

DRAFT REPORT OF THE MACPHERSON/ENGINEERING PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE ON ASSESSING TEACHING

Approved by the Faculty of Engineering – November 27, 2018

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Fei Chiang – Computing and Software
Dan Centea – (Co-Chair) School of Engineering Practice and Technology
Nancy Fenton – (Co-Chair) MacPherson Institute
Kris Knorr – MacPherson Institute
Matthew Minnick – Engineering Physics
Christa Morrison – MacPherson Institute
Zahra Keshavarz-Motamed – Mechanical Engineering
Jake Nease – Chemical Engineering
Yovana Racic – (student) Chemical Engineering and Management
Greg Van Gastel – MacPherson Institute
Lydell Wiebe – Civil Engineering

MANDATE

To review existing documents and provide guidelines for the preparation assessing teaching in the Faculty of Engineering. The Committee will apply the expectations stated in the Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching Policy (SPS B1) to develop the guidelines that include guidelines for conducting peer teaching observations, implementation and use of the teaching portfolio, and mentoring.

BACKGROUND: TEACHING EVALUATION IN THE FACULTY OF ENGINEERING

The Departmental Teaching Evaluation Report (DTER) is a component of Teaching and Promotion (T&P) dossiers used to evaluate faculty members for contract renewal, appointment, re-appointment, tenure/permanence, and promotion. The inclusion of the DTER in dossiers signals the importance of teaching in these evaluation processes. However, the extent to which the DTER actually promotes effective instruction depends on finer grain practices associated with teaching evaluation in the Faculty of Engineering.

The distinction between **summative** and **formative** aspects of evaluation is a useful one when considering how the DTER fits within a broader framework for teaching evaluation in the Faculty of Engineering. In particular, this distinction points to the idea that teaching evaluation can do more than measure teaching effectiveness – when done well teaching evaluation can also contribute to improvements in teaching effectiveness. The **summative** aspect of teaching evaluation is aimed at decisions about whether teaching effectiveness meets a criterion required for contract renewal, appointment, re-appointment, tenure/permanence, and promotion. The DTER itself serves this summative evaluation purpose. In contrast, the **formative** aspect of teaching evaluation is aimed at providing feedback to instructors that ultimately improves teaching practice. On its own, the DTER does not adequately serve this formative evaluation purpose. However, a set of well chosen teaching evaluation activities, completed periodically, and that feed into the DTER, could serve this purpose.

At present, the formative evaluation practices that feed into the DTER vary substantially across academic units, limiting both opportunities to improve teaching practice and the quality of the DTER. To address these issues, the Committee reviewed existing peer observation and teaching evaluation documents with the aim to identify a set of formative teaching evaluation activities that would: (a) support ongoing

improvement in teaching practice; (b) generate all of the material required by policies (e.g., SPS B1) to be included in the DTER; and (c) otherwise satisfy requirements on formative teaching evaluations that are distributed across several policy documents.

OVERVIEW OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

The Partnership Committee met on four occasions over the spring and summer terms (between June and October, 2018). At an early stage in our meetings the following observation set the direction for our work – DTERs in T&P dossiers vary substantially across academic units and, although they contain several similar approaches, they are not supported by a consistent set of formative teaching evaluation activities aimed at improving teaching practice. Although some useful formative teaching evaluation components are mandated by university policy, these components are scattered across policy documents in a way that discourages a full understanding of teaching evaluation guidelines at McMaster.

In light of the challenges associated with these scattered pieces of policy, the Committee re-framed its objective as follows: *To pull together the scattered pieces of policy into a simple set of formative teaching evaluation activities aimed at improving teaching practice in the Faculty of Engineering.* In doing so, the Committee reviewed the following existing documents: Continuous Improvement through Self-Assessment for the Faculty of Engineering (Dean’s council, 2017); Faculty of Engineering – Tenure and Promotion Guidelines (Feb, 2013); McMaster University Tenure and Promotion policy (2012); McMaster Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching policy (SPS B1); McMaster University Teaching Portfolio policy (SPS B2); Faculty of Science department teaching evaluation report; Computer and Software Engineering peer evaluation of classroom teaching documents; and, School of Engineering Practice and Technology peer observation and feedback process documents. The Committee identified a set of three activities that offer a focus for teaching evaluation, with the responsibilities for the three activities shared among: (1) instructors; (2) peer observers; and, (3) Chairs/Directors. In addition, the Committee generated template documents, one to accompany each of these activities that we hope academic units find helpful in completing each of the recommended teaching evaluation activities. The Committee co-Chairs carried out consultations with the majority of the Engineering Department Chairs and Directors (7 of 8) to obtain feedback on the draft prior to finalizing the document and submitting to the Dean’s Council.

This document includes two parts: 1) the formative aspect of teaching refers to annual process of evaluating teaching which informs the annual Chair/Director review; and 2) the summative aspect of teaching refers to the assessment of teaching for contract renewal, appointment, re-appointment, tenure/permanence, or promotion which is part A - Executive summary of the teaching portfolio (as specified in SPS B2).

THREE PROPOSED TEACHING EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

The following three teaching evaluation activities are proposed: – (1) Self-reflection; and (2) Peer Observation activities that are finalized by reports that feed into the 3) Chair/Director activity, which is the annual meeting between Chair/Director and faculty member. This annual meeting serves as the hub of the teaching evaluation process. A summary of how these three activities fit together is provided.

(1) Instructor’s Self-Reflection Activity

The Self-reflection activity is aimed at two issues. First, SPS B1 (Part IV) identifies seven elements that must be addressed in the DTER. Elements 3, 4, 5, and 6 in SPS B1 are often not well addressed in DTERs, possibly because the appropriate data are not gathered on a regular basis. To address this issue, The

Committee proposes that instructors themselves respond to elements 3, 4, 5, and 6 in SPS B1 prior to their annual meeting with the Chair/Director. These elements are related to: significant contributions to the curriculum; significant contributions to the development of course materials; significant participation in pedagogical discussions with students, colleagues, TAs, in the department or elsewhere; and, evidence of incorporation of some form of formative evaluation in courses and evidence of response to the concerns of students.

The self-reflection activity should be a simple one for the instructor, and completing it annually will provide needed information for the DTER of each faculty member. The self-reflection encourages the instructor to provide his/her reflections on topics that include but are not limited to teaching accomplishments; teaching challenges; and, feedback from peer observations. In doing so, we propose that instructors take into account things going well; things that could be improved; steps to be taken toward improvement; and, innovations and plans for doing any improvement in teaching in order to enhance student learning.

The outcome of the annual self-reflection activity is a report submitted to the Chair/Director. A draft form for this report has been prepared by the Committee and included in Appendix 1.

(2) The Peer Observer and Feedback Activity

The tenure and promotion policy (section III, article 8) indicates “the assessment of a candidate’s teaching shall be based on student and peer evaluations.” This underscores the importance of formative assessment through peer evaluation on teaching. To accomplish this policy requirement, the Committee recommends that the Peer Observation of teaching include three to five steps: 1) Pre-observation meeting; 2) Peer Observation; 3) Feedback meeting; 4) Instructor self-appraisal (if applicable); and, 5) Recommendations of a Peer Teaching Development Committee (if applicable).

Pre-observation meeting:

The peer evaluator and faculty member meet prior to the scheduled peer evaluation in order to:

- Review course syllabus for course objectives, teaching, and assessment methods
- Discuss the types of learners in the class
- Discuss methods of instruction selected for class, and class format
- Discuss how feedback is provided to students
- Discuss areas of focus for the evaluation
- Go over peer evaluation forms to be used during class observation
- Discuss any concerns or issues that instructor wishes to address
- Other areas, as requested by the faculty member being evaluated

The outcomes of this meeting are documented in Part A of the Peer Observation report. A form for this report is proposed in Appendix 2.

Peer Observation

- The peer observer should attend a class delivered by the person being observed. If possible, the observer should meet with a group of students for about 10 minutes at the end of the class. The outcomes of the class visit and discussions with the students are recorder in Part B of the peer evaluation form (see Appendix 2, Part C).

Feedback Meeting

- The Peer evaluator and faculty member should meet following the class visit to go over the peer evaluation. Following the review and discussion, a summary should be jointly developed by the peer evaluator and the faculty member and should be recorded in Part C of the Peer Observation form. This summary may include strategies for improvement as appropriate.

Post visit appraisal (optional)

The purpose of this step is to encourage the instructor to self-assess after the feedback meeting on several elements, including the way the course content was taught, the teaching methods employed, and the learning environment. The instructor should identify successful elements and elements to be refined both on all the above self-appraisal elements (above).

Peer observation of teaching is meant to be useful on an ongoing basis to the instructor (the formative aspect of evaluation), and should not to be confused with the overall peer evaluation of instruction that is part of the DTER (the summative aspect of evaluation). The peer evaluation section of the DTER will certainly draw on the individual peer observations of courses, but the peer observations of courses themselves will not appear in the T&P dossier. If it is clear to all that individual peer observations of courses will not appear in the T&P dossier, peer observers and instructors ought to be able to center their activities on improving instruction, without concern that a “weakness” in teaching identified in an observation report will undermine a T&P case.

Teaching Development Committee (if applicable)

The aim of the Teaching Development committee is to support instructors to achieve teaching excellence and to play an active role in enhancing the continuous improvement of all aspects of teaching. The department Chair may nominate the peer teaching evaluators who make up this committee. Evaluators can be Associate Chairs or trusted faculty members with recognized teaching credibility and experience. The committee will provide recommendations for faculty members needing improvement and useful feedback for teaching and learning development plans.

The outcome of the Peer Observer and Feedback Activity is a Peer Observer Report, a Post Visit Appraisal report (is applicable) and the recommendations of the Peer Teaching Development Committee (if applicable), which is submitted to the Chair/Director. Draft form(s) for this report have been prepared by the committee, but academic units should feel free to create their own template.

(3) The Chair/Director Activity

Chairs/Directors are required by policy to meet annually with all faculty members (SPS B1 – Section III, paragraph 2). The results of the discussion must be recorded in writing and agreed to by both parties (SPS B1 – Section IV, Item 1). We propose that this annual meeting should play a central role in evaluation of teaching, serving as a hub for reports on the teaching evaluation activities described below. As such, annual meetings with Chairs/Directors would cover the following:

- a. Discussion of Instructor Annual Self-reflection
- b. Discussion of Peer Observer report
- c. Discussion of Post-visit appraisal (if applicable)
- d. Feedback from the Teaching Development Committee (if applicable)

- e. Discussion of other teaching and learning related activities

The content of topics (a-d) are discussed in the previous section. Suggested activities for (e) may include: mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, and post-doctoral fellows, mentoring peers, advising clubs & teams, community engagement, and outreach activities.

The outcome of the Chair/Director Activity is the Chair/Director annual report on teaching, which is a part of the annual review of the faculty member. The content of the report must be agreed to by both Chair/Director and faculty member. A draft template for this report has been prepared by the committee, but academic units should feel free to create their own template.

SUMMARY

The DTER addresses the summative aspect of teaching evaluation, but falls short of addressing formative aspects of teaching evaluation. Moreover, the quality of DTERs in the Faculty of Engineering could be strengthened by improvements in formative teaching evaluation activities that are conducted regularly, and that ultimately feed into the DTER. The Committee members propose three teaching evaluation activities, with the responsibility for these activities distributed among Instructors, Peer Observers, and Chairs/Directors. We envision reports for each of the Self-Reflection and Peer Observer activities being directed to the Chair/Director to support the annual meeting between the Chair/Director and faculty member. A Chair/Director report then summarizes the annual meeting and is agreed upon by both Chair/Director and faculty member. These activities will ensure that opportunities are created to discuss and improve upon teaching practice, that all information required in the DTER is continuously gathered and updated, and that all relevant university policies are followed.

APPENDIX 1: Instructor's Self-reflection Form

Preamble

The self-reflection is derived from the *Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching* specified in Part IV SPS B1. The document combines the requirement of the SPS B1 policy (SPS B1, Part IV, Items 3-6) along with other relevant information related to teaching and learning. Although this is a minimum requirement, we recommend the completion of a self-reflection on an annual basis to track changes on significant contributions to teaching and learning as well as reflection on innovation and improvements in teaching.

Instructor Name: _____

Date:

Part A (SPS B1, Part IV, Items 3-6)

1. Significant contributions to the curriculum.

Examples of such contributions might include development of new courses, contributions to IQAP reviews, participation on undergraduate or graduate curriculum committees, participation on Faculty of Engineering Teaching related Committees.

Significant contributions to the curriculum:

2. Significant contributions to development of course materials.

Significant contributions to course materials:

3. Significant participation in pedagogical discussions with students, colleagues, and teaching assistants in the Department or elsewhere.

Examples of pedagogical discussions outside the Department might include participation in professional development workshops related to teaching, and academic meetings focused on pedagogical research

Significant participation in pedagogical discussions:

4. Evidence of incorporation of some form of formative evaluation in courses and evidence of response to the concerns of students.

Examples of such contributions might include changes to courses in response to student feedback on course evaluations, or in response to peer evaluations of teaching.

Evidence of incorporation of formative evaluation:

Part B

1. Teaching Accomplishments

List and briefly discuss your teaching accomplishments in the past year and the success factors that have contributed to those accomplishments. Possible questions to consider:

- What new effective classroom activities or pedagogical approaches have you used recently?
- How do you plan to continue developing your activities and approaches in the future?
- How might you be willing to share successful strategies with colleagues?

Teaching Accomplishments:

2. Teaching Challenges

List and briefly discuss the major challenges you faced in the past year related to teaching and/or other pedagogical activities. Explain how you have addressed those challenges. Possible questions to consider:

- Are there any learning objectives that were not met? Why? What do you plan to do in the future about this?
- What measures you have taken to mitigate the consequences of problems you might have faced in class? (e.g., were there circumstances outside your control – learning environment, external factors)
- What will you do to prevent these issues from re-occurring? What will you do to mitigate the teaching challenges associated them?

Teaching Challenges:

3. Course Evaluations

Reflect on your course evaluations and discuss any areas for improvement. Compare and contrast with past years' evaluations. Possible questions to consider:

- Is there anything particularly surprising in this year's evaluations?
- What are some of the student comments that have resonated with you?
- If you had some negative feedback, how do you plan to change your teaching practice to respond to that?

Course Evaluations:

4. Peer observations and feedback

Briefly discuss the learning of the peer observation process. Possible questions to consider:

- As an instructor being observed: What did you learn from your peers' feedback? What is the major take-away from the observations others conducted in your classes?
- As a peer observer: What did you learn from the peer you observed? Are there any good teaching practices that you observed and you would like to adopt? How about things you would like to avoid?

Peer observations and feedback:

5. Innovations and Improvement in Teaching

Briefly identify the elements that you use and consider to be innovative in teaching and learning, and reflect upon on the improvements in learning as a result of this innovation. Possible topics to address:

- Have you used non-traditional teaching approaches to lead enhanced learning such as small group learning, problem-based or project based learning, inquiry based learning, active learning strategies, and flipped classroom?
- What worked and didn't work?
- Suggested approaches for improvements in next year's goals.

Innovations and Improvement in Teaching:

6. Status of last year's goals (if applicable)

Reflecting on your last year's evaluation and development plan, list goals achieved, goals in progress and goals unattained. Possible questions to consider:

- If you have had an annual performance evaluation before, and have gone through this self-reflection exercise, which of the goals you set for yourself have been met?
- What is the progress on the development plan you discussed with your Chair?
- If some goals have not been attained, where do you attribute the failure? What are your future plans?

Status of last year's goals:

7. Needs and Goals (optional)

The question to consider here is:

- What support do you need from the School/department in order to accomplish your teaching goals?

Needs and Goals:

APPENDIX 2: Peer Observation and Feedback Activity

Preamble:

This peer observation and feedback activity is critical for the departmental teaching evaluation report as well as the ongoing teaching development of the instructor. A set of peer observer activities, described below, can be complemented by an instructor self-appraisal of the observation and broadly supported by a teaching development committee.

Part 1: The activities of the peer observer include three parts:

- Part A: Gather contextual information about the course and the instructor you are observing (Pre-observation form);
- Part B: Attend a class of the instructor being observed, and provide feedback, commentary, and suggestions. If possible, spend some time (without the instructor) to obtain student feedback
- Part C: Arrange a post-observation meeting to discuss your observations, feedback, and recommendations. Upon completion of all three parts, the observer will send the completed form to the instructor for his/her feedback and agreement, and submit it to the department Chair/Director (or as directed by the department).

Part 2: The instructor may complete a post-visit appraisal to self-assess on successful elements and elements to be refined during the peer observation visit (Post-visit appraisal).

PART A: Peer-Observation Form

Instructor Name: _____

Course Name and Code: _____

Number of students: _____ Required Course Elective Course

Name of Peer Observer: _____

* Prior to the observation, the peer observer should review the syllabus and course objectives

PART A

Information	Specific Comments
Is the content consistent with the calendar description and objectives of the course?	
Has the instructor discussed the abilities of students with instructors teaching pre-requisite courses and instructors which your course is a pre-requisite?	
What contextual information does the instructor think is relevant for peer observation of this course (e.g., lab/tutorial elements, online or blended elements, assessment approaches, first time offering the course, resources, teaching strategies or method of delivery)?	
What information does the instructor think the peer observer should know about this cohort of students? (e.g., this group of students are struggling more than previous cohorts, the typical percentage of students who attend)	
What are the instructor's teaching goals for this specific class/day? (e.g., the observed class is a review for an	

Information	Specific Comments
upcoming test, trying a new teaching or assessment approach, facilitate student engagement).	
Is there any particular feedback related to teaching and learning the instructor would like from the peer observation process?	

It is recommended that the peer observer reserve some time to discuss with students about what is working well, and what they would like to see changed/improved with respect to teaching and resources.

PART B

Please complete the peer observation form by providing specific comments to the suggested categories. If useful, please refer to the qualitative descriptors such as, exceptional, excellent, very good, good, satisfactory, needs improvement or unsatisfactory in completing your observation remarks.

Subject Matter	Specific Comments
Does the instructor demonstrate command of the subject matter?	
To what extent does the instructor demonstrate mastery of the subject matter?	
Is the content consistent with the course description and objectives?	
To what extent does the content reflect conventional applications of the material, state-of-the-art applications and foreseeable future applications?	
How does the instructor use experiential insights in the application of the material into the classroom?	

Classroom Management	Specific Comments
Effective Time Management (starts and ends class promptly; demonstrates good use of instructional time, etc.)	

Classroom Management	Specific Comments
Commands and earns respect and maintains control of classroom	
Maintains a positive and respectful classroom; handles student interactions appropriately	
Exhibits confidence as an instructor and establishes credibility	

Communication and Interaction	Specific Comments
Lesson objectives are clear	
Connects class to other areas of course content	
Encourages student inquiry/class discussion	
Expresses ideas clearly and audibly. Responds clearly to student questions.	
Shows energy and enthusiasm for subject matter	
Written communication is effective (handouts, written instructions, slides, etc.)	
Oral communication is effective (articulate speech, appropriate pace and volume of speech, pleasant demeanor, etc.)	
Non verbal communication is appropriate and effective (eye contact, mannerisms, gestures, movement in classroom)	
Provides feedback to student on assessments	

Methods of Presentation	Specific Comments
Is well prepared and presents material in a well organized manner	
Reads notes only a suitable amount of time	

Methods of Presentation	Specific Comments
Provides context for lecture/notes (such as course goals, curriculum, etc.)	
Provides appropriate and clear images	
Current topic is clear; explanation of material is clear	
Uses multimedia approach (if appropriate)	
Makes use of examples; relates material to real world/establishes relevance	
Uses physical resources skilfully (workspace, board, samples/demonstrations, etc.)	

4.0 Learning Environment	Specific Comments
Incorporates active learning into lectures; engages students in material	
Adjusts to individual and group needs	
Meets student needs through a range of teaching styles	
Checks for understanding by asking thinking questions	
Demonstrates respect for alternative points of view	

Additional Comments/General Comments (including student feedback):
[Qualitative Feedback is strongly encouraged-please complete this section]

PART C: Feedback Meeting

The peer observation feedback will be discussed at a follow-up meeting between the instructor and peer observer or the results will be sent to the Chair/Director. Indicate the date of the follow-up meeting below. The instructor will document this conversation in their own records.

Date of follow-up meeting: _____

Discussion topics to consider for the feedback meeting:

Topics	Specific Comments
What teaching elements should the instructor continue to use for this type of class or teaching objective?	
What teaching elements should the instructor change or avoid?	
What are some teaching elements to try in the future?	
What are some tangible steps that the instructor might implement to enhance their teaching?	
Any other discussion questions/topics.	

Upon completion all three sections, the observer will prepare the peer observation report and submit it to the department Chair/Director (or as directed by the department).

Post visit Appraisal Form (if applicable)

Preamble

The purpose of the post-visit appraisal is to encourage instructors to reflect on the post feedback meeting to self-assess several elements - the way the course content was taught, the teaching methods employed, and the learning environment created. The instructor should identify successful elements and elements to be refined.

Instructor Name: _____

Name of Peer Observer: _____

1. Course Content

- Did I demonstrate command of subject matter?
- Did my content reflect current research/knowledge of discipline? (if applicable)
- Was the purpose of my session evident?
- Was my content consistent with the course syllabus?

Successful Elements:

Elements to refine:

2. Teaching Methods

- Were my transitions between ideas smooth?
- Did I give relevant examples and use them to clarify concepts?
- Was my presentation organized?
- Was I enthusiastic about the subject?
- Did I adapt material to students' needs?
- Did I use supplemental materials/visual aids/technology effectively?
- Did I notice and adapt to student feedback accordingly?
- Given the type and size of the class, were the methods I selected appropriate?
- Did I integrate an assessment tool/strategy into the lesson?

Successful Elements:

Elements to refine:

3. Learning Environment

- Was my classroom atmosphere participatory?
- Did my students seem engaged with the topic?
- Did I encourage questions and check in with students?
- Was I attentive to cues of boredom or confusion?
- Did I provide a session that was thought provoking and stimulating?
- Did I provide an environment conducive to critical thinking and student-centered learning?
- Was I sensitive to issues of diversity and inclusiveness in order to promote a safe learning environment for students?

Successful Elements:

Elements to refine:

General Comments:

Recommendations for Improvement:

APPENDIX 3: Chair/Director Activity

Preamble

The departmental evaluation of teaching comprises two phases – 1) the formative annual evaluation on teaching and learning; and 2) the summative departmental teaching evaluation report (DTER). The annual evaluation of teaching and learning is carried out by the department Chair/Director with the purpose of continuous improvement in teaching. The DTER complies with the requirements with the SPS B1 Procedures for the Assessment of Teaching (Part 1V) and completed for the purpose of appointment, reappointment, tenure, permanence and/or promotion.

1) Annual Evaluation of Teaching and Learning:

This annual review is mentioned in Part III of SPS B1 (page 3), where “yearly annual review and discussion of teaching between the Department Chair and each faculty member” is specified as a duty of the Chair. This annual meeting to discuss teaching and learning provides an opportunity to review the results of the teaching evaluations and other aspects of teaching that are forwarded to the Chair/Director. These documents include:

- a. Self-reflection Report
- b. Peer Observation Report(s)
- c. Post visit Appraisal Report (if applicable)
- d. Teaching Development committee report (if applicable)
- e. Teaching portfolio (if applicable)

The Chair/Director will deem the appropriateness of annually reviewing the Executive Summary of the teaching portfolio (according to SBS B2).

The requirement for the meeting and written record can be satisfied by annually fulfilling the following steps:

- The Chair/Director ensures that course evaluation statistics are compiled and, if applicable, the faculty member incorporates them into Part A of the Teaching Portfolio
- All relevant teaching evaluation reports are forwarded to the Chair/Director prior to the meeting
- The Chair/Director will conduct the departmental evaluation of teaching and will compile the meeting outcomes into the teaching evaluation section of the annual performance review.
- The Chair/Director sends the completed annual performance review report to the faculty member following the meeting and, if applicable, the faculty member suggests any necessary changes.
- Once both parties agree that the annual performance review on teaching reflects the content of the meeting, the Chair/Director will file into the teaching section of the faculty member’s annual performance review.

2) The Departmental Teaching Evaluation Report

The Departmental Teaching Evaluation report is to be submitted for the purpose of appointment, reappointment, tenure/permanence and promotion, according to SPS B1 Part IV. This submission should minimally contain commentary with respect to all of the following elements that are relevant:

- Annual reviews and results of discussions with the candidate of the Executive Summary (Part A) of the teaching portfolio (SPS B2)
- Peer observations
- Significant contributions to curriculum
- Significant contribution to the development of course materials
- Significant participation in pedagogical discussions
- Evidence of incorporation of some forms of formative evaluations in courses and evidence of response to the concerns of students
- Review of the summative questions on the student evaluation questionnaire

Results of this discussion will be recorded in writing and agreed to by both parties.

Dean's Council meeting notes:

Assessing Teaching' was presented at the Dean's Council meeting on October 16, 2018. The Council approved that the content of this report become a policy within the Faculty of Engineering.

The Council members voted that the "instructor's self-reflection" portion be mandatory for all faculty each year and should serve as a complement to the Record of Activities. It was suggested that this component of the teaching assessment process be implemented in electronic form. During the discussion, it was agreed that the Peer Observation and Feedback Activity would be completed for all Assistant Professors and Associate Professors each year, and other instructors according to the needs of each Department or School at the discretion of the Chair/Director.

Dr. Ken Coley recommended adopting the process with a review in one or two years.

MOTION: Dr. Ken Coley moved to recommend, with the amendment that the Dean's Council will review the implementation after two years and that the Report on Assessing Teaching be approved.

Dr. Ridha Khedri seconded the motion. All were in favour and the motion was carried.

Dean Puri indicated there would be a new requirement for training evaluators.

Additional content for the peer observation form related to the subject matter knowledge of the instructor being observed was provided after the Dean's council meeting. This content will be included in the policy.

The MacPherson and Engineering Partnership co-chairs will prepare the formal policy containing the content approved by the Dean's council.

ANNUAL FORMATIVE EVALUATION PROCESS

Instructor's Self Reflection Activity

Self Reflection Form

Peer Observation & Feedback Activity

Peer Observation Report

Pre-observation Activity

Peer Observation Activity

Feedback Meeting Activity

Post Visit Appraisal (if applicable)

Teaching Development Committee
(if applicable)

Chair/Director Activity

Annual Evaluation of T&L for CP/M

Departmental Teaching Eval for T&P