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Importance of Peer Review

INFORMS TEACHING

- Helps teacher to see strengths and weaknesses
- Promotes interaction and discussions between teaching faculty
- Helps struggling newer teachers as well as inspires seasoned teachers

DOCUMENTATION (ILLUMINATION) FOR RPT, PTR

- Consistent tracking of teaching progress over time (trajectory)
- Consistent tracking of hallmarks of effective teaching over time (apples to apples)
- Consistent method of evaluating diverse classes
- Establishes/promotes rigor of teaching; and helps teaching to weigh as much as research and $ brought in
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Peer Review at NC State

- Who evaluates? Just about anyone!
- How often?
  - Assistant Professor – minimum of 3 peer reviews
  - Associate Professor – minimum of 2 peer reviews
  - Professors – every 5 years
- With what?
  - Development is departmental responsibility
  - Observation of instruction, review of course materials, written assessment
Peer Review Models at Other Institutions

- Variation in:
  - Number of recommended observations
  - Number of reviewers
  - Scope of observation
  - Evaluation forms
  - Summative documentation
  - Person(s) responsible
Peer Review Tool Development in the Department of Horticultural Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The instructor was:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Well prepared for class/lab</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Knowledgeable about subject matter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Effective in stimulating/creating interest and making topic relevant to students</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Enthusiastic for teaching and subject matter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Caring for students and subject matter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Clearly explained concepts and principles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Effective in communicating high standards and expectations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Effective in using teaching tools (Powerpoint, doc cam, live materials etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Effective use of relevant illustrations and examples</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Presenting material in a relevant logical manner and at an appropriate level of rigor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Asking challenging and appropriate questions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Encouraging (and appropriating time for) student questions, discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Able to hold class’s/lab’s attention</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Effective in engaging students in active learning</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Able to stimulate discussion and engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Treating students with respect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Effective in providing and open and responsive learning environment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Utilization of learning from students, discussing points of view other than instructor's own</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each peer review of teaching should include the following activities:
  - Pre-observation
  - Minimum of 1 lecture observation
  - Minimum of 1 lab observation

- Literature-based hallmarks of effective teaching incorporated into a rubric for ease of use during observation
## Peer Review Tool Development (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Instructor:</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gives appropriate assessment and feedback of student work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives interesting, engaging assignments</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides effective exercises/activities/assignments that develop critical thinking skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates evidence of ongoing self-evaluation and professional development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is accessible to students outside of class time</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Rubric created to document teaching efforts via reviewing course materials and interview with faculty member being reviewed
Pre-observation meeting
course materials shared
pedagogy discussed

Observation
of lecture(s) and corresponding lab(s)

Peer Evaluation Report written
narrative that covers assessment points

Post-observation meeting
discuss strengths/weaknesses and overall evaluation

Report submitted
to Department Head

Seems logical, right?
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Issues and Feedback to Date

FROM DEPARTMENT HEAD
- Not all faculty participated
- Some faculty used own approaches (not tool)
- Often report submitted was on the generic-side (did not address tool components)
- Faculty not constructively critical enough
- Need to incorporate faculty buy-in
- Other concerns:
  - Does a reviewer actually have enough teaching experience to effectively evaluate another?
  - Does a reviewer have the fortitude to give constructive criticism?
  - Is a reviewer capable of teasing out finer details of teaching?
  - How should personality conflicts be addressed?

FROM FACULTY
- A briefing/training session would be helpful as most faculty were unclear on how to evaluate
- Seen as valuable, but when push comes to shove, it always comes down to TIME (but several faculty felt that more than one lecture and lab should be observed)
- Significant effort required to conduct an effective review needs to be recognized and valued (linked to own annual review)
- Other concerns:
  - From reviewee standpoint, PR is seen as valuable, but not if reviewer is/perceived to be reluctant
Moving Forward

- Development of new instrument
- Create templates and clear documentation guidelines
- Revised procedure
Take Aways

- Bigger picture

  - What would be most beneficial for reviewee?
  - What would be most helpful for college level and higher admin?
  - What would be most helpful for RPT, PTR committee?
  - What would be most helpful for reviewer?
  - What would be most helpful to Dept. Head?
Take Aways (cont’d)

- Critical Need for Faculty Buy-in
  - Work together with faculty to revise tool and process;
  - Include reviewing a peer a component of annual review;
  - Develop mini-workshops on effective peer review;
  - Possibly add requirement to attend x number of teaching workshops/year to annual review
Thank you!

- Interested in more information? Want to collaborate? We want to hear from YOU!
  - Anne Spafford
    amspaffo@ncsu.edu
  - Wendy Warner
    wjwarner@ncsu.edu
Some Helpful Resources (So Far!)

- University of Dayton, Ryan C. Harris Learning Teaching Center
  - Peer Review of Classroom Instruction
  - Peer Review of Course Material
  - Self-evaluation
- Iowa State University, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching
  - Peer Evaluation of Teaching: Literature Review and Best Practices
- NACTA Community