX 2: DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF NON-TENURED CANDIDATES FOR REAPPOINTMENT, PROMOTION, AND TENURE	32
APPENDIX 3: SCHOOL OF EDUCATION PEER EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING	34
APPENDIX 4: DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY MEDICINE GUIDELINES FOR DOCUMENTING EXCELLENCE AND SCHOLARSHIP IN TEACHING	36
APPENDIX 5: DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING	38

<u>APPENDIX 6: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH BEHAVIOR & HEALTH EDUCATION POLICY ON PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING</u>	44
---	-----------

<u>APPENDIX 7: SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK PEER OBSERVATION FORM</u>	50
--	-----------

Background

On August 9, 2012, Richard Whisnant, Chair of the University Committee on Appointments, Promotions, and Tenure (APT), requested assistance from the Center for Faculty Excellence (CFE) “in understanding methods of teaching evaluation at UNC-CH and peer institutions.” The first specific form of assistance requested was to “gather in one place, in a user-friendly format, the existing rules and regulations of the various units on student and peer evaluation of teaching.” To that end, CFE staff first examined the formal, written APT guidelines that the UNC College of Arts and Sciences and UNC’s 12 professional schools have published. Links to these guidelines are available at <http://provost.unc.edu/policies/faculty/apt/>. We then sent an email message to each academic unit head (i.e., each School Dean, or, in the case of the College, each Department Chair) asking whether the unit had any written guidelines governing the evaluation of teaching effectiveness in addition to those published in the documents available from the Provost’s website. This report summarizes the findings of this information-gathering process.

Executive Summary and Analysis

Chapter 400.3.1.1[G] of the UNC Policy Manual sets forth guidelines on tenure and teaching at the University of North Carolina. This chapter, which was adopted in 1993, instructs the Chancellor of each constituent institution of the UNC system to:

review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure that (1) student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.

This mandate provides a lens through which to view the written guidelines published by the more than 50 UNC-CH tenure-granting units. Each unit can be grouped to one of four ordered categories based on the number of criteria the unit uses to evaluate teaching effectiveness and on the amount of procedural detail its guidelines provide.

The first and largest category comprises units whose guidelines suggest that they do only the very minimum needed to comply with the mandate. We term this group **Responsive** to convey our sense that these units' guidelines respond to the mandate, but do not go much beyond it. An example of a unit in the Responsive category would be a unit whose guidelines state that student course evaluations and faculty peer observations will be used to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for tenure and promotion, but whose guidelines do not specify either the peer observation procedures (e.g., frequency of observation, reporting format) to be used or the way in which student course evaluations will be analyzed.

The second category, which we term **Detailed Responsive**, comprises units who, like those in the first category, consider only the two sources of evidence mentioned in the mandate (i.e., student course evaluations and peer observation), but whose guidelines provide a bit more procedural detail. An example of a unit in the Detailed Responsive group would be a unit whose written guidelines provide some detailed information concerning how student course evaluation data and faculty peer observation data will be collected and analyzed, such as specifying the timing and frequency of peer observation or requiring the use of a standardized observation reporting form.

The third category comprises those units whose written guidelines go beyond what is needed simply to comply with the mandate. Typically, these units' guidelines specify a much larger and richer set of indicators that the unit uses to assess teaching effectiveness, and the guidelines articulate a conception of effective teaching wherein classroom performance is but one—albeit an important one—of many different components. We term this category **Extensive** to convey our sense that these units' guidelines articulate a broader view both of what constitutes effective teaching in a given discipline and of how to assess it. The units in this category also typically require candidates to maintain and submit a formal teaching portfolio to document their work and achievements in the area of teaching.

Finally, the fourth and smallest group, which we term **Comprehensive**, consists of units whose guidelines not only feature a large and diverse set of teaching effectiveness indicators, but also articulate a coherent, multidimensional conception of teaching effectiveness, with each assessment explicitly aligned with some aspect of the conception. An example of a unit in the Comprehensive category would one whose guidelines 1) state that effective teaching comprises both *process* and *outcome* dimensions, and 2) identify multiple sources of evidence that can be used to assess a candidate's performance on each of these dimensions.

Table 1 presents the four categories and the units we assigned to each of them.

Table 1. Classification of units by number and diversity of indicators used to evaluate teaching effectiveness and level of procedural detail provided in written guidelines.

RESPONSIVE	DETAILED RESPONSIVE	EXTENSIVE	COMPREHENSIVE
AFRICAN & AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES	ALLIED HEALTH SCI	DENTISTRY	EPIDEMIOLOGY
AMERICAN STUDIES	BIOLOGY	EDUCATION	HEALTH BEH & HEALTH EDUC
ANTHROPOLOGY	BIOSTATISTICS	ENVR SCI & ENG	HEALTH POL & MANGEMENT
ART	ECONOMICS	FAMILY MEDICINE	MATERNAL & CHILD HEALTH
ASIAN STUDIES	EXERCISE & SPORT SCI	INFORMATION & LIBRARY SCI	NURSING
CHEMISTRY	LAW	BUSINESS SCHOOL	NUTRITION
CITY & REGIONAL PLANNING	LINGUISTICS	MEDICINE: EDUC RESEARCH	SOCIAL WORK
CLASSICS	MATHEMATICS	PSYCHIATRY	
COMMUNICATION STUDIES	PHILOSOPHY		
COMPUTER SCIENCE	PHYSICS & ASTRON		
DRAMATIC ART	POLITICAL SCIENCE		
ENGLISH & COMP LIT	ROMANCE LANG & LIT		
GEOGRAPHY	SOCIOLOGY		
GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES			
GERMANIC & SLAVIC LANG & LIT			
GOVERNMENT			
JOURNALISM & MASS COMM			
MARINE SCIENCES			
MEDICINE: BIOMED RESEARCH			
MUSIC			
PUBLIC POLICY			
RELIGIOUS STUDIES			
STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RES			

This assignment of units to groups is necessarily imprecise. Within each, some units will have more detailed guidelines than others, and a given unit may not fit neatly into a single group. Nonetheless, we feel this conceptual scheme provides a useful, if somewhat crude, way to order the large and complex volume of information collected. In the following section we discuss specific units that exemplify each of the four groups.

Responsive

This group includes the majority of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS), almost all of the departments in the School of Medicine, as well as the School of Journalism and Mass Communication and the School of Pharmacy. For example, the APT guidelines for the Department of Statistics and Operations Research in the College simply state, “The evaluation of a candidate's teaching will be based on the Carolina Course Evaluation form, on departmental course evaluation forms, and on the written reports of senior faculty who visit their classes” with no further elaboration. Similarly, the APT guidelines for School of Journalism and Mass Communication state that candidates being reviewed for personnel actions must submit to the chair of the APT committee summary course evaluation pages for all courses taught in the relevant time period, sample student comments from the course evaluations, and all peer teaching observation reports.

Detailed Responsive

This group includes about a third of the departments in the College and several of the professional schools. For example, the Department of Biology in 2011 published a document entitled “Evaluation of Teaching by the Department of Biology,” which describes in detail the procedures the department uses to evaluate the teaching of candidates under review for personnel actions. The document describes the format, administration, and analysis of student course evaluations as well as the timing of peer classroom observations and the aspects of the candidate’s classroom performance to which the observers pay particular attention.

More typical of the CAS units in this group are the guidelines for the Departments of Political Science and Philosophy. Both departments’ guidelines state that evaluation of a candidate’s teaching entails a review of student course evaluations and observation of classroom performance by at least two faculty peers of higher rank, and provide some additional detail about the procedures for collecting and analyzing these sources of information. For example, the Department of Philosophy’s guidelines specify that classroom visitation must occur within a year prior to the candidate’s review, that each observer must visit a representative sample of the candidate’s undergraduate and graduate classes, and that the observers must prepare and submit written evaluations of the candidate’s classroom teaching. While only about a third of CAS departments currently merit designation in this category, an August 2012 memorandum established minimum faculty peer observation guidelines for all departments in the College. When these guidelines are fully implemented, all departments in the College will qualify as Detailed Responsive in our categorization scheme.

While almost all of the units in this group are CAS departments, the School of Law provides an example from outside the College. The main text of the School’s APT manual states only that the School “reviews student and peer evaluations of the candidate’s teaching” and that the review committee “may, if it deems it necessary or desirable, consult with former students or presently enrolled students concerning the candidate’s teaching competence.” If the School provided no further written guidelines concerning the evaluation of teaching, we would group it as simply Responsive. However, the School’s manual includes an appendix that describes the School’s procedures for peer observation of teaching, and this additional information earns the school a grade of Detailed Responsive.

Extensive

As mentioned above, the units we have categorized as Extensive merit this label because their guidelines reflect a richer conception of teaching effectiveness and a correspondingly larger variety of data sources for assessing a candidate’s teaching effectiveness. No CAS departments merited this grade. The one that perhaps comes closest is, again, the Department of Philosophy, whose guidelines 1) enumerate the factors that the Department considers contribute to classroom effectiveness (e.g., selection of course materials, clarity of presentation, fairness in dealing with students) and 2) state that, in addition to reviewing student course evaluations and peer evaluations, the Committee will solicit evaluations of the candidate from current graduate students and a representative selection of undergraduate students. It is possible that other CAS departments also base their evaluations of candidates’ teaching on more than just student course evaluations and peer observations but do so informally or by custom without promulgating this more comprehensive approach in their formal written guidelines. The survey we will undertake in the next stage of this project will attempt to ascertain whether this is so.

The Schools of Business, Dentistry, Education, and Information and Library Science are examples of units whose guidelines include a rich set of indicators of teaching effectiveness (e.g., development of new instructional materials, contributions to enhancing the teaching skills of departmental colleagues, scholarship related to teaching in the discipline) but do not organize these indicators within a coherent, multidimensional conception of effective teaching.

Comprehensive

The best example of a Comprehensive unit is the School of Public Health. Its guidelines describe teaching as comprising the dimensions of process, content, and outcome. The guidelines then identify

no fewer than 11 different sources of evidence candidates must submit to document effectiveness in these three areas of teaching, as well as 12 more sources of evidence that candidates have the option of submitting. In addition, the departments within the School have developed forms to guide peer evaluation. The form used by the Department of Maternal and Child Health, for example, asks peer observers to comment separately on a candidate's clarity, content, instructional materials, and on several aspects of his or her teaching style. The School of Nursing and, to a somewhat lesser extent, the School of Social Work also merit classification as Comprehensive units.

Special cases

The School of Medicine presents a somewhat special case. For faculty on the biomedical research track, the school-wide guidelines for the evaluation of teaching effectiveness qualify only as Responsive. The guidelines state that, for faculty on this career track, the candidate's promotion packet must contain a paragraph in the Chair's *recommendation letter* documenting the candidate's teaching contributions and "summaries of any student evaluations (quantitative ratings and/or narrative comments) and/or faculty peer evaluations that are available for a given candidate."

However, the school-wide guidelines for faculty whose recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is being based upon educational scholarship, as opposed to biomedical research, are more demanding, requiring submission of a teaching portfolio that must include peer and student evaluations of the candidate's teaching and may include a variety of other sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness. We would thus assign the label Extensive to this latter set of guidelines. Two departments within the School of Medicine, Psychiatry and Family Medicine, have guidelines that go beyond those promulgated by the School as a whole, and both departments examine a set of teaching effectiveness indicators sufficiently rich to qualify as Extensive.

In many of the professional schools, teaching takes place not only in traditional classroom settings but also in clinical contexts. Those units we have classified as Extensive or Comprehensive, and in which clinical instruction occurs, articulate a broad, inclusive conception of teaching and rich set of indicators for both classroom and clinical instruction. For example, the School of Social Work identifies one set of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of classroom instruction and a separate set of criteria for assessing the effectiveness of field advising (i.e., supervising and mentoring students who are working as interns with social service agencies). Needless to say, those units that do not employ a broad, inclusive conception of teaching effectiveness (e.g., Law, Pharmacy) employ it neither for classroom instruction nor instruction in clinical settings.

Analysis

Two broad patterns, both alluded to above, emerge from an examination of the units' written guidelines. First, most units qualify only as Responsive or Detailed Responsive because they identify only student course evaluations and faculty peer observation as the sources of evidence they use to evaluate candidates' teaching effectiveness. This limited number of indicators, and the close correspondence of these particular indicators to the mandate in [Chapter 400.3.1.1\[G\]](#) of the UNC Policy Manual, suggest that most units have not systematically conceptualized and articulated the nature and assessment of effective teaching in their particular discipline.

The second pattern is that all the units that qualify as Extensive or Comprehensive are professional schools, or departments within professional schools. We have no explanation for this finding. Nor do we know how or where the inspiration for developing a richer conception of teaching originated. We note, however, that the most detailed written policy on the peer review of teaching, promulgated by the Department of Health Behavior & Health Education (HBHE) in the School of Public Health, was developed in collaboration with staff of the CFE's predecessor organization, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). CTL staff would have brought HBHE faculty into contact with ideas from the education research literature about how to conceptualize and assess teaching effectiveness. These ideas

might then have diffused to other departments within the School of Public Health, across the street to the Schools of Nursing and Dentistry, and beyond.

Finally, we note that while almost all units state in their guidelines that candidates for tenure and promotion are expected to demonstrate excellence in teaching, one unit uses language that appears to set the unit's sights a bit lower. The School of Pharmacy's (SOP) guidelines state that candidates for tenure and promotion must document "acceptable" performance in teaching. While we cannot infer from this difference in terminology that the quality of instruction in the SOP is any poorer than in other units—indeed, what qualifies as acceptable in the SOP may qualify as excellent in other units—the SOP is nonetheless anomalous in using language that appears to set a lower standard of achievement in the area of teaching.

Limitations and future work

The summary and analysis presented above is based on an examination of the units' formal written APT guidelines. It is entirely possible that one or more units have developed detailed evaluation procedures that they have not yet incorporated into their formally written APT guidelines, or that they base their evaluation on a larger variety of sources of evidence than is reflected in their formal guidelines. We know this is in fact the case for at least some of the units we surveyed. Conversely, we also know of at least one unit whose actual evaluation procedures deviate from those described in its formal written guidelines. The next stage of our inquiry, therefore, will be to administer a survey to determine what criteria and indicators each unit actually uses to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for tenure and promotion.

College of Arts and Sciences

The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure (2009) state that “demonstrable excellence in teaching is required for consideration of tenure.” The document further characterizes “excellence in teaching” as follows:

An excellent teacher is one who prepares his or her course with the discrimination and skill needed for excellent scholarship; responsibly formulates the objectives of the course and uses imaginative ways of achieving them; commands the attention of students; stimulates their interest; enlarges their minds; improves their thinking; and, to the extent that it is possible, makes them active rather than passive participants in the course. An excellent teacher demands substantial accomplishment and high standards of work, grades all work fairly, is articulate and resourceful, and bases what he or she teaches on evidence and sound method. In addition, where appropriate, such a teacher conscientiously provides helpful and timely advice and guidance to both graduate and undergraduate students on an individual basis, directs theses and dissertations, and serves on committees that critically examine and evaluate such research projects.

This description identifies a desired set of behaviors, but provides no guidance on what procedures should be followed or what forms of evidence should be collected to enable a review committee to judge the extent to which a candidate for tenure or promotion exemplifies these behaviors. Other documents issued by the University and by the College, however, do provide such guidance.

As noted in the introduction, [Chapter 400.3.1.1\[G\]](#) of the UNC Policy Manual instructs the Chancellor of each constituent institution of the UNC System to ensure that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review (including direct observation of classroom instruction) are included in teaching evaluation procedures.

Student course evaluations

Since fall 2010, the College has used an internet-based survey tool, [Carolina Course Evaluations Online](#), to gather student ratings of faculty teaching effectiveness. Currently, all but two of the College’s tenure-granting units (Asian Studies and Biology) use this online course evaluation tool. The shift to online evaluations, while facilitating the collection, analysis, and reporting of student ratings, has resulted in a reduced response rate as compared to traditional, in-class, paper-and-pencil evaluations. (Online student course evaluations are also administered by most of the professional schools. As of this writing, only the Schools of Business, Government, and Law do not use online evaluation instruments.)

Peer observation and evaluation

In August of 2012, the Dean of the College issued a memorandum establishing minimum guidelines for peer faculty teaching observations that all departments are now required to follow when carrying out personnel reviews. These minimum guidelines state that, for reappointment to assistant professor, tenure and promotion to associate professor, and promotion to full professor, at least two faculty members of higher rank than the candidate must each observe the candidate teaching at least one full class session. The observing faculty members are then required to write a report for each class session observed, employing a specific report template (Appendix 1). The memorandum further states that these reports “must form part of the department personnel file sent forward, and be summarized in the internal personnel committee report and/or the Chair’s letter.”

As noted above, these peer review guidelines are minimum standards. In the memorandum, the Dean welcomed and encouraged departments in the College to undertake “more extensive peer faculty teaching observations for promotion, tenure, and post-tenure reviews.”

Of the 33 tenure-granting departments within the College, 19 departments have no additional written guidelines for evaluating the teaching effectiveness of candidates for tenure and promotion. Eleven departments (Table 2) do have in their APT manuals language regarding the evaluation of teaching effectiveness beyond what is contained in the College APT guidelines and the memoranda noted above. This additional language is typically limited in scope; for example, it provides some detail concerning the procedures to be used for carrying out peer evaluation of teaching, the frequency with which the peer observations of teaching will occur, or simply lists the additional types of evidence that will be used to document effective teaching.

Table 2. CAS departments whose written APT guidelines concerning the evaluation of teaching go beyond the guidelines promulgated by the College.

DEPARTMENT	ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE
BIOLOGY	Procedure for evaluation of teaching; describes procedures for peer observation and student course evaluations.
ECONOMICS	Departmental APT committee may seek additional information from candidate's current and recent students and advisees.
EXERCISE & SPORT SCIENCE	APT policy manual lists criteria for evaluation of teaching, including student evaluations, peer observation, and review of course materials.
LINGUISTICS	Manual specifies contents of dossier and procedures for peer observation.
MATHEMATICS	Department has guidelines specifying the frequency and form of peer observation; changes are currently being considered.
PHILOSOPHY	APT manual provides detailed description of procedures and criteria.
PHYSICS & ASTRONOMY	Guidelines state that teaching evaluation involves three components: peer observation, student evaluations, and a written self-evaluation.
POLITICAL SCIENCE	Specifies procedure for peer review of teaching, including class observation and review of course materials, candidate statement, and student evaluations.
ROMANCE LANG & LIT	Departmental policy lists the types of evidence to be used to document effective teaching and procedure for peer observation.
SOCIOLOGY	Department practices peer observation and reviews course materials, teaching statement, and student evaluations.
STATISTICS & OPERATIONS RES	Evaluation of candidate's teaching will be based on student course evaluations, peer observations, and teaching awards (if any).

For example, the APT guidelines for the Department of Political Science—closely based, as are most of the departmental APT manuals, on the 2009 CAS guidelines—include a paragraph that specifies the

department's procedure for peer review of teaching, which includes class observation and review of course materials, the candidate's teaching statement, and student course evaluations. As noted in the Executive Summary, the Department of Philosophy is something of an outlier within the College; its guidelines identify a greater variety of forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness than do other departments, and include a more extensive discussion of its criteria and procedures for evaluating teaching (Appendix 2).

Three departments within the College (History, Psychology, and Women's and Gender Studies) did not respond to our inquiry, and so we do not know whether they have written guidelines for evaluating teaching effectiveness beyond those promulgated by the College.

School of Business

The Kenan-Flagler School of Business APT manual states that the following elements will be evaluated in assessing the teaching effectiveness of a candidate for tenure and promotion:

1. Course content and design, including development of needed new courses
2. Development of effective new teaching materials—including those that are used by other faculty at this and other institutions
3. Personal contributions to the development of effective teaching by other faculty (i.e., building the teaching skills of other faculty members)
4. Skill in classroom presentation and discussion, as based both on student assessments and peer evaluations
5. Contributions to the development of individual students out of the classroom
6. Consistent evidence of motivation and ability to maintain and enhance these factors.

The manual also contains the following additional language concerning the evaluation of teaching-related activities for personnel actions:

Teaching in executive development programs is a voluntary activity and usually involves at least some direct compensation. But, it is also an important part of the School's mission. Faculty members are encouraged to share their research and teaching expertise with non-degree constituencies through the School's ongoing non-degree programs or through a management program designed for a specialized market. Successful contributions in this area can enhance the assessment of a faculty member on the teaching dimension, and can therefore enhance the overall assessment of a faculty member's performance. However, lack of involvement or an assessment of inadequate teaching performance in executive development programs should not be a reason for low assessment of teaching.

It is not necessary for an individual to be an effective teaching contributor to all of the School's degree programs to receive a favorable assessment on the teaching dimension. However, the ability and willingness to make versatile contributions across programs is encouraged and valued. This capability among the tenured portion of the faculty adds to the long-term flexibility of the School to meet the challenges and needs of future teaching environments. As such, untenured faculty should be given the opportunity to demonstrate teaching ability across different teaching programs. Such successful diversity can reflect favorably on the potential of the faculty member to meet the longer-term teaching needs that may arise in the School. In addition, some courses are more demanding to teach, but responsiveness of the individual faculty member to broader school needs is valued.

School of Dentistry

The School of Dentistry's APT manual states that the criteria for teaching effectiveness include "quality of teaching, innovation in teaching, innovation in methods for evaluating students, impact upon students, and nature and extent of responsibilities."

The data that the School of Dentistry uses to evaluate teaching effectiveness include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Learner evaluation of teaching (includes continuing education presentations)
2. Peer evaluation of teaching
3. Student and peer evaluation of courses
4. Review of teaching innovations
5. Review of scholarship involving teaching
6. Evaluation of outcomes such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, outside invitations to present continuing education from other institutions, or teaching awards.

Learner evaluation of teaching, peer evaluation of teaching, student and peer evaluation of courses, and review of teaching innovations are evaluated using the teaching portfolios and the Chair's letter. Documentation from the teaching portfolio required by the Promotion, Tenure, and Appointments Committee includes the candidate's reflective statement about teaching, summaries and details of the student assessment of teaching, the peer evaluation of teaching, and any pertinent teaching innovations.

Review of scholarship involving teaching (appropriate at any rank, but required for promotion to full professor) is taken from the candidate's CV, the outside letters, and the Chair's letter.

Evaluation of outcomes—such as success of students mentored, number of schools adopting textbooks, invitations from other institutions to present continuing education, students providing unsolicited favorable evaluations of faculty, or teaching awards—is based on the candidate's CV, outside letters, and the Chair's letter. In cases where quality of mentoring is being evaluated, sections from the teaching portfolio detailing student work and publications should be submitted and mentioned in the Chair's letter.

Candidates are required to prepare a teaching portfolio comprising the following components:

1. Statement of Teaching Responsibilities
 - a. Summary of courses taught and directed
 - b. Student mentorship
 - c. Student research committees
2. Efforts to Improve Teaching
 - a. Formal courses in education
 - b. Conferences and workshops attended
3. Enhancement of Existing Courses
 - a. Addition of tutorials, role-playing, case studies, etc.
 - b. Incorporation of writing skills, oral presentation skills in course
4. Information from Students
 - a. Summary of student ratings of teaching effectiveness
 - b. Statements from former students
 - c. Listing of papers published by students
 - d. Honors earned by students
5. Service to Teaching
 - a. Membership on teaching related committees
 - b. Membership on student examining committees
6. Information from Colleagues
 - a. Summary of peer evaluations of course materials
 - b. Summary of peer reviews of teaching related research
 - c. Comments from colleagues
7. Information from Other Sources
 - a. Guest lecturers to other faculties
 - b. Continuing education lectures
 - c. Honors and awards
8. Future Teaching Goals.

School of Education

The School of Education requires candidates for reappointment, promotion, or tenure to submit a teaching portfolio comprising the following seven sections:

1. Statement of philosophy of teaching
2. A copy of the most recent summary statement of program goals
3. Personal goals and plans for teaching enhancement
4. Student evaluations of quality of instruction (including guest lectures) and quality of supervision
5. Classroom observation documents
6. Reports from co-teachers and co-supervisors
7. Other documents and products, including course materials (e.g., syllabi, examinations, original teaching materials); a list of honors, masters, and doctoral committee work; and copies of honors theses, masters theses, and doctoral dissertations directed.

The following optional materials may also be submitted as part of the portfolio:

1. Evidence of innovation in teaching methods, course content, other learning experiences, curriculum development or revision, or contributions to educational theory
2. Evidence that contributions to teaching are being adopted or are affecting teaching programs in other departments, schools, or institutions
3. Evidence of impact of teaching on the professional careers of former students, colleagues, and junior faculty
4. Awards received in recognition of outstanding teaching
5. Invitations from other institutions to serve as lecturer, staff developer, or visiting professor
6. Invitations to serve as a consultant in educational programs and methods
7. Grants to support and enhance instructional activities (where these can be construed as an individual faculty member's accomplishments in teaching)
8. Efforts to improve teaching through acquisition of new skills, attendance at workshops, seminars, etc., should be noted.

The School's detailed procedures for peer evaluation of teaching, dating from 1998, are presented in Appendix 3.

School of Government

The data that the School of Government uses to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for reappointment, promotion, and tenure include:

1. Review of teaching materials
2. Peer and APT committee observations of classroom teaching
3. Reflective teaching statement
4. A teaching portfolio comprising the following elements
 - a. A copy of the curriculum vitae the candidate submits as part of his or her promotion package
 - b. The candidate's reflective teaching statement
 - c. Sample written materials/class handouts used in teaching
 - d. Sample overheads/PowerPoint presentations used in teaching
 - e. Sample discussion questions used in teaching or prepared for group discussions
 - f. Student course evaluations
 - g. External reviews and/or letters the candidate may have received regarding teaching or other aspects of his or her work
 - h. Syllabi for Master of Public Administration (MPA) courses (if applicable), sample exams for MPA courses (if applicable), and any other material the candidate feels will help with the evaluation of their teaching.

The manual notes that:

There is no set format for peer observations, but the write-up of the observation should indicate the dates and subjects of the sessions observed. Previous examples have discussed the following types of things: command of the subject matter, clarity of teaching objectives for the session, effectiveness of the presentation and techniques used, extent of engagement with and by the audience, responsiveness to questions, time management, and appropriateness of the amount of material covered.

The teaching portfolio is considered within the School only; it does not go up for review to other parts of the University.

School of Information and Library Science

The School of Information and Library Science reviews the following kinds of evidence to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion:

1. A list of courses taught each semester for the past three years and the number of students taught by section, including the names of graduate students supervised, undergraduate honors projects, thesis titles, and completion dates for degree work since employment at UNC-CH
2. Current and past course and seminar syllabi, reading lists, assignments, and the like, which state the course objectives and how they are met
3. Written evaluations gathered from current students for each course
4. Written comments from students solicited at the time of consideration for personnel action
5. Written comments of a random sample of graduates who have taken one or more classes with the candidate
6. Written evaluations by peer faculty members based on classroom observation, interviews, and examination of syllabi and assignments
7. Examples of work of candidate's students including
 - a. Papers or abstracts of Master's papers directed by the candidate
 - b. Abstracts of Dissertations of PhD students directed by the candidate plus others on which the candidate has made a substantial contribution
 - c. Published work of students showing evidence of strong support and direction from the candidate
 - d. Examples of other papers or projects completed by students under the candidate's direction
8. Other documentation considered significant by the Personnel Committee or the faculty member being reviewed.

School of Journalism and Mass Communication

The School of Journalism and Mass Communication reviews the following kinds of evidence to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion:

1. Reflective teaching statement
2. Most recent syllabus for each course taught
3. Summary course evaluation pages for all courses taught in the relevant time period (for third-year reviews, since initial appointment; for promotion and tenure, since the initial appointment; and for post-tenure review, since the last review)
4. Sample student comments from the course evaluations
5. All peer teaching observation reports
6. Anything else the faculty member thinks is relevant, such as copies of notes from students, list of awards students have won for work done for class, number of student papers accepted at conferences, or nominations for teaching awards.

School of Law

To evaluate the teaching effectiveness of candidates for reappointment, tenure, and promotion, the School of Law reviews student and peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching. The review committee may, if it deems it necessary or desirable, consult with former students or presently enrolled students concerning the candidate's teaching competence.

Appendix G of the School's APT manual provides the following additional procedural information:

Collegial knowledge, student evaluations, and classroom visits are used in assessing teaching. All subjective and objective students' evaluations are reviewed. Assessments of senior faculty who conduct classroom visits for the purpose of evaluating a candidate's teaching competence are also considered. Two visits to each of the two classes taught are made for candidates upon whom tenure has not yet been conferred. Each course is audited by two faculty members so that an assessment by four senior faculty members of the candidate's teaching is available. For candidates with tenure, only one course is visited. For all candidates, except for those under consideration for initial reappointment, reports of classroom visits in earlier years are available for consideration. Faculty conducting class visits meet with the teacher to provide feedback on strengths and weaknesses observed.

For reappointment as an Assistant Professor, the Promotions and Tenure Committee (P&T) continues to read all of the candidate's student evaluations, and sends faculty reviewers to each of his or her classes in at least the two semesters before the reappointment decision is made. In making its report to the faculty, P&T comments on what it sees as strengths, weaknesses, potential problems, and areas for improvement.

School of Medicine

The School of Medicine's APT manual states that a candidate's promotion packet "must include a summary of both the quality and quantity of the teaching contribution made by the faculty member being proposed for promotion and/or tenure." Specifically, the promotion packet must include:

1. A *reflective statement* comprising
 - a. A summary of the candidate's activities as an educator and a description of his or her teaching philosophy
 - b. A statement describing the candidate's specific area(s) of expertise and accomplishments
 - c. A vision for the future, particularly as it relates to the candidate's scholarly activities, be they primarily clinical, educational, and/or research
2. The Chair's *recommendation letter*, which must include a paragraph documenting the candidate's teaching contributions
3. *Annual teaching summaries* written by a senior departmental leader. The manual states that the formal teaching summary should include summaries of any student evaluations (quantitative ratings and/or narrative comments) and/or faculty peer evaluations that are available for a given candidate.

Individuals whose recommendation for promotion and/or tenure is being based upon educational scholarship, as opposed to biomedical research, must additionally submit a teaching portfolio comprising:

1. Documentation of teaching activities
2. Reflective statement
3. Peer and learner evaluations of teaching.

The required information in the teaching portfolio is thus more or less redundant with the information to be provided in the reflective statement, Chair's recommendation letter, and annual teaching summaries that are required to be included in a candidate's promotion packet. The manual further states that:

While evaluation by both peers and learners is required, the extent and format of the data that are required will be determined by the faculty member's department. These evaluations will derive from ongoing teaching evaluation efforts established within each department. Data collection and maintenance will be a departmental function. Typically, the department will select appropriate, representative pieces of this information for incorporation into the teaching portfolio at the time of consideration for promotion and for discussion at the annual review.

The optional materials in a teaching portfolio can include:

1. Material Created by the Individual Teacher
 - a. Representative course syllabi that detail objectives, teaching methods, and bibliography
 - b. Instructional materials (text, visuals, video, computer-based) personally or collaboratively developed
 - c. Videotapes of teaching by the faculty member in clinical, laboratory, and other non-didactic settings
 - d. Evaluation/assessment materials developed
 - e. Reports of any studies conducted by the faculty member relating to medical, graduate, or undergraduate education
2. Material Generated by Others
 - a. Statements from colleagues (both on- and off-campus) who have reviewed educational materials developed by the faculty member
 - b. Invitations to lecture/teach at other institutions or at professional conferences

3. Products of Teaching
 - a. Learners' scores on examination items and/or performance rating scales directly related to the faculty member's teaching
 - b. Research reports or papers/presentations created by individuals taught by this faculty member
 - c. Record of learners who succeed in advanced study
 - d. Statements from graduates or supervisors about the instructor's influence on their careers. (To preserve confidentiality, these will be requested by the department and maintained by the department.)

As far as we have been able to determine, only two departments within the School of Medicine, Family Medicine and Psychiatry, have written guidelines concerning the evaluation of teaching effectiveness that go beyond the information provided in the APT guidelines for the School as a whole.

The Department of Psychiatry APT manual states that the APT committee shall accumulate and consider the following teaching-related data:

1. List of candidate's teaching responsibilities during the previous three years, including the number of hours and students involved; all formally scheduled supervision should be described and, to whatever extent possible, quantified
2. Description of the supervision and clinical care teaching the candidate has offered
3. Trainee (residents, graduate students, or medical students) evaluations of the candidate's teaching; surveys of all students who have worked with the faculty member are desirable; annual evaluations of faculty by residents and other students are used
4. Opinions of the candidate's teaching skills made by faculty members who have personally observed the candidate
5. List of invitations the candidate has received to give presentations at a) local meetings, b) statewide meetings, c) national meetings, d) international meetings, and e) Grand Rounds at other institutions
6. Teaching awards, if any
7. Assessment of the quality and frequency of the candidate's local Grand Rounds presentations and assessment of how actively the candidate contributes to Grand Round discussions when he or she is not the primary presenter
8. Solicited letters attesting to the candidate's teaching ability are allowable; these must be balanced with the information obtained from more objective surveys (current students are not solicited).

The Department of Family Medicine requires candidates for promotion to submit a teaching portfolio comprising:

1. A reflective statement of teaching goals and philosophy
2. Documentation of major educational responsibilities
3. Examples of the products of the individual's teaching
4. Evaluation by learners
5. Evidence of evaluation by peers.

The Department's Faculty Handbook further states that, "evidence of peer evaluation of teaching, at least twice a year, is required for all faculty members," and that "the topic but not the content of the review should be listed in the teaching portfolio."

School of Nursing

The School of Nursing APT manual states that the School evaluates candidates' teaching effectiveness along the three dimensions of *performance, impact or significance, and recognition*.

Evidence used to evaluate candidate's teaching performance include:

1. List of courses, including continuing education, taught by the faculty member for all years since the last review (or, for newly hired faculty, the preceding 3 years) with numbers of students involved
2. Numbers of undergraduate, master's, pre- and post-doctoral students, and visiting scholars advised academically or supervised clinically
3. Number, student names, and titles of doctoral dissertations and master's and honors research projects supervised
4. Number of memberships on doctoral dissertation and master's and honors research committees
5. Scope of teaching activities, such as size and level of teaching load, and any exceptional responsibilities undertaken
6. Evaluations by students and colleagues
7. Activities in curriculum and program development; leadership roles in curriculum development showing innovation and responsiveness to national educational trends and health initiatives
8. Evidence of innovation in teaching methods, course content, other learning experiences, curriculum development or revisions, or contributions to educational theory; innovation refers to relevance, contemporary teaching modalities, responsiveness to new challenges (e.g., innovations in use of digital media)
9. Evidence of leadership and scholarly engagement and activities in the development and delivery of continuing and outreach education (e.g., AHEC), development of evaluation systems, and of contributions to educational theory through research in education such as program evaluation or research on teaching/learning styles or activities (e.g., programs for special populations, cost-effective approaches to teaching that maintain quality)
10. Publications of refereed articles, educational strategies, textbooks, educational research results, or computer-assisted instruction.

The evidence used to evaluate the impact or significance of candidates' teaching include:

1. Scholarly reputations of journals and publishers of the candidate's teaching publications
2. Independent judgment of recognized experts concerning the quality of the teaching products (e.g., reviews of textbooks, citation indexes)
3. Student and peer teacher evaluations
4. Evidence that contributions to teaching are being adopted or are affecting teaching programs at other institutions or other end-users
5. Evidence of impact on the professional careers of others (e.g., former students, junior faculty, colleagues).

The evidence used to evaluate the recognition the candidate has received for his or her teaching include:

1. Awards and honors recognizing excellence in teaching
2. Grants to support instructional activities and programs; if collaborative, the faculty member's distinctive contribution is described
3. Recognition by professional organizations for leadership in educational endeavors (e.g., serving as a training grant reviewer for state and federal agencies), leadership in major educational bodies (e.g., National League for

- Nursing), invitations to serve and active participation in education-focused consensus conferences for state and national organizations
4. Serving as an editor or reviewer for educational publications
 5. National leadership roles related to education
 6. Invitations from other institutions to serve as lecturer, visiting professor, or education consultant.

School of Pharmacy

The School of Pharmacy APT guidelines state that candidates for tenure and promotion must document *acceptable* performance in teaching. The primary forms of evidence used to evaluate whether a candidate's teaching performance is acceptable include:

1. Student review data
2. Evaluation of changes in student satisfaction over time
3. Comparison of candidate's student review data with that of peers in the same disciplinary area
4. Regular peer review of in-class performance.

Other elements of evaluation include, but are not limited to, such issues as:

1. Teaching load
2. Service as a coordinator of team-taught courses
3. Activities in the revision of existing courses or the development of new courses or teaching approaches
4. Curricular development on a broad scale
5. Non-traditional teaching within the professional degree program (e.g., working with honors or independent studies students in a scholarly setting)
6. Training of graduate students, fellows, and residents outside the classroom setting
7. Participation in other forms of student mentoring relationships such as thesis or dissertation advisory committees.

The section of the School's APT manual that describes post-tenure review states that:

Peer evaluation of teaching is an especially important component of the post-tenure review process. Peer review of syllabus materials, visitation of classes, and other indicators of teaching will be conducted in order to enhance the insights of the faculty as a whole about teaching and to provide relevant information on the faculty member being reviewed. As a general matter, the Division Chair will work with the faculty member being reviewed to arrange for visitation in at least two class sessions of at least two courses during the year prior to or the year in which the post-tenure review of an individual faculty member is conducted.

School of Public Health

The School of Public Health's APT manual states that:

Teaching excellence is assessed through an evaluation of the currency and relevance of the content, the effectiveness and efficiency of delivery, and whether students are learning how to think critically and solve problems. Innovation, adoption of course materials by others, contributions to teaching methodology, all can be supporting measures for this assessment, but this listing is not all-inclusive. The teaching portfolio is the primary source document employed by reviewers to assess teaching excellence.

The manual further states that the School conceptualizes teaching as comprising *process*, *content*, and *outcomes*: "Process is how one teaches (i.e., the use of a variety of appropriate and up-to-date teaching methods), content is what one teaches, and outcomes are the result or the impact of teaching on the student (i.e., what the student learns or can do as a result of teaching)." As noted above, candidates for tenure and promotion are required to submit a teaching portfolio that documents high quality teaching in each of these three areas. The manual states that the portfolio should include the following types of evidence:

Process

1. Documentation of the courses taught, including continuing education courses, for the preceding four years, with numbers of students involved
2. Evidence of innovative approaches to teaching
3. Numbers of undergraduate, master's, and doctoral students advised or supervised and evidence that student advising is effective; this includes, but is not necessarily limited to, academic advising and supervision of student research and field training experiences
4. Evidence of successfully mentoring undergraduate and/or graduate students through the honors paper, thesis, or dissertation process
5. Scope of teaching activities such as size and level of teaching load, and any exceptional responsibilities undertaken (e.g., teaching more than the "usual" or standard load for the department)
6. Evaluation by students of courses taught including a summary statement, tables, or charts, indicating how the numerical evaluations have progressed over time and how they compare to other faculty in the department.

Content

1. Evidence that course content reflects new developments in the discipline
2. Evidence that the candidate's development of new content or synthesis of existing content has affected how the discipline is taught
3. Evidence that teaching methods and course content are periodically peer-reviewed. Peer review includes the following (done by senior faculty, or other outside experts): classroom visitations, review of course syllabi and other related materials, and review of student evaluation of teaching.

Impact

1. Evidence of impact of all forms of teaching (e.g., classroom and distance education teaching, supervising students in research and field experiences, academic advising, and continuing education) on the professional careers of former students, colleagues, and junior faculty
2. Evidence of annual self-evaluation of teaching.

In addition to the above minimum requirements, candidates can document the high quality of their teaching by including in their portfolios the following types of materials and information:

1. Documentation of activities in curriculum and program development
2. Evidence of innovation in teaching methods, course content, other learning experiences, curriculum development or revision, and use of appropriate technology
3. Evidence that contributions to teaching are being adopted or are affecting teaching programs at other institutions
4. Evidence that teaching has a significant impact on students beyond what is considered usual or normal
5. Awards received in recognition of outstanding teaching
6. Publication and adoption of textbooks
7. Invitations from other institutions to serve as lecturer, trainer, or visiting professor
8. Invitations to serve as consultant in educational programs and methods
9. Grants to support instructional activities (where these can be construed as an individual faculty member's accomplishments)
10. Grants to support research activities which also have some impact on teaching (e.g., research grants which involve students, or where new laboratory equipment is also used for teaching purposes)
11. Evidence of responsiveness and collaboration, as demonstrated by
 - a. Evidence of capacity to sustain and build relationships and teams for teaching
 - b. Engagement in collaborative interdisciplinary teaching
 - c. Contributions to department and School teaching missions
12. Contributions to the education support structures of the department or School, as demonstrated by
 - a. Evidence of mentoring and advising of junior faculty and students
 - b. Participation in programs (certificate programs, executive education, workshops) aimed at enhancing skills of practitioners
 - c. Evidence of leadership in the design, delivery, and evaluation of teaching programs that catalyze others to achieve their maximum potential.

While the main text of the APT manual enumerates the above extensive list of materials for inclusion in a teaching portfolio, the School's APT Committee checklist (Appendix 2 in the manual) lists only the following six items:

1. Documentation of courses taught
2. Number of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students advised
3. Student evaluations of courses, including summary table
4. Evidence of peer review of teaching
5. Evidence of impact of teaching
6. Self-evaluation of teaching.

Appendix 4 of the manual provides detailed guidance on assembling a teaching portfolio and Appendix 5 of the manual provides detailed guidance on conducting peer observation of teaching. The latter document notes that the School requires faculty to undergo peer review of their teaching at least every two years.

Department-specific guidelines

Each of the School of Public Health's seven departments has additional departmental policies concerning the evaluation of teaching for tenure and promotion decisions. For five of the seven departments (Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Health Policy and Management, Maternal and Child Health, and Nutrition), the additional policies specify the procedures and instruments (e.g., standardized observation forms) to be used for peer review of teaching. As an example, Appendix 5 presents the Department of Epidemiology's Peer Review of Teaching Policy.

The guidelines published by the Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering (called "Expectations for Promotion and Tenure in Environmental Sciences and Engineering") state that the Department evaluates several indicators of a candidate's success in teaching and mentoring students, including formal student course evaluations, evidence of successfully graduating PhD students, evidence of helping to advance students' professional development, and solicited comments on a candidate's mentorship from his or her former students.

Within the School, the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education has the most detailed written policy on peer review of teaching (Appendix 6). This policy document (adopted 1996) comprises three sections: guiding principles, classroom observation, and other modes of evaluation. The section on classroom observation states that, ideally, candidates for tenure should undergo two separate peer reviews prior to the tenure decision; one during the latter part of the faculty member's first appointment period and a second during the latter part of their reappointment period. The classroom observation teams comprise one or more HBHE faculty who have received training as peer reviewers and, according to the written policy, a staff member from the Center for Teaching and Learning. (The Center for Teaching and Learning no longer exists, and the Center for Faculty Excellence does not participate in the process.) Each peer review cycle entails at least two observation sessions (i.e., two entire class periods).

The section on "other modes of evaluation" lists the following alternative data sources pertinent to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness:

1. Teaching Portfolio
2. Course Evaluations
3. Testimonials
4. Archival Data Indicative of Teaching Outcomes.

School of Social Work

The School of Social Work's APT manual states that the criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of classroom instruction include:

1. Effectiveness of teaching materials
 - a. States clear and relevant course objectives
 - b. Uses up-to-date reading materials
 - c. Includes major variables important to the subject
 - d. Creates a good fit within curriculum guidelines
 - e. Presents clear course requirements and grading system
 - f. Demonstrates a consistency among objectives, units of study, and assignments
2. Effectiveness of classroom performance
 - a. Has an effective presentation (e.g., is coherent, organized, and responsive to students; has well-designed class activities; generates class discussion)
 - b. Meets sessions responsibly
 - c. Is available to students outside class as appropriate
 - d. Demonstrates expertise in the area
 - e. Provides climate for intellectual stimulation
3. Other activities as appropriate
 - a. Develops new courses
 - b. Collaborates in teaching courses
 - c. Directs individual study for students.

The criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of field advising (if applicable) include the degree to which the candidate:

1. Is available to students and agencies
2. Has a good relationship with field instructor and other agency personnel
3. Monitors student progress regularly
4. Spends an adequate amount of time assessing or evaluating student performance and agency role in professional education
5. Participates in field meetings and is knowledgeable about practices and procedures.

The School reviews the following sources of evidence of teaching effectiveness:

1. Course syllabi
2. Student evaluations
3. Peer observation reports
4. Field instructor's evaluation
5. Personal statement of evaluation.

In addition to the above written guidelines, the School has developed a standard form to guide peer observation of classroom teaching. This form (Appendix 7) identifies the specific dimensions of classroom teaching (e.g., content, method of presentation, use of time) that the observers should evaluate.

Appendix 1

College of Arts and Sciences
Peer Observation Report Form

Peer Faculty Teaching Observation Report

Faculty Member Name and Department: _____

Evaluator Name, Title and Department: _____

Signature of Faculty Evaluator: _____

Full Name of Course: _____ Course Dept. and Number: _____

Date of Observation: _____ Time of Observation: _____

Location: _____ Number of Students in Attendance: _____

Class Enrollment: 25 or fewer 26 to 50 51 to 100 over 100

Comments (including type of teaching being observed, extent and nature of class interaction, and a critical evaluation). If you wish to use a rating scale, please define each rating point.
You may attach an additional or separate document.

Appendix 2

Department of Philosophy Procedures for Evaluation of
Candidates for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure

VII. Procedures for Evaluation of Non-tenured Candidates for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

- A. The Chair will formally and in writing notify the faculty colleague to be reviewed at least three months prior to the start of the scheduled review. The Chair should indicate at that time the specific options open to the department. (1. Reappointment or non-reappointment for first-term assistant professors. 2. Promotion and tenure or non-reappointment for second-term assistant professors. 3. In exceptional circumstances, reappointment with tenure at the rank of assistant professor for second-term assistant professors. 4. Reappointment with tenure or non-reappointment for untenured associate professors. 5. Promotion from associate professor to professor.)
- B. The Chair will indicate what materials the candidate must submit for this purpose. These include:
1. An up-to-date curriculum vitae.
 2. Publications and professional and scholarly activities.
 - a. Copies of relevant writings, published or unpublished.
 - b. Reviews of the candidate's writings, such as book reviews or manuscript reviews that the candidate wishes to submit, including referee reports or publishers' reviews.
 - c. A list of public lectures, papers read, or symposia organized with places and dates.
 - d. A description of any grants or fellowships received, together with copies of the proposals, as well as any grant requests pending.
 - e. A brief outline of plans for future research.
 3. Materials relevant to the evaluation of the candidate's teaching.
 - a. Statement detailing teaching experience, courses taught, and courses planned for the future.
 - b. Examples of teaching materials, such as course descriptions, outlines, reading lists, and examinations.
 - c. A list of B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. theses directed and graduate committee memberships, both inside and outside the Department.
 - d. A brief statement by the candidate describing his or her teaching goals and strategies, with regard to both undergraduate and graduate instruction.

Appendix 3

School of Education Peer Evaluations of Teaching

Syllabus Review

Criteria for the review of faculty syllabi include relevance of materials, currency of materials, comprehensiveness, clarity of assignments, assessment procedures, and inclusion of essential content (e.g., honor code, disability, and anti-discrimination policies).

Teaching Observation Requirements for Untenured Faculty (approved February 1998).

Current procedures are identified below. New procedures will include a systematic format for all peer evaluators to follow, including specific categories related to the observation of classroom teaching. Procedures for faculty whose teaching includes more than 25% of online teaching will also have their online teaching reviewed.

- The faculty member under review identifies two members of the faculty to review his or her teaching and to make in-classroom observations. One observer must be a senior faculty member. The second faculty member may be either a tenure track senior faculty member or a fixed-term faculty member at the rank of associate professor or higher.
- The faculty member will choose the course(s) and negotiate the observation schedule. Observers and the faculty member will meet for one pre-observation conference to discuss the goals, objectives, and methods for the course. The faculty member should provide relevant written materials, such as course syllabi, before or during the conference.
- Two classes will be observed by prior arrangement with the faculty member. Both observers must attend the same two classes. Students should be fully informed in advance of the observation.
- Observers may choose any method to record their impressions of the classes they visit, unless the School of Education specifies a method. They are required to summarize their impressions in writing as soon as possible.
- A post-observation conference including the observers and the faculty member should occur within two weeks of the last observation to discuss whether the specific goals, objectives, and methods set by the faculty member were successful.
- A draft of the report, co-written by the observers, should be given to the faculty member before the post-observation conference. Following the conference, the report will be finalized. The faculty member may submit his or her own analysis of the classes that were observed, addressed to the Dean and submitted to the HR Director.

Appendix 4

Department of Family Medicine Guidelines for Documenting Excellence and Scholarship in Teaching

Guidelines for documenting excellence in teaching

The program director letter and teaching portfolio should document the nature and scope of teaching, summarize evaluations and give a demonstration of initiative, creativity, and availability. Excellent learner evaluations and scholarship support excellence.

Criteria can include:

HIGH VALUE

- a. Achievement of students. High scores, awards, projects, publications, and presentations (evidence of mentoring by promotion applicant).
- b. Direction of an educational program or course in medical school.
- c. Direction of an educational program or course outside of medical school.
- d. Development of innovative syllabi and course, which include handouts, well-defined objectives, and bibliographies. These must be provided as documentation.
- e. Superior teaching evaluations by students and peers.
- f. Publication of a description/evaluation of an educational innovation.

MEDIUM VALUE

- g. Documentation of specific teaching commitments and activities (at least three years of documented experience).
- h. Visiting professorship at another institution.
- i. National presentation on an educational topic.
- j. Consultation on education to local, regional, and national groups or organizations.

Guidelines for documenting scholarship in teaching

Criteria can include

HIGH VALUE

- a. Authorship/editorship of books or sections of books on education.
- b. Development of educational/audiovisual materials for distribution outside the institution.
- c. Minimum of one refereed article on education every two years.
- d. Direction of a teaching fellowship program.
- e. Leadership (PI, CO-PI) in obtaining training grant.

MEDIUM VALUE

- f. Participation in educational committees in the Medical School/the local institution.
- g. Participation in a teaching fellowship program.
- h. Presentation of paper/program/workshop at state, regional (two in the last three years).
- i. Active participation in writing one training grant in past two years.
- j. Presentation of paper/program/workshop at national level.

LESSER VALUE

- k. Participation in specific educational conferences at the local institution as well as at the regional and national level.
- l. Participation in education committees at regional level.
- m. Membership in appropriate professional organizations.

Appendix 5

Department of Epidemiology Peer Review of Teaching

Purposes

Evaluation of teaching in the Department of Epidemiology of the School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, has always been central to the professional development of faculty and to the enhancement of the quality of the academic curriculum. In 1993-94, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina mandated that evaluation of faculty performance include, in addition to student evaluations and peer review, “direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants.”

The purposes of the peer review of teaching process in Department of Epidemiology are:

1. To improve the quality of teaching in the Department;
2. To contribute to the review process for tenure and promotion;
3. To contribute to the professional and career development of its faculty;
4. To provide data for updating and improving both the master’s and doctoral curricula.

Process

Each instructor’s peer review team will consist of two faculty members, either tenure-track or fixed-term, at least one of whom must hold the rank of associate or full professor.

Direct observation of classroom teaching is used to review the instructors of courses for which they are the lead- or co-instructor.

There will be two parts to the course peer reviews per review cycle*. The first part will focus on course materials, including the syllabus, mid-term and/or end-of-course evaluations, and may include student interviews. The reviewing team will complete Peer Review Form I. (Overall Course). The second part of the review will focus on classroom observations conducted by the same or a new team of two faculty members each attending one or more class sessions taught by the faculty member being reviewed. The team will complete the Department’s Peer Review Form

II. (Classroom Observation)

The review team(s) will discuss both parts with the faculty member whose course is being reviewed. Based on this discussion, the reviewing team may modify its report. The peer review team will submit a signed report for the reviewed faculty member’s file. The faculty member being reviewed may submit a signed response to the report. Both reports, with the reviewed faculty member’s responses if applicable, will be included in the faculty member’s file for use in a promotion packet. If the faculty member being reviewed disagrees with the conclusions of the reviewing committee, an appeal may be made to the Department Chair.

***Review Cycle and Frequency.** Currently, documentation of peer review of teaching is required as part of the teaching portfolio that is part of a promotion or tenure package and evaluation process for tenure-track faculty. See UNC SPH Appointment, Promotions and Tenure Manual, Appendix 4.

DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY

Instructor

Course

Observers

Date of Interview

I. Overall Course (based on instructor interview and review of course materials).

CONTENT (appropriate amount, demonstrates command and knowledge of material, depth and complexity of material, up-to-date)

OBJECTIVES (clear, appropriate, feasible)

READINGS (appropriate amount, up-to-date, organized, accessible, interesting)

WRITTEN MATERIALS (syllabus, course schedule, reading list)

ORGANIZATION (course plan is clear, sequence is logical, guests are appropriate and scheduled in advance, grading policy is clear and fair, readings and course materials are available)

II. Classroom Observation

Topic _____

Date _____

CLARITY AND ORGANIZATION (introduces topic, ideas flow logically, major points emerge, material is understandable)

CONTENT (demonstrates command and knowledge of material, objectives are appropriate, session follows objectives, material is up to date)

MATERIALS (handouts, slides, overheads, video)

STYLE

Methods (active learning, appropriate pace, engages students, balances lecture and discussion)

Enthusiasm (energy, interest, stimulating, scintillating)

Attitude toward students (positive, listens and responds, shows respect, involves students and at the same time effectively controls discussion)

Fairness (avoids bias/discrimination, treats students equally, grading is objective and impersonal, fair in calling on students)

Flexibility (open to new/challenging ideas, welcomes other points of view, willing to reconsider propositions, willing to review grades on individual assignments)

Summary

Conclusions

Recommendations

Additional Guidelines (adopted August, 2012)

General Principles Guiding Classroom Observations.

1. The evaluation process must be fair, objective, and consistent. Standard forms for collecting and reporting classroom observation data should be specified and used on all occasions and for all faculty members whose teaching is subject to peer review.
2. The evaluation should be constructive.
3. Evaluation criteria should be grounded in the instructional goals of the course.
4. Peer reviewers should be tolerant of different styles of teaching and should not impose standards predicated on a single acceptable technique.
5. Recommendations resulting from the review process should be specific and achievable.
6. A plan for accomplishing recommended changes should be an integral component of the evaluation process.

Dimensions of Classroom Teaching to Observe.

1. Content - e.g., currency, accuracy, level appropriateness, and scope of material covered in class and in assigned readings; the instructor's mastery of the material covered; the appropriateness of syllabi and other materials.
2. Style - e.g., the teaching methods, communication skills, innovativeness, organization, preparation, enthusiasm, respect for diversity, and pacing exhibited by the instructor in the classroom.
3. Access - e.g., the instructor's availability before or after class or at office hours, responsiveness to calls or e-mail from students, approachability, and attentiveness to student concerns.
4. Fairness - e.g., the amount of work assigned in the course, appropriateness of tests and the criteria used for scoring them, clarity of expectations, differentiation of opinions from facts, receptivity to alternative views, respect for students, and equal treatment of students.
5. Mentoring - e.g., exposure of students to relevant opportunities for learning or career development, encouragement of further pursuit of ideas, and conduct as a role model.

Appendix 6

Department of Health Behavior & Health Education
Policy on Peer Review of Teaching

Policy on Peer Review of Teaching
Department of Health Behavior & Health Education
School of Public Health
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
May 20, 1996

Committee on Peer Review of Teaching:

Robert F. DeVellis, Chair

Vangie Foshee

Sarah Kobrin

Allan Steckler

Katherine Turner

and

Faculty of the Department of Health Behavior & Health Education

Background

The Committee on Peer Evaluation of Teaching within the Department of Health Behavior and Health Education was formed in April, 1995 by Dr. James Sorenson, Chair, and held its initial meeting on May 19 of that year. Dr. Sorenson charged The Committee with the development of a recommended policy for the process of peer review within the department. More specifically, he asked that the committee (a) identify the principles underlying peer review, (b) develop a draft policy on peer review, (c) recommend what should be included in department teaching portfolios, (d) review existing teaching evaluation forms, and (e) identify a process and set of criteria for peer review of teaching effectiveness [memo to Ad Hoc Committee on Peer Review of Instruction, dated April 5, 1995]. This charge was in response to multiple factors, both local and national. Throughout the field of higher education, there has been an increasing emphasis on the importance of peer evaluation as a mechanism for improving teaching. Like many institutions, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has acknowledged the importance of peer review and his adopted policies toward its implementation. The University's Board of Governors issued a report entitled *Tenure and Teaching at the University of North Carolina* (adopted by the Board in September, 1993) addressing multiple issues, including the utility of peer review in evaluation for promotion and tenure. In an Administrative Memorandum, dated September 28, 1993, President Spangler quoted a recommendation adopted by the Board of Governors that states, in part, that institutional policies should establish clear, specific, written policies for evaluation of teaching and that peer review should be an integral part of the evaluation process. Subsequently, the School of Public Health, in its *Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure Manual* (October, 1994) included a guide for peer review of teaching (Appendix 6).

The first priority of the Committee has been to address points (a) and (b) of its charge, i.e., to inform ourselves and the department of the nature of peer review as a process and to recommend a departmental policy to the faculty. Our first action after the initial organizational meeting was to examine existing materials pertinent to peer review of teaching. These included both published guides and actual evaluation materials and protocols used at this University and elsewhere. Dr. Ed Neal of the Center for Teaching and Learning, who met with Dr. DeVellis in June of 1995, provided extensive background materials. During the Fall semester of the 1995-1996 academic year, the Committee met as a body on several occasions to define the scope of peer review of teaching and to identify suitable evaluation methodologies. In February and March, 1996, the Committee presented its findings and recommendations to the Faculty at two successive DPAC meetings. The Committee Chair presented various options and examples to the Faculty, who expressed their collective preferences. The Policy Draft that follows reflects our perception of their views.

Effective policies must satisfy the seemingly contradictory criteria of delineating enduring standards and guidelines while maintaining relevance and utility despite changing circumstances. The challenge these criteria pose is perhaps never greater than during the initial period of a policy's application. With that in mind, the Committee recommends that the following policies and procedures concerning peer review be re-examined after the completion of the first cycle of reviews within HBHE. On the basis of that initial experience, these policies and procedures should be amended as necessary.

I. Guiding Principles

- A. Peer review of teaching, including classroom observation, is an integral part of teaching evaluation.
- B. The purposes of peer review include optimizing the teaching effectiveness of all faculty and providing a fair, effective, and uniform set of criteria for incorporation in promotion and tenure decisions.
- C. Information about the procedures used to conduct peer review and the criteria by which instructional competence is evaluated should be openly available to faculty and to the public.
- D. To the extent consistent with a fair and objective evaluation, the process should be collaborative and participatory. Emphasis should be placed on achievable improvements in teaching in addition to evaluation.
- E. Peer review is but one of several components of a comprehensive teaching evaluation.

II. Classroom observation.

Classroom observation is an integral component of peer review of teaching. Each evaluation should include classroom observation. Generally, the team assigned to review a faculty member's classroom teaching will observe that teaching in person during normal class times. Under unusual circumstances, some alternative (e.g., video taping) may be arranged with the mutual consent of the evaluators and the instructor being evaluated.

- A. *Scope of Peer Review and Classroom Observation.* Peer review, including classroom observation, is of

potential value to instructors at all levels of experience and rank. As the peer review process within the department matures, the faculty should apply it broadly as a tool for achieving and maintaining educational excellence. The process, however, requires considerable resources. Initially, faculty facing promotion or tenure should be given priority as candidates for peer review of their teaching. Ideally, for faculty members approaching a tenure decision, two separate peer reviews should transpire prior to the tenure decision. The first peer evaluation would occur during the latter part of the faculty member's first appointment period. The second would occur during the latter part of their reappointment period so that the evaluation results could be included in their promotion and tenure package. For tenured faculty facing promotion, peer review should occur during the year prior to their promotion evaluation so that the evaluation results can be included in their promotion package. Other faculty will be reviewed periodically.

- B. *Classroom Observation Team.* The evaluation team will include one or more HBHE faculty who have received training as peer reviewers and a staff member from the Center for Teaching and Learning. The team reviewing a faculty member's teaching competency will be appointed by the Department Chair. Faculty members who are to be evaluated may express their preference for who from the Department will serve on the evaluation team, although necessarily other factors also will influence the team's makeup. The team and the instructor should function as a working unit whose goal is to strive for teaching excellence. Team members should work actively toward establishing a constructive and non-adversarial relationship with the instructor, while maintaining a commitment to fairness and objectivity.
- C. *Number of Observations.* The evaluation team will plan two (or more) observation sessions. Typically, they will observe two entire class periods. Observations will **not** take place without the prior knowledge of the instructor. Prior to each classroom observation, the evaluation team members will meet with the faculty member being evaluated for the purpose of planning the observation session. At this time, the evaluation team will ascertain the type and level of students enrolled in the course and the instructor's objectives for the session to be observed. Following each occasion of classroom observation, the team will again meet with the faculty member under review. At this time, all parties may discuss issues related to the class observed, including suggestions, clarifications, recommendations, resources, and similar matters.
- D. *General Principles Guiding Classroom Observations.*
1. The evaluation process must be fair, objective, and consistent. Standard forms for collecting and reporting classroom observation data should be specified and used on all occasions and for all faculty members whose teaching is subject to peer review.
 2. The evaluation should be constructive.
 3. Evaluation criteria should be grounded in the instructional goals of the course.
 4. Peer reviewers should be tolerant of different styles of teaching and should not impose standards predicated on a single acceptable technique.
 5. Recommendations resulting from the review process should be specific and achievable.
 6. A plan for accomplishing recommended changes should be an integral component of the evaluation process.
 7. The instructor who has been evaluated should be made aware of available resources that might facilitate recommended changes.
- E. *Dimensions of Classroom Teaching to Observe.* The instructional goals of the course being observed will influence the choice of domains. As noted elsewhere, these domains should be explicated during the pre-observation meeting between the instructor being evaluated and the evaluation team. Major dimensions of classroom teaching include the following:
1. Content - e.g., currency, accuracy, level appropriateness, and scope of material covered in class and in assigned readings; the instructor's mastery of the material covered; the appropriateness of syllabi and other materials.
 2. Style - e.g., the teaching methods, communication skills, innovativeness, organization, preparation, enthusiasm, respect for diversity, and pacing exhibited by the instructor in the classroom.
 3. Access - e.g., the instructor's availability before or after class or at office hours, responsiveness to calls or e-mail from students, approachability, and attentiveness to student concerns.
 4. Fairness - e.g., the amount of work assigned in the course, appropriateness of tests and the criteria used for scoring them, clarity of expectations, differentiation of opinions from facts, receptivity to alternative views, respect for students, and equal treatment of students.
 5. Mentoring - e.g., exposure of students to relevant opportunities for learning or career development, encouragement of further pursuit of ideas, and conduct as a role model.

6. Outcome - e.g., course test performance, student performance on course-related portions of the comprehensive exams, student performance in more advanced courses of the same type, and student self-reported knowledge gains.
- F. *Written Summaries.* The evaluation process should yield two separate written summaries. Each of these should conform to a format developed during the initial round of peer evaluation and classroom observation. Fairness, accuracy, and objectivity are fundamental to both summaries. One should include specific detailed observations and recommendations for the primary purpose of assisting the instructor in improving teaching. This report will be given only to the instructor. The second summary, not necessarily containing the same level of detail, will be provided to administrators for the purpose of gauging the instructor's teaching effectiveness. The latter may omit details not directly relevant to an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness but must be consistent with the more detailed report.

III. Other modes of evaluation.

Methods other than classroom observation should be integral to peer review of instruction because some important data cannot be directly observed and not all teaching occurs in the classroom. Several alternative data sources pertinent to teaching effectiveness are discussed below.

- A. *Teaching Portfolio.* The teaching portfolio shares with peer observation the distinction of being required of departments and faculty members in the School of Public Health. The *Appoints, Promotion and Tenure Manual* of the School of Public Health states that, "It is the responsibility of each tenure-track faculty (and appropriate clinical faculty) to develop and maintain a teaching portfolio. This portfolio should be updated annually, and should be presented at the time of promotion and tenure" (p. 7). Also included in the *Manual* is an Appendix describing teaching portfolios. The Center for Teaching and Learning is also available for consultation regarding the development of teaching portfolios. This collection of documents describing a faculty member's teaching philosophy and accomplishments is a fundamental component of the data used to evaluate teaching effectiveness.
- B. *Course Evaluations.* The third component that is essential to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness is student course evaluations. The practice of collecting student evaluations at the conclusion of each course should continue and the information generated should be an integral part of the data on which teaching effectiveness is judged.

In addition to peer observation, the teaching portfolio, and student evaluations, other data sources may provide important information about teaching effectiveness. These sources may be particularly relevant for documenting teaching effectiveness outside of the classroom, e.g., in the capacity of advisor or as research or field supervisor. The utility of any particular data source from those described below may depend on the specific instructional activities of individual faculty members. Therefore, not all of the following need be collected or examined routinely nor does the absence from the following list of other potentially relevant data sources preclude their use.

- C. *Testimonials.* Endorsements of instructors based on interviews with present students, letters from past students, or evaluations from co-instructors of team-taught courses may be relevant sources of data on teaching effectiveness. When evaluative information is solicited from present or former students, there must be assurances that this information is provided voluntarily and, if preferred by the student, anonymously. The *Faculty Advising & Mentoring: Student Evaluation Form* (see attachments) may be used for this purpose.
- D. *Archival Data Indicative of Teaching Outcomes.* Another potentially relevant source of information is archival data that testify to student learning or faculty teaching effectiveness. Such data may include completion rates for student projects (e.g., Master's papers, dissertations, IPs), faculty-student co-authored publications, advisee graduation rates, post-graduation employment of former advisees, or faculty-developed instructional products adopted by other instructors or institutions.
- E. *Other Relevant Data Sources.* The preceding is not an exhaustive list of indicators of teaching effectiveness. The inclusion of other data sources is appropriate when their relevance to the assessment is self evident or can be demonstrated. Teaching outside of the classroom may be especially difficult to document and data sources other than those mentioned above may be appropriate. Particularly when a faculty member's teaching evaluation will affect imminent tenure or promotion decisions, the faculty member should discuss with the Chair the appropriateness of including data sources other than those customarily employed.

Appendix 7

School of Social Work Peer Observation Form

PEER OBSERVATION FORM FOR CLASSROOM TEACHING
UNC-CHAPEL HILL SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK

Faculty Member Observed: _____

Course Title: _____

Number Students: _____

Observer(s)*: _____

Date of Visit: _____

Length of Visit: _____

CONTENT: (Information is responsive to the objectives for the session [attach] and reflects current developments in the field of study at a depth and complexity appropriate for the students' level of mastery)

METHOD OF PRESENTATION: (Appropriate strategies are used to convey information and to actively and meaningfully engage students, including lecturing, asking questions that stimulate thought and discussion and using examples, handouts, audio-visual aids, and small group techniques to promote integration of class content)

EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESENTATION: (Information is presented in an organized and coherent manner that promotes students' integration of content; objectives and plan of action are clear; content from the current session is linked with previous and future class sessions; main points are summarized; assignments are explained and clarified)

* If more than one observer, please complete peer observation form as a team.

USE OF TIME: (Amount and complexity of content are appropriate for the time allocated, including the use of class exercises to promote integration of class content)

CLASSROOM CLIMATE: (Instructor conveys a sense of respect and appreciation for students and their ideas, encourages students to ask questions and to comment critically on material presented, and demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject)

STRONG POINTS ABOUT STYLE AND CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR ENHANCEMENT OF PERFORMANCE: (Please include ONLY if deficiencies are noted during the observation that need to be addressed in a corrective plan)

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____