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TIME TO PAUSE

In a perfect world, what would your teaching evaluation system look like?

Objectives
Discuss the status of teaching evaluation
Describe components of a robust peer review protocol
Describe strategies for peer observation
Discuss strategies for coping with bias
Suggest tips for peer review
Teaching Evaluation

Common
- Student evaluations of teaching (SETs) (end of course, student input)
- Peer reviews of teaching (mid course, peer input)

Less Common
- Portfolios
- Self-reflections

Issues with SETs

Bias, bias, bias!
- Students as evaluators
- Dual use as summative and formative
- Misuse and misinterpretation
- Single point measure
- Students don’t benefit
- Discourages risk taking/innovation

Story Time

Experiences with student evaluations of teaching
- Co-teaching - gender related
- Student focus on accents, clothing, etc
- Use of quant to compare instructors
What Can We Do?
- Have multiple measures
- Have multiple rater types
- Use more qualitative data

Peer Review of Teaching
- Evaluation, by colleagues or peers, of all teaching related activities
- Either formative (for development) or summative (for personnel decision) purposes
- Should include a variety of teaching materials

Why Peer Review?
- Teaching best understood by teachers (subject matter and context)
- Learn what students are experiencing in their courses
- Curriculum improvement
- Mentorship
- Collaborative (builds understanding)
- Another data point
What are your experiences with peer review of teaching? What does your process look like?

Who and How Often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Min. 1 before reappointment &amp; 3 before tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Every 5 years &amp; min. 2 before full professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Every 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Faculty (.75 FTE +)</td>
<td>Annually years 1-3; Every 3 years thereafter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Peer Review of Teaching should be done every year!

Pros

- Helps to make teaching visible and collaborative
- Adds perspective to end of course evaluations
- Elevates teaching (assessment adds value)
- Students are not appropriate judges for everything
- Can focus on improvement (formative)
- Promotes reflective teaching practices
Cons
Vulnerability of peer reviewer
Vulnerability of the reviewee
Time to do review
Lack of standards
Validity and reliability concerns
Bias

How do we mitigate the cons and amplify the pros?

Establish a Robust Protocol
- Assignment of reviewer(s)
- Reviewer/reviewee pre-observation meeting
- Classroom observation
- Review of syllabus/other materials
- Post observation debrief
- Final written report
Reviewer Assignment

- Rotate reviewers annually
- Plan out reviews for 3 years
- Make being a peer reviewer an expectation
- Reward peer reviewers
- Lean on full professors

Classroom Observations

- Use agreed upon templates
- Cover F2F and online components
- Prepare for the observation
- Record your observations
- Include a post observation debrief

Components of a Template

- Logistics
- Environment
- Teaching style
- Communication
- Organization
- Syllabus
- Web
Review of Teaching Materials

Use an agreed-upon template
Review pre-observation
Include syllabus, recordings, websites
and other asynchronous teaching materials

The Review Report/Letter

Use a template
Check your biases
Remember the purpose and who will see it
Have a section to frame reviewer biases

Tips

Make notes on what you are looking for in observations (they go quickly)
Always remember how your review will be used
Ask the instructor questions
Train reviewers (especially on implicit bias)
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