

The Belk College of Business Peer Review of Teaching Policy & Procedures

The UNC Charlotte Academic Personnel Procedures Handbook, Section VI requires that the teaching performance of untenured tenure-track faculty, clinical professors, lecturers, part-time instructors, and graduate students with responsibility for classroom instruction be evaluated by direct observation on a regular basis. The following procedures are required for peer reviews of faculty teaching in the Belk College of Business. Departments may develop more detailed procedures within the framework outlined in this document and may conduct more frequent peer reviews should they desire to do so.

The results of the peer review will form one part of the assessment of the faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness. Additionally, the feedback generated from these peer reviews can be invaluable for a faculty member seeking to improve her/his teaching performance.

Procedures

The teaching performance of all untenured tenure-track faculty, clinical professors (any rank), lecturers (any rank), doctoral candidates, and adjuncts in their first UNC Charlotte contract will be evaluated by direct observation during their first semester of teaching in the College. Reviews beyond the first semester will be conducted as follows:

Faculty	Recurring Review	Reviewer(s)
Untenured Tenure-Track	Biennially	Two tenured faculty
Clinical Assistant and Associate Professors, and Lecturers	Biennially & prior to contract renewal	Two tenured faculty, Clinical Professors, or Senior Lecturers
Clinical Professors and Senior Lecturers	Once per contract term prior to contract renewal	Two tenured faculty
Adjunct	Biennially	One tenure-track, clinical faculty, or lecturer
Doctoral Candidate	Annually	One tenure-track, clinical faculty, or lecturer

The Department Chairperson will select faculty reviewers to conduct the reviews as listed above. For reviews of clinical faculty and lecturers in their contract renewal year, it is advisable for the department chair to be a reviewer. Contract faculty requesting early contract renewal, must provide sufficient notice of early contract renewal in order for a proper review to be scheduled.

After consultation with the assigned reviewers, the faculty member being reviewed and the department chair will jointly determine the class to be observed and the time for the classroom visit. All reviews will last a minimum of 50 minutes. For classes longer than 50 minutes, reviewers may leave at some natural break point prior to the dismissal of the class.

In the case of a review of an online course, the format of the review will depend upon whether the course material is delivered synchronously or asynchronously. If the material is delivered synchronously, then the review shall take place in the same manner as a face-to-face course. If the material is delivered

asynchronously, the faculty member should provide the reviewers with the materials (videos, written notes, handouts, etc.) that the students would use for a class period. If the course has synchronous interaction (question and answer session, discussion session, etc.) with the instructor and the class, the reviewers may opt to review that portion of the course.

Each reviewer will submit a written evaluation (see guidelines below and optional observation form in the Appendix) of the faculty member's teaching performance to the department chair and the faculty member being reviewed. The faculty member being reviewed may submit a self-evaluation and/or commentary on the reviewers' written evaluations to the department chair. All written evaluations of classroom teaching and responses from the faculty member under review (if any) must be considered in the department chair's annual evaluation of the faculty member's performance, must be included in the faculty member's file assembled for reappointment, promotion, or tenure (RPT) and for contract renewal decisions, and must be considered in the RPT process.

Evaluation Guidelines

The written evaluations need to provide details on the class observed:

1. Course (name, class number, and section, i.e., Consumer Behavior MKTG 3216-001)
2. Instructor
3. Date and length of observation
4. Names of observer and co-observer(s)
5. Course Format (Face-to-face, Online Synchronous/Asynchronous, Hybrid)
6. Class format (lecture, discussion, lecture/discussion, group work, etc.)
7. Topic(s) covered
8. Number of students present

The written evaluations should assess the following:

1. Objectives. Did the instructor make the objectives of the lecture/classroom presentation clear?
2. Teaching Strategies/Methodologies. What were these? Were they appropriate to achieve the class objectives?
3. Organization/Preparation. Was the classroom presentation well organized and prepared?
4. Scholarship. Did the instructor demonstrate a thorough understanding of the material?
5. Attitude. Did the instructor convey a positive attitude toward the class and the subject?
6. Motivation. Was the instructor effective in stimulating and holding student interest? Did the instructor encourage student participation?
7. Clarity. Was the instructor's presentation clear and understood by the class?
8. Effectiveness. In summary, was the instructor an effective teacher?

Optionally, departments may choose to adopt a classroom observation form like the one included in the Appendix of this document.

Initial Version: March 23, 2007

Revised April 20, 2007

Revised February 1, 2011

Revised March 31, 2021

Appendix

Sample Classroom Observation Form

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Course Format (Face-to-face, Online Synch/Asynch, Hybrid): _____

Class format (lecture, discussion, lecture/discussion, group work, etc.): _____

Date of Observation: _____ Length of Observation: _____

Topic: _____

Reviewer: _____ # of Students: ____

Instructions: Use this form to record ratings. **Use comments to explain or contextualize those ratings.** If the question is not applicable, mark N/A.

Presentation Format and Skills

The instructor demonstrates preparedness.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor employs strategies to gain attention and/or establish rapport at the beginning of the class period.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor clearly outlines the objectives for the class period.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor presents material in a logical sequence.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor emphasizes key points or main ideas.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor presents material that is appropriate to the stated purpose of the course.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor clearly explains course content.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor uses examples, metaphors, and/or analogies appropriately and effectively.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor offers applications of course material.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor explains what the students need to do to prepare for the next class period (e.g., what assignments are due, what readings should be done, etc.).

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor demonstrates mastery of course material.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Additional comments/observations:

Classroom Climate

The instructor is available before or after class to speak with students or conveys a willingness to meet with students at alternative times.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor uses student names.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor encourages participation and/or responses from all students in the class.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor treats students with respect.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor's nonverbal communication (i.e., eye contact, gestures, body movement, posture, dress, etc.) demonstrates interest, enthusiasm, and professionalism.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor uses humor appropriately.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Additional comments/observations:

Variety and pacing of instruction

The instructor varies teaching techniques or instructional methods to gain and maintain student attention and interest.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

The instructor is responsive to students who indicate confusion or non-comprehension.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Students are given the opportunity to contribute thoughts and ideas.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Video clips, websites, and other audiovisual materials have a clear purpose.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Handouts are clear, appropriate, and applicable to course content.

Poor *Marginal (Needs Improvement)* *Satisfactory* *Very Good* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Additional comments/observations: