

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING
BERKELEY DIVISION, ACADEMIC SENATE

April 2015

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The University community believes that excellence in teaching and research go hand in hand, and as a matter of policy, they are both considered essential duties of every faculty member. Since teaching plays a significant role in decisions regarding advancement and promotion, it is imperative that clear documentation of teaching ability and teaching contribution be included in such cases. The University of California Personnel Manual and the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate's [Policy for Evaluation of Teaching \(for Advancement and Promotion\)](#) state the expectation that all cases for advancement and promotion normally will include a variety of ways to evaluate teaching (i.e., [APM-210 Criteria for Appointment, Promotion and Appraisal](#)).

The Berkeley campus has relied almost entirely on end-of-term student evaluations, and in particular, one question about overall teaching effectiveness: "Considering both the limitations and possibilities of the subject matter and course, how would you rate the overall teaching effectiveness of this instructor?" This single question is required of all departments as specified in the Berkeley Policy for Evaluation of Teaching. An abundance of research does support that "administering well-crafted questionnaires to students is both valid and reliable as one source of information for evaluating teaching". While any single source of information about a faculty member's teaching is valuable, student course evaluations alone do not portray a complete picture on which to conduct an evaluation. When other factors are considered (e.g., gender bias), the premise of only using student evaluations for assessing teaching ability and contribution appears clearly inadequate. Different sources of information provide complementary perspectives on various aspects of teaching and together they provide a more comprehensive and accurate portrait of teaching as a scholarly activity.

With these reasons in mind, the Committee on Teaching (COT) of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate presents the following recommendations:

- 1) The Berkeley campus should implement the Teaching Dossier, and begin requiring the relevant components as part of the merit and promotion materials in a tiered system, starting in fall 2017 for mid-career reviews, fall 2019 for promotion to tenure and fall 2021 for Full Professors.
- 2) Best practices and procedures for Peer Observation, as outlined by the COT, should be followed when this component is included in the Teaching Dossier.
- 3) Campus academic administrators and faculty leadership should facilitate discussions amongst the faculty to explain the value of a teaching dossier, as well as to solicit feedback in an effort to ensure its adoption. Formal training, resources, campus experts, as well as disciplinary experts/mentors, should be provided by the campus as the practice is taken up by individual faculty and departments.
- 4) Studies should be undertaken to evaluate the impact of the implementation of the teaching dossier, as well as the introduction of new ways of teaching evaluation, such as peer observation. The Center for Teaching and Learning (in collaboration with COT) is interested in designing and conducting this research.

Background

The essential question in the evaluation of teaching is whether the candidate contributes in an effective, creative and appropriate way to the teaching mission of the department. The documentation of teaching ability and teaching contribution can be evaluated from information in the following five main areas:

- **Course Design**, illustrated by the design of new courses or redesign of existing courses to adapt and keep current the body of knowledge as well as contributions to curriculum and instruction.
- **Teaching Methodologies**, illustrated by presentation of material.
- **Content Knowledge**, demonstrated by command of the subject.
- **Student Learning**, illustrated by selection of relevant work to be conducted by the student, appropriate evaluation and effective feedback to the student on material submitted.
- **Departmental Responsibility**, including directing student research, advising students and/or postdocs and guiding and supervising Graduate Student Instructors, in addition to regular teaching load.

For a description of these components, the reader is referred to the Policy for Evaluation of Teaching- for Advancement and Promotion. The sources of information for evaluating teaching generally come from a variety of sources such as; a) current students, b) former students and alumni, c) graduate student instructors (GSIs), d) faculty colleagues, and e) self-evaluations. Various methods can be used to gather data from these sources and include rating forms or detailed questionnaires, written appraisals, letters or responses to open-ended questions on rating forms, interviews and peer observations among others. Combining these sources and methods, it is possible to collect a variety of information about a faculty member's teaching.

An existing Berkeley model for evaluating and advancing teaching excellence is the annual selection of the Distinguished Teaching Award (DTA) recipients. The process through which distinguished teachers are selected each year includes a two-stage creation of a teaching dossier, as well as classroom observations of nominees. The COT recognizes that there is no one way to be an excellent teacher, and instead uses the multiple lines of evidence provided in the dossiers to determine if “such sustained excellence in teaching incites intellectual curiosity in students, inspires departmental colleagues, and makes students aware of significant relationships between the academy and the world at large.” The COT, which has selected the DTA recipients each year since 1959, has also set forth the following criteria for teaching excellence:

- Effective design and redesign of courses.
- Ability to engage and inspire in students independent and original thinking.
- Enthusiasm and vitality in learning and teaching.
- Active involvement in and guidance of student research projects, both undergraduate and graduate.
- Advising students with personal attention and care.
- Mentorship and supervision of Graduate Student Instructors (GSIs) that facilitates effective teaching.

These criteria serve as a flexible template for use in evaluations of teaching dossiers for merit and promotion consistently across disciplines.

PART I: THE TEACHING DOSSIER

Teaching dossiers provide context and document evidence of teaching drawn from a variety of sources. Dossiers provide the opportunity to evaluate teaching longitudinally, situating teaching as an ongoing process of inquiry, experimentation, and reflection. In addition to helping faculty members reflect on and improve their teaching through the process of selecting and organizing material to include, dossiers contribute to a more professional view of teaching as a scholarly activity.

The COT believes that the use of Teaching Dossiers is the best way to get at the complexity and individuality of teaching. Because the content and organization of dossiers will differ from one professor to another, reflecting this complexity and individuality, the use of dossiers for tenure and promotion decisions should include certain required items along with elective ones. Required elements would allow for evaluative comparisons across departments and disciplines, while elective items encourage evidence of what makes a faculty member's teaching unique and effective. These elective items could be included in the dossier, at the discretion of individual faculty members. The COT recommends the adoption of the Teaching Dossier and present a list of required and elective items which are aligned with the 1987 Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching (for Promotion and Tenure):

Required Elements of a Teaching Dossier:

- **Department Chair's letter.** A carefully prepared Chair's letter is an essential part of a Teaching dossier. An effective letter from the chair will describe departmental teaching evaluation procedures, the nature and quality of a candidate's teaching, and the evidence upon which this evaluation is based. Specific details may have been already presented in the Department Ad hoc Committee report, and the Chair letter can provide additional information and a broader perspective on the candidate's teaching ability and contribution to complement the information already discussed in the Ad hoc Committee report. In general, the Chair's letter will also contain a summary of the candidate's contribution to research and service.
- **Department Ad hoc Committee Report.** For mid-career review, promotion to tenure, and promotion to professor reviews, departments are encouraged to convene an ad hoc committee (two or more faculty members) to examine teaching evaluation data and assess a candidate's teaching performance. The ad hoc committee generally provides a significant review of this data, which includes a review of student ratings, individual student comments as well as some evaluation of course content and teaching load. Similarly to the Department Chair's letter, the Ad hoc Committee Report will also contain a detailed review of the candidate's contribution to research and service.
- **Candidate's Teaching Responsibilities.** The instructor must submit a list and description of courses taught by course number. Information regarding enrollment must be included. The candidate should comment on the courses indicating relevant information (e.g., new, team taught, significantly revised) as well as contribution to the undergraduate, graduate or professional curricula.
- **Candidate's Teaching Statement.** The instructor must provide a written statement describing teaching experience and teaching approach, including the goals of specific courses and choices of teaching strategies. The instructor can include excerpts of student's comments from end-of-semester teaching evaluations as supporting evidence for the relevant courses. The instructor can

document efforts to improve instruction and address comments about teaching performance made by the department chair, colleagues and by students on end-of-semester teaching evaluations.

- **Supervision and Mentoring of Students.** Instructors must describe their role in directing senior theses, masters and doctoral studies, and postdoctoral scholars. The number of graduate students successfully completing degree work could also be included (indicate the date each student began graduate school).
- **Student evaluations.** Some form of student evaluation data (e.g., end-of-semester student ratings) for each different course taught in the period under review must be presented. The data should include both summaries of student evaluations of teaching and sufficient "raw" data (i.e., representative student comments) to allow the reviewers to see the candidate's teaching from the students' point of view.

Elective Elements of a Teaching Dossier:

- **Peer Review.** Reports or letters about the candidate's teaching performance from faculty colleagues familiar with the content could be included in the dossier. The letters should cite the basis and evidence for judgments made, such as peer observation or review of instructional materials, among others. An evaluation of programmatic content of selected courses taught by the candidate can also be included in the review. Other elements include: a) sample of students work (e.g., homework, project assignments, and exams); b) feedback from the faculty member to the student, and c) examples of outstanding and average student work. Finally, Peer review can also include the recently introduced practice of Peer Observation. This component will be discussed in more detail later.
- **Alumni and/or GSI Evaluations.** Former students, as well as Graduate Student Instructors (if the candidate teaches with GSIs), can provide information about the candidate's teaching performance and his/her impact on professional development outside the course setting.
- **Other Material.** Dossiers can also include letters from current students, summary of exit-interviews, results of group interviews, or summaries of surveys of alumni that specifically address the candidate's teaching. It can also include other relevant information in support of teaching efforts such as books, monographs and readers as well as teaching awards and or other recognition for teaching efforts.

It must be noted that most of these elements are consistently included in current cases for advancement and promotion (e.g., student evaluations), while the inclusion of others (e.g., candidate teaching statement or peer evaluation) appear to vary significantly across the Berkeley Campus. The development and maintenance of a teaching dossier enables individual faculty, as well as the University more broadly, to directly address and make visible the different kinds of teaching responsibilities that faculty assume both inside and outside the classroom. Although the Teaching Dossier can be used as a stand-alone "virtual" document, a more direct application is to provide guidance on the necessary documentation of teaching ability and contribution to be included in a typical promotion case as shown in PLATE 1. Appendix A provides examples of Elective Materials that can be included in the Teaching Dossier.

PLATE 1: Example of Teaching Dossier Components to be included in a Typical Promotion Case

- 1. Department Chair's Letter**
- 2. Department Ad hoc Committee Report**
- 3. Candidate's Teaching Responsibilities**
- 4. Candidate's Teaching Statement**
- 5. Supervision and Mentoring of Students.**
- 6. Student Evaluations: Summary and Raw comments.**
- 7. Additional Material (Elective)**
 - a. Peer Review (with or without Peer Observation)*
 - b. Alumni and/or GSI Evaluations*
 - c. Teaching Improvement Activities.*
 - d. Products of Teaching (e.g., books, readers)*
 - e. Evidence of Student Learning (e.g., exit interviews)*
 - f. Teaching Awards and Recognition*

Elements 1 through 6 are required components (in bold), while element 7 contains elective documentation (in italics). The Dossier is not intended to be a check list but a guide to the Evaluation of Teaching as teaching is very different across Department and disciplines.

Assembling a Teaching Dossier

Research on the practice of compiling a teaching dossier suggests that a selective document of eight to ten pages plus supporting appendices is sufficient for the vast majority of faculty members. Some institutions put a ceiling on the number of pages they allow in order to prevent data overload in the dossier. A sound dossier offers a coherent teaching profile in which all parts support the whole. These key supporting documents should be presented in a manner that demonstrates a discernable pattern, such as all evaluations for one course for the previous three years, or all syllabi for all courses taught for the past two years. A key test of the lucidity of the appendices is if they are clear to potential readers outside the department or discipline. The dossier should actively include all professional activity that provides direct support for student learning. In addition to traditional classroom teaching, that would include instruction in laboratories or in the field and advising students among others. One benefit of a complete teaching dossier is that they offer faculty an unmatched opportunity to document classroom practices and teaching activities that otherwise would go unrecognized and unrewarded.

Time Demands in the Preparation of a Dossier.

It is expected that most professors can complete their Dossier or portfolio in twelve to fifteen hours spread over several days. It is also evident, that the first time collecting the appropriate documentation will require some preparation and such activities will become incremental in subsequent submittals. The Center for Teaching and Learning, CTL, is available to provide guidance to facilitate the overall process.

Implementation of Teaching Dossier for Personnel Decisions.

Based on best practices drawn from the research and considering the application of those practices within the context of Berkeley, COT recommends that the campus begin requiring the development of a teaching dossier as part of the merit and promotion materials submitted in fall 2017 for mid-career reviews. Departments could have the option of starting this practice earlier. COT recommends that a teaching dossier eventually be required at reviews for mid-career, tenure, and full professor. The ensuing career milestones that would require a teaching dossier should be implemented in a tiered system, whereby the requirement for a portfolio for tenure cases would go into effect fall 2019, and for promotion to full professor, fall 2021.

Specific Questions to Consider in Evaluating Dossiers.

The criteria and suggested focus for examining dossier materials must be suitable and adapted to individual institutional and departmental objectives and goals. As a result, it is better to adapt - not adopt - already developed criteria and suggested focus from others and reshape them to meet individual department conditions. Required elements would allow for evaluative comparisons across departments and disciplines, while elective items encourage evidence of what makes a faculty member's teaching unique and effective. The criteria and suggested focus for evaluating elective items presented in Appendix A should be considered as a guide and perhaps as a starting point for campus discussion intended to mold and reshape the model for a better fit with Berkeley's institutional and departmental needs.

PART II: PEER OBSERVATION OF CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION

While a teaching dossier include a number of components, this section specifically addresses considerations for peer observations of classroom instruction (hereafter referred to as peer observation). No source of evidence about teaching effectiveness can contribute more to informing larger conversations around teaching on campus than the ability to ground those conversations in shared practice. Having first-hand experience observing a colleague's classroom provides the grounding necessary to discuss teaching based on direct, versus indirect, evidence. Such firsthand visits by a faculty member's peers would increase the amount and type of information available about teaching in promotion and tenure cases. However, just as importantly, peer observations and the discussions about teaching that would accompany them can raise the visibility and improve the effectiveness of teaching within departments through the sharing of best practices. In this section, we review departmental considerations in introducing peer observation and provide links to relevant documents and guidelines. The COT intent is not to propose a one-size-fits-all approach, but rather to encourage departments to determine what works for their faculty, in their discipline, and with their history and current policies. COT proposes that the Berkeley campus allows the inclusion of peer observation, at the discretion of the faculty or department chair, as one of the components of peer review in the Teaching Dossier, whether solely to share information with the candidate (and not include it in the promotion case) or to provide evaluative information for reviewers (i.e., including this component in the promotion case).

Purpose of Peer Observation of Course Instruction.

There are two purposes of such activity: one is evaluative and provides information for promotion/tenure cases, and the other is informational and provides feedback to stimulate the improvement of teaching and the exchange of information about best practices. It is the case that peer observation for evaluative purposes will likely have the additional effect of improving teaching. However, our discussions with departments suggest that some would prefer initially to introduce peer observations, focusing only on the sharing of information about best practices, and to defer its use for evaluative purposes until the practice of peer observation is well established. The COT believes that such a two-stage approach is appropriate at this time.

Who Should Conduct the Observation?

A peer observer should have pedagogical expertise and ideally should also have disciplinary expertise. Some departments will prefer to draw on their own faculty or those from departments that are similar in terms of field/discipline to carry out the observations, but others will prefer to draw on the expertise of faculty from different departments. The [Center for Teaching and Learning](#), CTL, can provide assistance in training faculty members to carry out peer observations.

Timing and Frequency of Peer Observation.

Timing and frequency of peer reviews will depend on purpose. The majority of departments have expressed interest in conducting peer observations early in a faculty member's career, especially at mid-career. The consensus is that observations conducted early on are most likely to impact teaching effectiveness, and they also provide a benchmark for progress. Other departments have expressed interest in considering a more expansive peer review process, beginning mid-career but continuing through cases for promotion to Professor. COT sees the value of peer observation at these three career stages in order

to encourage continual teaching improvement, but the value is particularly high at mid-career and tenure. Additional consideration should be made to the fact that many circumstances beyond the control of a faculty member could impact a class session on a particular day, coloring the learning experience of a class negatively, and thus resulting in a negative observation. For this reason, faculty should be given the option of a one-time do-over for any peer observation of classroom teaching, without prejudice.

Managing Workload.

At this moment, COT does not anticipate workload to be an issue, since peer observation is an elective component of the Teaching Dossier. If, however, the practice becomes popular, the COT would evaluate this new condition at a later time. Anticipating a very unlikely scenario that all Dossiers would contain a peer observation, the COT discussed several ways of minimizing and/or incentivizing the workload involved in conducting peer observations. The first recommendation is that the Academic Senate could establish a subcommittee of the COT consisting of a pool of trained, qualified peer observers, such as former recipients of the Distinguished Teaching Award, from which departments could draw. Conducting these observations that count as academic service would offset much of the concern about additional workload. Other possibilities include: a) smaller departments opting to join with other small departments or work at the division level to “share” observers, thus leveraging a larger pool of faculty in a general discipline or field; b) departments could perform reviews at pre-determined career stages (i.e., mid-career, tenure, full) to spread workload out over time and reduce the number of faculty needed to review in any given year; and c) departments could request opportunities to train more faculty in conducting reviews so that the work can be spread amongst more able faculty colleagues.

Guidelines & Procedures.

With input and approval by the COT, several [forms](#) have been created that can be used to inform and guide the peer observation process (*See Appendix B*). While dimensions of peer observation vary from department to department and discipline to discipline, the COT recommends that peer observation occur at least once for each course type (e.g., lecture, seminar, laboratory, studio) per career milestone, and that professors have the opportunity to request a repeat observation. Individual department chairs should exercise discretion in the amount of work required when individuals have a significantly higher teaching load.

PART III: PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR TEACHING DOSSIERS

In addition to introducing the expectation of a teaching dossier, campus academic administrators and faculty leadership should facilitate discussions amongst the faculty to explain the value of a teaching dossier, why it is being introduced at this time, as well as to solicit feedback in an effort to ensure the adoption of the teaching dossier. Formal training, resources, and campus experts (as well as disciplinary experts/mentors) should be provided as the practice of crafting a teaching dossier is taken up by individual faculty and departments.

PART IV: RESEARCH STUDIES FOR EVALUATING IMPACT OF TEACHING DOSSIERS

Finally, COT also recommends that studies be undertaken to evaluate the impact of the teaching dossier and is interested in designing and conducting this research in collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) on campus.

APPENDIX A: EXAMPLE OF ELECTIVE MATERIALS

The following paragraphs provide a list of elective documentation for a Teaching Dossier. It must be noted that different disciplines and departments will use different components and the list is meant to help guide and not constraint the selection of materials to be included. The list are classified primarily based on the main component that is being evaluated: a) course design, b) teaching methodologies, c) content knowledge, d) student learning, and e) department responsibility. Note that some items serve to illustrate more than one of the components.

Course Design

- Statement of teaching goals and objectives
- Detailed Syllabi and Course goals and objectives
- Teaching materials (tests, homework, reading lists, handouts, assignments)
- Graded term papers, projects, assignments

Teaching Methodologies

- Videotape of the professor teaching an entire class
- Information about special circumstances that may have affected teaching
- Peer observation of classroom instruction
- Description of steps taken to evaluate or improve one's teaching
- Honors or other recognition of teaching excellence

Content Knowledge

- Evidence in teaching materials
- Record of attendance at disciplinary-based conferences resulting in presentations to faculty or application to classroom
- Record of public lectures or performances, reviews of scholarly or creative work
- Record of student research directed
- Evidence of consultations and invitations related to teaching and participation in faculty colloquia

Student Learning

- Statement of evaluation criteria for student grades and grade distribution
- Copies of graded exams, student papers, homework or other related products
- Successful drafts of student work, along with the professor's suggestions as to how each draft might be improved. Student learning portfolios
- Pre- and post-test performance. Videotape of student presentations at the beginning and the end of a course
- Statements by alumni on their learning

Departmental Responsibility

- Record of service on teaching-related committees (e.g., curriculum, faculty development)
- Evidence of design of new courses and programs
- Evidence of involvement in student advising or career development
- Record of teaching load, class size and teaching improvement activities

EXAMPLE OF EVALUATION FORM FOR ELECTIVE COMPONENTS

PART I: COMPOSITE RATING (1=poor, 2=fair, 3=good, 4=very good, 5= excellent)

<i>Suggested Focus in Examining Materials</i>	<i>Rating</i>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Course Design</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are materials and course content appropriate for the course level? • Are they appropriately challenging? What level of performance do the students achieve? • Is there evidence of meaningful curricular development? • Do course requirements appropriately address critical thinking development? Writing skill development? • Are the teaching materials consistent with the course's expected contribution to the department curriculum? 	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Teaching Methodologies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do student ratings compare with similar courses in the Department? • What trends are apparent across courses? (e.g., undergraduate vs. graduate) • What are this faculty member's teaching strengths? Weaknesses? • Is there evidence of teaching improvement over time? • Does the faculty member engage in team teaching? Interdisciplinary teaching? 	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Content Knowledge</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the teaching materials current and is the best work in the field represented? • Is the faculty member sought out as a resource in the discipline area by peers or students? • Does he or she seek opportunities to learn more about the subject? • Is there evidence that the professor uses expertise in settings outside the department? • Does the faculty member actively involve students in scholarship? 	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Student Learning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there evidence of real cognitive or effective student learning? • Are the professor's comments on student work appropriate? Thorough? Motivating? • How suitable is the professor's grade distribution? • Is there evidence of assistance provided by the professor to students who are preparing publications or conference presentations? • Do student essays, creative work, or fieldwork reports indicate deep, reflective thinking and learning? 	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Departmental Responsibility</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are classes met on time? Missed classes made up? • Does the professor instruct an appropriate number of students? • Does he or she take an active role in the improvement of instruction in the department? • Does the faculty member seek feedback about teaching performance, explore alternative teaching methods, make changes to increase student learning? • Does he or she make an appropriate contribution as a student advisor? 	
<i>TOTAL SCORE</i>	

PART II: COMMENTS AND OVERALL RATING

After reviewing your ratings in the five components above, please comment here on your overall rating of this faculty member as a teacher.

APPENDIX B: GUIDE TO PEER OBSERVATION (OF COURSE INSTRUCTION)

COMMITTEE ON TEACHING BERKELEY DIVISION, ACADEMIC SENATE

February 2015

GUIDE TO PEER OBSERVATION (OF COURSE INSTRUCTION)

Peer observation (of course instruction) is one valuable source of data about teaching and provides an opportunity to help instructors think about their teaching philosophy, methods and strategies. This process helps maintain the instructor strengths and ultimately improve their teaching. If a department chooses to use peer observation as one of the components of peer review, form templates are available through the Center for Teaching and Learning, CTL, (<http://teaching.berkeley.edu>) and can be adapted as needed.

In order to ensure that faculty benefit from the peer observation, adding value to their teaching practice and serving as valid evidence of their teaching effectiveness, the following best practices are suggested:

FOR DEPARTMENTS

- Instructors need to be informed about the purpose of peer observation.
- It is recommended that a Pre-Peer Observation Form be completed by the instructor. It is used to prepare the instructor and the observer for the class session with any relevant information (i.e., learning goals, student dynamics).
- A Peer Observation Form is used to guide the observation and evaluation to focus on agreed upon pedagogical practices.
- An opportunity is provided to instructors to respond to comments and suggestions from the peer observation.
- Experience performing peer observations (plus training and support where appropriate) increases their reliability and validity.

FOR PEER OBSERVERS

- Arrive at class ahead of time.
- Observe an entire class session. If you must leave, make sure the instructor knows beforehand.
- Try not to affect the teaching-learning process. Be invisible (as much as possible). Do not intervene during the observation. As an exception, only intervene by explicit prior agreement with the instructor.
- Have a method of recording what takes place (Peer Observation forms have been developed to guide the process)
- Note the time in the margin of the review form every few minutes so that the class structure can be put in context.
- Diagram instructor and student positions and interactions illustrating the degree of participation, who participates in class and how often.
- Provide feedback that is accurate and specific, with examples. “33% of students raised hands to answer

instructor question” rather than “students appear engaged and responsive” or “Instructor voice trailed off while summarizing concept #3 at 3:45” rather than “instructor mannerism is distracting or confusing.”

- Contribute to what the instructor has already thought about (dovetails with Pre-Observation Form information and instructor self-knowledge).
- Provide feedback in a supportive, nonjudgmental manner.
- Provide positive points intermixed with areas for growth.
- Provide specific alternatives for teaching practices needing change or improvement.
- Understand and be sensitive to what the instructor can control and their experience level.
- Provide feedback that prompts discussion between the instructor and the peer observer.

Conduct a post-observation discussion with the instructor. In this discussion, the observer should:

- Begin by discussing what the instructor is doing well, and why.
- Provide specific examples which are more useful than focus on generalities.

FOR INSTRUCTORS

- Take the opportunity to comment and respond to in a post-observation discussion. Frame your own impression of the class, discuss your strengths and also areas that you are actively seeking suggestions for improvement. This will help guide the feedback from the observer and set the stage for a discussion.
- Informed by the results of the current peer observation, articulate pedagogical goals to accomplish by the next peer observation and outline concrete steps to reach those goals. The summary section in the Peer Observation Form provides a designated space for this actionable plan, among other items.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the peer observation – as a source of evidence of teaching effectiveness and an opportunity for reflection/discussion around maintaining strengths and improving teaching. The summary section in the Peer Observation Form provides a designated space for this evaluation, among other items.

FOR OBSERVERS & INSTRUCTORS

- Conduct an honest exchange, of both strengths and suggestions for improving teaching.
- Treat the post-observation meeting as a discussion, not just the peer observer delivering feedback.
- Instructors are allowed a one peer observation do-over (i.e., repeat) without prejudice. This request should be directed to the peer observer as soon as possible after the conclusion of the first peer observation.

PEER REVIEW/OBSERVATION FORMS (Revised February 2015)

PRE-PEER OBSERVATION FORM (OPTIONAL)

Sources and Methods for Evaluating Teaching
Committee on Teaching-Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

This is an optional form to be filled prior to the in-class peer observation. The form can be used to frame your and/or your discipline's approach to the course topic and pedagogy so that the peer observer is better informed regarding your pedagogical decisions. Furthermore, it can be used to provide the peer observer with any information you feel would be helpful before the class session. The better informed a peer is, the more reflective their review will be.

Faculty/Instructor: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Time: _____

Location: _____

Class: _____

Peer Observer: _____

Pedagogical Approach to Course Topic (individual session and/or entire course):

*e.g., explain why lecture coupled with discussion, small-group work with supporting lecture, short lectures with quizzes

--

Miscellaneous Helpful Information Prior to In-Class Peer Observation:

*e.g., student dynamics, unit on theoretical concepts versus practical applications, preparing students for a term project

--

General Remarks

--

PEER OBSERVATION FORM (Revised February 2015)

Sources and Methods for Evaluating Teaching
Committee on Teaching-Berkeley Division, Academic Senate

Peer observer - This form is designed to guide your observation and evaluation of a faculty/instructor in-class session. Please note teaching strengths as well as provide suggestions for pedagogical improvement, whenever possible, as a supplement to evaluative comments. This form is not meant to be used as a checklist, rather it should generally frame the evaluation and serve as a starting point for identifying appropriate areas to address given the discipline, instructor teaching style and individual class session goals. The areas of focus listed in the form are not limited or exhaustive—feel free to comment on additional relevant components not included here.

Faculty – Your assigned peer observer will provide comments and suggestions on your classroom instruction using this Peer Observation Form. The *Faculty/ Instructor Response* column is provided so that you respond to the comments and suggestions from the peer observer.

All- This form is intended to focus reviews on the mechanics of the classroom instruction and interaction, not on the content of the course.

Faculty/Instructor: _____

Date: _____/_____/_____

Time: _____

Location: _____

Class: _____

Peer Observer: _____

Preliminary Activities

Potential areas for comment:

- Setup (i.e., materials, information projected on board/screen, physical arrangement)
- Class Start (i.e., on time, overview of class session w/ clearly stated goals)

Peer Observer Comments & Suggestions

Faculty/ Instructor Response

--	--

The Main Event

Instructional Methods (i.e., lecture, discussion, small-group work)

Potential areas for comment:

- Well-suited for teaching the content covered
- Have a clear purpose
- Encourage general attentiveness and consider attention spans in the timing of classroom activities
- Provide opportunities for student participation and encourage engagement with instructor, and/or peers
- Emphasize and summarize important points
- Attend to the intellectual, emotional, and/or physical needs of students
- Prompt students' to draw on prior learning and experiences
- Examine student achievement of goals (i.e., questioning students on course material, observing student performance, discussion, quizzes)

Class Flow

Potential areas for comment:

- Well organized and easy to follow
- Transitions between units, sections, concepts and/or topics
- Allows time for questions
- Uses time management to cover content
- Concludes and reviews of day's topic

Peer Observer Comments & Suggestions

Faculty/ Instructor Response

<i>Peer Observer Comments & Suggestions</i>	<i>Faculty/ Instructor Response</i>

Interaction with Students

Potential areas for comment:

- Presentation techniques are well utilized (i.e. movement, lecturing from notes vs. manuscript, eye contact)
- Tone of voice indicates interest in the subject, students, and student questions
- Creates a participatory classroom environment
- Responsive to student nonverbal cues (i.e., excitement, boredom, confusion, apprehension)
- Uses student names whenever possible
- Encourages student questions and provides clear explanations to those questions

Peer Observer Comments & Suggestions

Faculty/ Instructor Response

Integration of Technology (if applicable)

Potential areas for comment:

- Technology is used to engage students, enhance learning, and/or generally enrich students' class experience as part of lecture, activities, or discussion
- Technology is leveraged to facilitate a learning experience that would otherwise not be possible
- Student work done via technology outside of class is integrated into the class session (e.g., homework, discussion, board)

Peer Observer Comments & Suggestions

Faculty/ Instructor Response

General Comments, Summary & Suggestions: (to be filled out by peer observer)

-This space could be used to describe the setting in which the lesson took place, relevant information about the makeup of the class, and any other descriptive characteristics that would provide appropriate context to the review. This space could additionally be used to highlight areas for suggested pedagogical improvement, along with concrete strategies.

Faculty/Instructor Response

-This space should be used to articulate goals for the next peer review of course instruction and outline concrete steps to reach those goals.

Intentionally left blank

APPENDIX C: SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

This appendix contains supporting documents used for reference only.

C.1: APM-210 CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND APPRAISAL

C.2: BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE'S POLICY FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING (FOR ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION)

C.3: DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD CHECKLIST (Revised February 2015)

C.4: GENERAL THOUGHTS IN EVALUATING TEACHING DOSSIERS

C.5. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES RELATING TO TEACHING DOSSIER

C.1: APM-210 CRITERIA FOR APPOINTMENT, PROMOTION AND APPRAISAL

Review and Appraisal Committees

Rev. 7/1/05

The criteria set forth below are intended to serve as guides for minimum standards in judging the candidate, not to set boundaries to exclude other elements of performance that may be considered.

(1) Teaching — Clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality in teaching is an essential criterion for appointment, advancement, or promotion. Under no circumstances will a tenure commitment be made unless there is clear documentation of ability and diligence in the teaching role. In judging the effectiveness of a candidate's teaching, the committee should consider such points as the following: the candidate's command of the subject; continuous growth in the subject field; ability to organize material and to present it with force and logic; capacity to awaken in students an awareness of the relationship of the subject to other fields of knowledge; fostering of student independence and capability to reason; spirit and enthusiasm which vitalize the candidate's learning and teaching; ability to arouse curiosity in beginning students, to encourage high standards, and to stimulate advanced students to creative work; personal attributes as they affect teaching and students; extent and skill of the candidate's participation in the general guidance, mentoring, and advising of students; effectiveness in creating an academic environment that is open and encouraging to all students, including development of particularly effective strategies for the educational advancement of students in various underrepresented groups. The committee should pay due attention to the variety of demands placed on instructors by the types of teaching called for in various disciplines and at various levels, and should judge the total performance of the candidate with proper reference to assigned teaching responsibilities. The committee should clearly indicate the sources of evidence on which its appraisal of teaching competence has been based.

In those exceptional cases when no such evidence is available, the candidate's potentialities as a teacher may be indicated in closely analogous activities. In preparing its recommendation, the review committee should keep in mind that a redacted copy of its report may be an important means of informing the candidate of the evaluation of his or her teaching and of the basis for that evaluation.

It is the responsibility of the department chair to submit meaningful statements, accompanied by evidence, of the candidate's teaching effectiveness at lower-division, upper-division, and graduate levels of instruction. More than one kind of evidence shall accompany each review file. Among significant types of evidence of teaching effectiveness are the following: (a) opinions of other faculty members knowledgeable in the candidate's field, particularly if based on class visitations, on attendance at public lectures or lectures before professional societies given by the candidate, or on the performance of students in courses taught by the candidate that are prerequisite to those of the informant; (b) opinions of students; (c) opinions of graduates who have achieved notable professional success since leaving the University; (d) number and caliber of students guided in research by the candidate and of those attracted to the campus by the candidate's repute as a teacher; and (e) development of new and effective techniques of instruction, including techniques that meet the needs of students from groups that are underrepresented in the field of

instruction.

All cases for advancement and promotion normally will include:

- a. evaluations and comments solicited from students for most, if not all, courses taught since the candidate's last review;
- b. a quarter-by-quarter or semester-by-semester enumeration of the number and types of courses and tutorials taught since the candidate's last review;
- c. their level;
- d. their enrollments;
- e. the percentage of students represented by student course evaluations for each course;
- f. brief explanations for abnormal course loads;
- g. identification of any new courses taught or of old courses when there was substantial reorganization of approach or content;
- h. notice of any awards or formal mentions for distinguished teaching;
- i. when the faculty member under review wishes, a self-evaluation of his or her teaching; and
- j. evaluation by other faculty members of teaching effectiveness.

When any of the information specified in this paragraph is not provided, the department chair will include an explanation for that omission in the candidate's dossier. If such information is not included with the letter of recommendation and its absence is not adequately accounted for, it is the review committee chair's responsibility to request it through the Chancellor.

C.2: BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE'S POLICY FOR EVALUATION OF TEACHING (FOR ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION)

Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching

- Directive (9/87) from Provost King
- Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching (for Advancement and Promotion)

Berkeley: OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

September 18, 1987

DEANS, PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES:

Re: Policy for Evaluation of Teaching (for Advancement and Promotion)

Last year the Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations asked the Senate Committee on Teaching to formulate a comprehensive policy with guidelines for how the assessment of teaching should be presented in recommendations for faculty promotion or advancement. The Committee on Teaching conducted a review, which included among other things invoking the aid of faculty who have received the Distinguished Teaching Awards.

Their statement, "Policy for the Evaluation of Teaching (for Advancement and Promotion)" and its attachment, "Recommendations for Administering and Analyzing Student Course Evaluations," are enclosed. Please distribute these documents to your respective teaching units.

The Policy has the full endorsement of the Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations and unit heads are urged to follow it as closely as possible.

C. Judson King

Provost, Professional Schools and Colleges

Attachment

POLICY FOR THE EVALUATION OF TEACHING (FOR ADVANCEMENT AND PROMOTION)

Committee on Teaching

April, 1987

I. Criteria for Advancement and Promotion

The University community believes that excellence in teaching and excellence in research go hand in hand, and as a matter of policy teaching and research are both essential duties of every faculty member. Promotion depends upon the demonstration of excellence in both areas.

The essential question in the evaluation of teaching is whether the candidate contributes in an effective, creative, and appropriate way to the teaching mission of the department. Attention should be paid to the varieties of demands placed on instructors and the range of teaching activities called for in various disciplines and at various levels. It is imperative that clear documentation of ability in teaching be included in all advancement and promotion cases. Incomplete advancement or promotion cases will be returned to the originating department.

While no two cases will be alike, there are several recurring themes which may be addressed in the preparation of the teaching component and several useful techniques for verifying performance in these areas.

II. Aspects of Teaching to be Evaluated

Teaching plays a major role in decisions regarding advancement and promotion. Therefore, an explicit discussion of the teaching performance of a faculty member is essential. The following components of teaching may be evaluated in a personnel review decision.

- **Design and redesign of courses.** Does the course "work"? Are the course objectives reasonable? Are course requirements clearly stated and communicated to students? Is the course continuously updated to reflect recent developments in the field?
- **Presentation of material.** Does the teacher convey enthusiasm for the subject matter? Does the teacher present material with logic and force, arousing curiosity in beginning students and stimulating advanced students to creative work?
- **Command of the subject.** Is the instructor knowledgeable in the subject matter of the courses he or she teaches? Does the instructor engage in reading or research in the subject matter of the course in order to keep up to date with current research developments?
- **Contributions to curriculum and instruction.** Has the teacher developed instructional materials, such as textbooks, videotapes, computer courseware, slides, publications related to teaching, or the like? In what ways has the teacher participated in departmental or campus curriculum design or development efforts?
- **Directing student research.** How active is the teacher in guiding the research projects of graduate

and undergraduate students?

- **Advising.** What formal advising duties or informal advising has the teacher undertaken? How much time does the teacher spend consulting with students?
- **Guiding and supervising Graduate Student Instructors.** To what extent has the teacher prepared, trained, and supervised graduate student instructors?

III. Sources and Methods for Evaluating Teaching

Each department or teaching unit can be expected to have a unique culture which supports and encourages teaching excellence and which will have its own traditions of teaching evaluation that serve to define and reinforce that culture. Departments should work to improve their evaluation methods and seek to make them supportive and encouraging rather than investigative or punitive. The following is a list of sources of information for evaluating teaching; departments will choose those most appropriate for the particular case.

- The candidate's **faculty colleagues** who have appropriate expertise in the discipline are best able to evaluate the scholarship that informs the design and organization of courses and curriculum, the choice or development of texts and other instructional materials (syllabus, handouts, etc.), the nature of examinations and assignments, and so on.
- **Current students** can comment on an instructor's ability to communicate clearly, the extent and level of the instructor's course preparation, whether the instructor makes effective use of class time, how sensitive and responsive the instructor is to difficulties students may be having in the course, the workload, and so on. Students should not be used to judge the adequacy, relevance, and timeliness of the course content nor the breadth of the instructor's knowledge and scholarship.
- **Former students** can comment on the long-term effectiveness of the candidate's teaching: for example, the role of the instructor's courses in preparing the student for advanced study or work in the discipline.
- If the candidate teaches with **Graduate Student Instructors**, these students can often comment on the teachers role and effectiveness in the classroom and in preparing, training, supervising and evaluating GSIs.
- **Self-evaluations** can be both descriptive and evaluative and may address such issues as teaching goals and philosophy, involvement in curriculum projects, efforts to improve teaching, and so on.

Various methods can be used to gather data from these sources: rating forms or detailed questionnaires, written appraisals (letters or responses to open-ended questions on rating forms), interviews, observations, and so on. Combining sources and methods, it is possible to collect a variety of information about a faculty member's teaching. For example, colleagues can evaluate instructional materials or observe an instructor's classroom teaching. Students can complete evaluation forms at the end of a course, participate in individual or group interviews, or fill out surveys when they graduate.

IV. The Teaching Dossier

A teaching dossier should include the following items:

- **Departmental letter summarizing the candidate's teaching.** A carefully prepared Chair's letter is an essential part of a dossier. An effective letter from the chair will describe departmental teaching evaluation procedures, the nature and quality of a candidate's teaching, and the evidence upon which this evaluation is based.
- **Departmental ad hoc committee report for mid-career review, promotion to tenure, and promotion to professor.** For these types of reviews, departments are encouraged to convene an ad hoc committee (two or more faculty members) to examine evaluation data and assess a candidate's teaching performance. The ad hoc committee's report should be included in the dossier.
- **Candidate's statement.** It is helpful if candidates provide a written statement of their teaching approach, including the goals of specific courses and choices of teaching strategies. They may also comment about their efforts to improve instruction and respond to criticisms of their teaching performance made by the department chair and by students on end-of-course evaluations.
- **Description of courses taught.** A list of courses by course number and enrollment should be included. The candidate may wish to comment on the courses indicating which are new, team taught, and so on.
- **Description of student research directed.** Candidates may want to describe their role in directing senior theses, masters and doctoral studies, and postdoctoral scholars. The number of graduate students successfully completing degree work could also be included (indicate the date each student began graduate school).
- **Peer evaluation.** Reports or letters about the candidate's teaching performance from faculty colleagues familiar with the content could be included in the dossier. The letters should cite the basis and evidence for judgments made (observation, review of instructional materials, and so on).
- **Student evaluation.** Some form of student evaluation data (e.g., end-of-semester student ratings) for each different course taught in the period under review should be presented. The data should include both summaries of student evaluations of teaching and sufficient "raw" data (i.e., representative student comments) to allow the reviewers to see the candidate's teaching from the students' point of view. In addition, the dossier can include letters from current students or summaries of interviews.
- **Alumni evaluation.** Former students, as well as Graduate Student Instructors (if the candidate teaches with GSIs), can provide information about the candidate's teaching performance.
- Dossiers may include letters, results of group interviews, or summaries of surveys of alumni that specifically address the candidate's teaching.

V. Resources for Evaluating Teaching

The Center for Teaching and Learning, under the auspices of the Committee on Teaching, has prepared a handbook that suggests a range of useful methods and procedures for evaluating teaching.

C.3: DISTINGUISHED TEACHING AWARD CHECKLIST (Revised February 2015)

Stage One Checklist (using forms or spreadsheets provided)

- a) Nominating Letter: No more than 2000 words, from the nominator, typically the department chair or head of the departmental committee on teaching or awards committee. The letter should show, among other things, how the nominee clearly rises above otherwise good teaching in the department, how the nominee's research and teaching are integrated, and how students respond to the teaching. This letter carries a great deal of weight in the Stage One nomination.
- b) Chronological List of Courses Taught: Table containing a chronological list of all courses taught during the last eight semesters of residence,
- c) Quantitative Summary and Comparison: Quantitative summary and comparison of student evaluations of courses listed in (b) with respect to departmental averages for similar courses.
- d) Grade Distribution Chart: Grade distribution charts for any two courses offered in the most recent four semesters of residence.
- e) Raw Student Evaluations: Raw student evaluations gathered for the same two courses in (c). Do not submit summary data, but rather the evaluations themselves with student comments.
- f) Teaching Schedule: Nominee's fall and spring "*Teaching Schedule*." Members of the Committee on Teaching will observe classes of those nominees who are advanced to Stage Two in the spring semester, and may also visit classes in late fall if time permits.

Stage Two Checklist (using forms or spreadsheets provided) (Revised February 2015)

- a) Reflective Statement: A reflective statement by the candidate of teaching goals, objectives, and experiences, not to exceed 1,000 words.
- b) Candidate's Curriculum Vitae.
- c) List of Teaching Responsibilities Outside the Classroom.

Evaluations and charts for two **additional** courses should be submitted (i.e., different from those submitted in Stage I), as follows:

- d) Grade Distribution Chart: Grade distribution charts from two additional courses in the most recent five semesters of residence (including the immediate past fall semester).
- e) Raw Student Evaluations: Raw student evaluations (i.e., including the written responses) from the courses in Grade Distribution Chart form (d). Scanned documents should be of excellent clarity.
- f) Letters of Support: No more than eight total, including at least three (3) from current or former undergraduates; at least two (2) from current or former graduate students (including GSIs); and at least one (1) from a colleague (campus or off-campus), ideally someone who has recently observed the candidate's class. No letters longer than 1,000 words should be submitted.
- g) Class Materials: Class materials for any one of the four courses for which evaluations have been submitted: Materials might include syllabi, handouts, tests, assignments, and so on. If these materials are available on a website, or through bCourses, please simply provide the link.

C.4: GENERAL THOUGHTS ABOUT TEACHING DOSSIERS

Research Highlights on Teaching Dossiers.

As early as the mid-1980's, a teaching dossier was defined as a "summary of a professor's major teaching accomplishments and strengths" (Shore, et al., 1986). Although entries included in a dossier can represent both good and bad practices, most teaching dossiers seem to include only positive examples, especially when they are being used in personnel decisions (Wolf, 1991). The ideal portfolio would include the professor's reflections about instructional decisions, thereby capturing the rationale and thinking behind these decisions (Edgerton et al, 1991). Another element is the need to include samples of students' work accompanied by any feedback from the faculty member to the student. Examples of outstanding and average work might also be included.

A dossier should be an ongoing activity, with entries added throughout the year and across years. Some faculty view this constant accumulation as busywork (Robinson, 1993). Other two- and four-year colleges have found the dossier to provide excellent documentation for both formative and summative purposes (Edgerton et al, 1991). Root (1987) conducted one of the few studies that investigated colleagues' evaluations of teaching dossiers and concluded that a committee of colleagues could provide sufficiently reliable evaluations. The dossiers included course outlines, syllabi, teaching materials, student evaluations, and curriculum development documentation—much of what is generally prescribed for a teaching dossier with the exception of teacher reflections and evidence of student learning. Ultimately, the best way to get a valid summative evaluation of teaching is to base it on a dossier containing data from multiple sources—ratings from students, peers, administrators, self-ratings, and learning outcomes—that reflect every aspect of teaching including course design, classroom instruction, assessment of learning, advising, and mentoring (e.g., Weimer, et al., 1988; Chism, 1999; Hoyt & Pallett, 1999; National Research Council, 2003).

Research Highlights on Peer Review of Teaching.

No other source is as qualified to evaluate an instructor's understanding of the course subject, the currency and accuracy of the course content, the appropriateness of the level of difficulty of the course and of the teaching and assessment methods used in its delivery, and whether the course content and learning objectives are consistent with the course's intended role in the program curriculum (for example, as prerequisite to other courses) than faculty colleagues (Brent and Felder, 2004). Because teaching styles are viewed by many as personal, scholars in the field have suggested that learning, rather than teaching style, should be the measure of teaching effectiveness. For this reason, a useful starting point is to define good teaching as the purposeful activity intended to bring about learning in others, and it is good or successful in the degree to which it helps accomplish that intended learning (Ory, 1990). With this definition, the focus of the review becomes how to demonstrate that learning has occurred as a result of the teaching process, and how teaching practices foster student learning (Dochy, et al., 1999).

Evaluating Teaching Dossiers

The following sections are excerpted and adapted from Seldin, et al. (2010, pp. 72-82) and provide some general information and context for the evaluation of teaching dossiers. The evaluation of teaching performance, from dossiers or any other instruments, is unavoidably an exercise in subjective judgment

which is routinely used in personnel decisions. If the evaluation process meets key requirements, the likelihood of making better personnel decisions is greatly enhanced. The general following aspects have been identified:

1. Acceptability is perhaps the most important requirement to the evaluation of a teaching performance through dossiers. Until the dossier program has won the unqualified support of the evaluators and those being evaluated, it will be on shaky ground. That means that academic administrators and faculty leaders must build support for the program by focusing attention not just on the technical soundness of the dossier concept but also on its attitudinal and interpersonal aspects. The campus must engage in frank and open discussions in order to build program acceptability.
2. Importance of Mandated Dossier Items: Because each dossier is unique, the content and organization will differ among faculty members. This can possibly create difficulty in using dossiers for personnel decisions. One way around this problem is to require dossiers to include certain mandated items along with elective ones. By standardizing some items, comparison of teaching performance becomes possible.
3. Avoiding Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teaching Dossiers. There are some common pitfalls in the evaluation of dossiers for personnel decisions. Here they are offered as two don'ts:
 - *Don't assume that everyone must teach in the same way.* It is better to allow individual differences in teaching styles and techniques as long as they can be tolerated by department and institutional goals. In general, it is best to develop criteria within the smallest practical unit: the department level.
 - *Don't assume that standards and ratings will be the same across academic disciplines.* Standards and ratings tend to fluctuate--sometimes wildly and even unfairly. The same variation in standards and rating exists in all methods used to evaluate teaching. This is a very strong argument for the institution of a teaching dossier which allows a more comprehensive evaluation of teaching performance. Although popular and extensively used, appraisals of teaching based almost exclusively on student ratings is hardly the answer. It is better to install a teaching dossier program that has the advantage of documenting both the complexity and individuality of teaching and then refine the process of dossier evaluation so that it is accurate, fair, and complete.

General Items to Consider in Evaluating Dossiers.

This list of suggested items for evaluating dossiers was developed from detailed discussions with more than 225 members of personnel committees at colleges and universities across Carnegie classifications and supported by work of Seldin (2002), Zubizarreta (2004) and Miller (2005), Seldin et al (2010):

1. If core items are required, they must all be included in the portfolio.
2. Evidence must be presented to show that academic department, program, and/or institutional goals (for example, the development of critical thinking skills) are met in the classroom.
3. Evidence of accomplishment--not just a reflective statement--must be presented in the dossier.
4. The vast majority of data must be current or from the recent past--perhaps the past four years.
5. The degree of documentation in the three areas of information (from oneself, from others, and evidence of student learning) must be in general balance, and several sources should be used as documentation

in each area.

6. The dossier must demonstrate teaching consistent with departmental and institutional priorities and missions.
7. The reflective statement of what and why professors teach as they do must be consistent with the syllabus and with student and peer reviews of their teaching.
8. The dossier must meet established length requirements for the narrative and the appendix.
9. Some evidence of peer evaluation of teaching must be presented unless this would be inconsistent with the department and/or institution's culture.
10. Products or outcomes of student learning must reveal successful teaching.
11. Efforts of improved performance over time--in methods, materials, and evaluations--must be included in the portfolio.
12. The ratings on all common core questions on student rating forms from several courses and several years must be included.
13. The teaching responsibilities section must be consistent with the department chair's statement of the professor's responsibilities.
14. The dossier must profile individual style, priorities, and teaching achievements.
15. The dossier must reflect consistency between professor's reflective statement of teaching philosophy and his or her teaching actions in the classroom, lab, or studio.
16. All claims made in the dossier narrative must be supported by evidence in the appendix.
17. Evaluators must focus attention on the evidence supporting teaching effectiveness.
18. Review committee members must allow individual differences in teaching styles, techniques, and priorities and not assume that every faculty member must teach in the same way.
19. Evaluators must avoid relying too heavily on any one source of evidence.

C.5. ADDITIONAL RESOURCES RELATING TO TEACHING DOSSIER

- Anderson, Erin, ed. (1993) *Campus Use of the Teaching Portfolio: Twenty-Five Profiles*, American Association for Higher Education.
- Bernstein, D.J. (2002). Representing the intellectual work in teaching through peer-reviewed course portfolios. In S.F. Davis and W. Buskit (Eds.), *The Teaching of Psychology: Essays in Honor of Wilbert J. McKeachie and Charles L. Brewer*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Braskamp, L.A., & Ory, J.C. (1994). *Assessing faculty work: Enhancing individual and institutional performance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brent, R., and Felder, B. (2004). A protocol for peer review of teaching. Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition.
- Burns, C.W. (1999). Teaching portfolios and the evaluation of teaching in higher education: Confident claims, questionable research support. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 25(2), 131-142.
- Burns, C.W. (2000). Teaching portfolios: Another perspective. *Academe*, 86(1), 44-47.
- Cambridge, B. (2001) *Electronic Portfolios: Emerging Practices in Student, Faculty, and Institutional Learning*, American Association for Higher Education.
- Centra, J. (2000). Evaluating the teaching portfolio: A role for colleagues. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 83, 87-93.
- Chism, N.V.N. (1997-8). Developing a philosophy of teaching statement. *Essays on Teaching Excellence*, 9(3), 1-2.
- Chism, N.V.N. (1999). *Peer Review of Teaching*, Bolton, MA, Anker Publishing.
- Davis, B.G. (2009). *Tools for teaching (2nd edition)*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dochy, F.J.R.C., Segers, M., & Sluijsmans, D. (1999). The use of self-, peer and co-assessment in higher education: A review. *Studies in Higher education*, 24(3), 331-350.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., and Quinlan, K. (1991) "The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching". American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.
- Hoyt, D.P., & Pallett, W.H. (1999). "Appraising teaching effectiveness: Beyond student ratings". IDEA Paper No. 36, Kansas State University Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development <www.idea.ksu.edu>.
- Hutchings, P. (ed.) (1998), "The Course Portfolio: How Faculty Can Examine Their Teaching to Advance Practice and Improve Student Learning", American Association for Higher Education.
- Knapper, C., & Wright, W.A. (2001). *Using portfolios to document good teaching: Premises, purposes, practices*. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 88, 19-29.
- Miller, J.E. (2005). *Teaching portfolios for faculty and graduate teaching assistants*. Paper presented at the International College Teaching Methods and Styles Conference, Reno, NV.
- Millis, B.J. (1995). "Shaping the reflective portfolio: A philosophical look at the mentoring role". *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 6(1), 65-73.
- Mues, F., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2000). Preparing a teaching portfolio. *Amherst Mass.: University of Massachusetts, The Centre for Teaching*.
- Murray, J.P. (1997) "Successful Faculty Development and Evaluation: The Complete Teaching Portfolio", ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.
- National Research Council. (2003). *Evaluating and improving undergraduate teaching in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

- O'Neil, C., & Wright, A. (1995). *Recording teaching accomplishment: A Dalhousie guide to the teaching dossier*. Halifax, Canada: Office of Instructional Development and Technology, Dalhousie University.
- Ory, J.C. (1990). "Teaching and its evaluation: A handbook of resources". University of Illinois at Urbana.
- Pratt, D. D. (2005). Personal philosophies of teaching: A false promise. *Academe*, 91(1), 32-35.
- Quinlan, K. M. (2002). Inside the peer review process: how academics review a colleague's teaching portfolio. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18(8), 1035-1049.
- Robinson, J. (1993) "Faculty Orientations toward Teaching and the use of Teaching Portfolios for Evaluation and Improving University-Level Instruction." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association.
- Root, L. S. (1987) "Faculty Evaluation: Reliability of Peer Assessments of Research, Teaching, and Service." *Research in Higher Education*, 26, 71–84.
- Seldin, P. (1997). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Seldin, P. (2002). Guidelines for evaluating the teaching portfolio. Faculty seminar presented at Pace University, Pleasantville, NY.
- Seldin, P. (2004). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (3rd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Seldin, P., Miller, J. E., & Seldin, C.A. (2010). *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (4th Ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Shore, B. M., Foster, S.F., Knapper, C.K., Nadeau, G.G., Neil, N. and Sim, V. (1986) *The Teaching Dossier: A Guide to Its Preparation and Use*. Canadian Association of University Teachers.
- Weimer, M., Parrett, J.L., & Kerns, M. (1988). *How am I teaching?* Madison, WI: Magna Publications.
- Wolf, K. (1991) "The Schoolteacher's Portfolio: Practical Issues in Design, Implementation, and Evaluation." *Phi Delta Kappa*, 129–136.
- Wright, W. A., Knight, P. T., & Pomerleau, N. (1999). Portfolio people: Teaching and learning dossiers and innovation in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 24(2), 89-103.
- Zubizarreta, J. (1999). Evaluating teaching through portfolios. *Changing practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions*, 162-182.
- Zubizarreta, J. (2004). Checklist for the evaluation of teaching portfolios. In P. Seldin, *The teaching portfolio: A practical guide to improved performance and promotion/tenure decisions* (3rd ed. p. 34). Bolton, MA: Anker.