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# Peer Review of Teaching: Recognizing Serious Intellectual Work

Dan Bernstein djb@ku.edu

## Mary Huber

*Scholarship Assessed (1997, Glassick, Huber & Maeroff)*

* All forms of scholarship include:
	+ Clear goals
	+ Adequate preparation
	+ Appropriate methods
	+ Significant results
	+ Effective presentation
	+ Reflective critique
* Can Teaching be serious intellectual work or just delivery of performance of knowledge
* Is Inquiry into learning the right metaphor for excellence in teaching?
* What do these ideas add to your understanding of how to ask who the better examples

## How can reviews be done?

What could a reviewer look at? (from Dan’s ppt.)

* Domain of the course and its context
* Goals for the semester and program as appropriate
* Assignments with frameworks for evaluation
* Planned activities outside of and in preparation for class
* Planned activities in class
* Descriptions and analysis of student understanding
* Lessons learned from the current iteration
* Connections with related points in curricula
* Overall reflection by instructor

At the end of the semester, use the evidence (evaluation and grades) to think about the course.

Dan Bernstein has a center that interviews the faculty.

Pay attention to student voice, track over time.

### Little direct observation is required

* Use student observations of classroom so that faculty time can be spent evaluating assignments
* Peers visit classes only when there is a problem

### Instructor provides:

* + Access to existing materials (syllabus, assignments)
	+ Brief reflection on development across offerings

### Peer reviewer looks for:

* + Comments on the components of scholarly practice
	+ Can be made into a report format

### Not every course every semester

* + Want to see trajectory of thinking and how they use the information
	+ 2 key courses, 3 offerings reviewed pre-tenure

## Challenges

* Time and cost
	+ Show two or three examples of each level of work so that reviewers are not overwhelmed
* Preparation for valid and reliable judgment
* Differentiation--all reviews are glowing
	+ Formats of teaching are too diverse

### Relation between peers, instructor and students

* Students are non-expert observers
	+ Can raise questions or highlight perceived strengths
* Instructor and peers can follow up on student observations and comments
* Peers can judge the quality of the intellectual work
* Combine all three over time for improvement
	+ Provide substantive evidence at evaluation moments

## Continuum of review

From Dan’s ppt.

* Observe a class and write a letter
* Observe multiple classes, interact, write on specific prompts
* Read syllabus and assignments, observe classes, write based on interactions about plans
* Read assignments, discuss and observe learning activities, look at student work, write about achievement of course and program goals
* All above; give detailed reading of students’ level of understanding, discuss relation to learning activities
* All above; look at trajectory of understanding over several offerings, related to changes in learning activities

Recognize exemplary teachers

# Peer Evaluation in the T & P Process (panel)

Moderator: Michael Kane (ADTS)

Panelists: Jeff Adler (CLAS), Eric Triplett (CALS), Norman Leppla (CALS), Michael Miyamoto (CLAS)

Linda Haddad (Nursing)

When classrooms are "flipped" evaluations tend to go "bimodal" is there an attempt to look at this?

* Peer review is not useful
	+ Who is qualified to review?
* Do reviewers know enough to review?
* Student evaluation response is such a low turnout that the feedback is not useful
	+ Annual evaluations done by department chair are important
		- Identify large courses that will have lower student evaluations
		- Sometimes department chairs don't know how to review because they are so busy
		- Dept. chair needs to provide mentoring to faculty/reviewers
			* Chairs need some training
			* Currently, there is no formal training on how to teach
			* No training for peer review currently available
			* Concerns about data sets in student evaluations
	+ People who are stellar scholars seem to receive more leeway in teaching
	+ Peer review letters tend not to contain descriptive information about the class
		- Some people do know what needs to go into the letters
		- Helpful: when the letter points out why student evaluations might be low for a particular course
		- Faculty reviewers are not prepared to write letters--no data to review
			* No historical perspective
			* Teaching of the year portfolio is not put on display for others to see what excellent teaching is
	+ Student Evaluation questions need an overhaul
		- Form of the questions is problematic
		- Student teaching evaluations do not measure learning, they measure student satisfactionid

# Perceptions on Peer Review of Teaching at UF (panel)

Moderator: Oscar Crisalle (ADTS)

Panelists: Reggie Frye (COP), Ben Smith (CLAS), Sevan Terzian (COE), Margaret Temple-Smith (College of Law)

Jane Gannon (Nursing), Al Wysocki (CALS), Michelle Darnell, (WCBA)

[See CLAS guidelines](http://clas.ufl.edu/forms/2015-Peer-Teaching-Evaluation.pdf)

* + In Nursing, peer evaluation is optional
		- No specific guidelines for peer review
		- Template?
	+ COE: good teaching requires reflection
		- Peer review can be beneficial to allow explanation of teaching
	+ Helpful for college and department to have systematized method for review
		- How can chairs and colleges enhance
	+ Beyond associate level, institution does not see meaningful peer review letters
	+ Law School:
		- Schism between summative and formative

Bernstein: evaluation needs to start with student LEARNING not student perception

* + CALS: The "good stuff" comes from peers informally
		- Helpful to capture as part of official peer review record
	+ Documentation of something you have done informally with colleague shared with chair
	+ People need to feel comfortable being vulnerable

Need for development of a comprehensive document

* + Faculty to have input in the development
	+ Best documents show the progression over time
	+ Change conversation to be "what have you done to respond to peer review"
		- At least self-reflect
		- Yields a more useful
	+ Who is a peer?
		- Problematic for small departments with no experts in the field (LLC)
		- Who is qualified to do the review?
	+ Make process less punitive
		- Bad teaching can hurt you, outstanding teaching doesn't necessarily help you
	+ Review for Summative and formative goals don't fit together very well

Who is the best person to initiate a review?

* + Pre-tenure = systematic
	+ Post-tenure between chair and faculty member, no fewer than every three years
	+ Where no tenure (Lecturers) up to faculty member
		- Can be difficult for a faculty member to get reviewed
		- Advice from instructional designers

# Current Methods of Peer Review of Teaching across Colleges (panel)

CLAS Peer Evaluation Guidelines:

<http://clas.ufl.edu/forms/2015-Peer-Teaching-Evaluation.pdf>

* Includes accommodations for online teaching
* Consider consistency about who gets reviewed and how often
* Under collective bargaining, the chair should invite peer review

WCBA: Every review committee has an instructional designer

* Process to align department with college requirements
* Figure out a way to incentivize faculty to serve in the peer review role

COM now has a new office of faculty development, new forms

Faculty input for teaching award criteria?

How are faculty trained to be peer reviewers?

* Most have been evaluated by peers in the past
* Generally, it is the better teachers who are asked to review
* Anecdotally, they receive some feedback from the chairs

How important is it for faculty to develop teaching portfolios?

* Avoid using portfolio as a "wastebasket"
	+ What are some good sample documents
	+ Avoid "make work"
	+ Choose carefully
* TIP (Teaching Improvement Program—created in the late 1990’s to recognize quality teaching) limited to two courses
* Teaching Portfolio--value is the reflective portion
* Only some instructors provide a teaching portfolio for their reviewers (COJ)
	+ Gives them an advantage
* Reviewers can nose around in online materials
	+ Possible “guided tour” to avoid drowning in materials?

WCBA Ph.D. Teaching award

* + Submit portfolio to Tawnya's team
	+ Time consuming process
		- Difficult to implement for faculty
		- Includes review of classroom teaching
		- Includes review of course materials
	+ Valuable for Ph.D students

## Teaching portfolios

* + Consider universal standard
	+ Portfolio tool is available in Canvas
	+ Can copy instructions
	+ COM limits portfolio to 12 pages
		- COM has a template
	+ Nursing = brought in a speaker about portfolio development
		- Show how you have improved something that was not doing well
	+ Need to include outcomes
	+ Visit the old TIP guidelines?
	+ Is there a way to support anonymity?
		- Journal articles and awards are anonymous
	+ Can we separate out content from teaching?
	+ Teaching portfolio is a lot of work
		- Do you get the biggest bang for your buck?
		- Most useful teaching feedback comes from informal
		- Select something that represents your skill
		- Should not be the sole component
	+ Need to think about teaching quality vs. content
		- Problematic for small departments
		- Consider external reviewers
		- Content should stand up to equivalent courses at peer institutions

# Strategies to Develop Effective Teaching Peer Assessment Procedures (breakout)

Central group of people who would help organize and prepare reviewers

* + People to help them get up to speed so that they would be ready and prepared to provide useful feedback
	+ New faculty members need to start early
	+ Process on how to document your teaching
		- So that when you undergo formal review it is not new
		- Reflection
	+ Tension between formative and summative
		- If you spend time working privately--it is good to have something to show
		- Some kind of portfolio that captures the evolution of the product
		- Under control of an author, but available to reviewer
	+ Find a way to recognize and provide incentives for reviewers
		- Not just an add on
	+ A need for the continuous exchange of written feedback
		- Helpful for colleagues to provide feedback for new faculty
	+ Start early, making the best of this work visible to the community
		- Show that UF is taking this work seriously
		- Allows recognition
		- People see what is considered excellent teaching
	+ Support from the top
		- KU president publicly supports teaching and peer review

# Coupling Formative and Summative Teaching Evaluation (breakout)

* + Importance of having a committee of peer reviewers
	+ People designated as peer reviewers if they have some special skill or pedagogical expertise awarded time
	+ Faculty document what they thought they had done to improve their teaching
	+ Committee coming back to look at improvement
	+ Pre-review conversation, post review conversation, follow up with recommendations

* + Need a mentoring component
	+ Accrue continuing education credits

# Faculty Training (breakout)

Question 1: What information, skills are required for faculty to become effective reviewers

Peer observation for COM

* + - Peer feedback method (published form) that focuses on teaching skills in the classroom
		- Pre-meeting with faculty member to be observed
		- Definition of what the form needs
		- See Wayne McCormick's form
		- Recommend a post meeting
		- White space for you to write comments
		- Intention is formative
		- At insistence of college > scale = 3pts. Emerging, evident, exemplary
		- Workshop = a brief talk to introduce the tool
			* Showed two video clips illustrating interactions
			* What did you see about use of form
			* People who were trained in workshop have not done other workshops
		- Required for faculty to have in T&P packet
			* On an as-needed basis
			* Faculty Development office in college has a different form (summative)
		- No focus on evidence of learning

WCBA

* + - Form used shows key areas where they are looking to give feedback
		- Sit-down meeting with instructor (Ph.D. student)
		- No formal write-up, to keep informal
		- "Calibrated" form within the ID team
		- Sit in with reviewers during the first time
			* Do a de-briefing to ensure alignment

CALS

* + - Team of 3 people
		- Pre-meeting with faculty member
		- Syllabi, exam questions
		- Reports go to evaluation leader
		- Both summative and formative
		- No official training--discuss forms with the team lead

Need a structure

* + QM review process is very strong, but intense

PHHP

* + Task force that goes through an intensive process with George Hack
	+ Starts at design phase with instructional design help
	+ George works with faculty during delivery of course
		- Sit in and observe course
		- Focus groups with students (find out insights above and beyond course evaluations)
	+ Meet with faculty before and after
	+ After going through process with George Hack, faculty can now serve in the same capacity
		- Can't do more than 6 - 8 courses per semester
	+ Challenge is that most departments don't have faculty focused on teaching like PHHP has

Resource issue--devote to junior faculty as formative feedback

* + Reach a level of competency
	+ Needs to be Goals + evidence
	+ In reality focus in on classroom behavior
	+ Can we train other faculty to be effective evaluations of teachers?
		- People who are teaching focused may not have the stature in the college to provide feedback to tenured/tenure track faculty
	+ Can all first year teachers be required to be mentored, reviewed
		- Working with master teachers, instructional designers
		- Can this be part of professional development to go into T&P packet
		- Dan's triad of reviewer (second year?)
		- Mechanism for unit leaders (chairs) to buy into the teaching process
			* Where does that message come from?
		- Starting with junior faculty will help to send the message that teaching is important
	+ Need a university-wide push regarding the importance of teaching
		- Manifest through colleges
		- Needs upper administration support
			* A few simple statements from the highest levels
			* **Need to be part of presidential goals**
			* We fail to award stature to our quality teachers
			* Need to be the same expectations as for research with the same support

What is the motivation for faculty development?

Does online teaching need to be evaluated differently than face-to-face teaching?

* Data and tool collection may need to be different, but achievement of outcomes is the same for both

* Start teaching with goals + objectives
* Why did you choose the method?
* Are your students achieving?
* Reflection
* Improvement

### First Year:

Choose top teaching faculty as peer mentors, pair with instructional design staff > competency based model

PHHP: 1st year = rigorous > competency

WCBA: "Assurance of Learning" from accreditation requirements

* + Competency across business systems
	+ Show growth over time--work with accreditation specialist
	+ How to integrate into entire college
	+ Very helpful in the key courses where they do it
	+ Use Canvas competencies to identify gaps in the program
		- Need someone to help faculty to weed through the data
		- Needs someone knowledgeable in the discipline/department

 Teaching competency is the starting point

* Consider things beyond things done by faculty
* Calibration of the instrument
* Start with Junior faculty

Conversation with unit leaders--need leadership from top

* Tie to efficiency
* See what was built at Cornell

Need individuals who can tie outcomes to teaching strategies

* Show the needs and outcomes
* Leverage the data for teaching/learning research?

Need a group to lead the effort? QA Committee? ADTS? Can we get support of Deans?

Angel, Angela, Andy, Provost Office?

Sample of KU course portfolios: <http://cte.ku.edu/portfolios>

Large collection from many universities: <http://www.courseportfolio.org>

# Looking Forward

* + Need a short session where people present the written guidelines that already exist
		- Are there procedures that are applicable across units?
	+ Short Term and Long term goals
	+ Low-hanging fruit:
		- Making work visible?
		- Can the application packets for teacher of the year be made available?
		- Post conference survey
		- Content analysis of all of the teaching philosophies that have been submitted in T & P packets
			* Publish, categorize
			* What is needed?
			* Graduate student project
		- Is there room in TES for a session on how to train faculty?
		- Needs to be something at the University that holds faculty to a level of expectation
		- A series of workshops for the OFDTE to identify courses at UF that have been redesigned and are now excellent courses--highlight
			* Explain how the course was redesigned
			* Include how to assess learning
			* Invite faculty who want to improve their own courses to work with faculty who have improved courses
		- **Bring COE and Ag Ed together with other faculty--how do we monitor success?**
		- Workshop
		- President is writing the new goals for the university
			* Can the higher administration show that teaching is important?
			* Who is on the task force?
			* Goals have been published--can objectives support teaching?
	+ Medium hanging fruit:
		- Instructional designers to help review courses/faculty?
		- Need parallel support for in-class
		- OFDTE?
		- Teaching College in CALS
	+ Keep Teaching and Learning Visible

## Follow Up

Can all commit to help with one of the items discussed today? Share this information with those who could not attend.

* Survey has been sent out for people to identify areas where they might like to participate/contribute
* <https://ufl.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_56mLtCLZc8RhHut>

Survey Questions:

* I would be willing to contribute to the following activities
	+ Share my unit’s peer review guidelines.
	+ Identify best practices for showing evidence of student learning.
	+ Identify ways to showcase the importance of teaching.
	+ Identify training needs to support the peer review process.
* I would be willing to participate in a work group to achieve one or more of the following tasks:
	+ Create a “master” set of guidelines that units could customize to serve their needs.
	+ Contribute to workshops or tutorials to support peer review of teaching.
	+ Create a peer review process or framework to support the peer review of teaching.
	+ Publicize the importance of peer review for teachers.