

The Belk College of Business Peer Reviews of Teaching 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, assistant clinical professors, and lecturers in their first UNC Charlotte contract will be evaluated by direct observation during their first semester of teaching in the College and annually thereafter. Clinical associate professors and lecturers that are in their second or subsequent contracts will be evaluated by direct observation at least once every two academic years. Clinical professors will be evaluated by direct observation at least in the penultimate year of the contract.

Graduate students with instructional responsibilities will be evaluated by direct observation during each semester.

After consultation with the faculty member under review and the Department Review Committee, the Department Chairperson will select at least two tenured faculty reviewers to conduct the review. For reviews of clinical faculty and lecturers in their contract renewal year, it is advisable for the department chair to be a reviewer.

After consultation with the assigned observers, the faculty member being reviewed and the department chair will jointly determine the class to be observed and the time for the classroom visit. For standard day-time classes (with a duration of 50 or 75 minutes), reviewers will attend the entire class, arriving prior to the commencement of the class and remaining until the class is dismissed. For longer classes (with a duration of 150 minutes or more), reviewers may leave at some natural break point prior to the dismissal of the class.

Each reviewer will submit a written evaluation (see guidelines below) 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 (if any) from the faculty member under review 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) 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. Date.
3. Names of observer and co-observer(s).
4. Class format (lecture, discussion, lecture/discussion, group work, etc.).
5. Topic(s) covered.
6. Number of students present.
7. Length of observation.

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?

Initial Version: March 23, 2007

Revised April 20, 2007

Revised February 1, 2011