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Revising the Peer Review Process

- Scoured literature for best peer review practices; Wendy surveyed other institutions
- Interviewed faculty and administration (Hort., CALS)
- Wendy and I revised the process used in Hort.
- Fine tuned process with a Hort. committee fall 2016
- Solicited feedback from faculty in other departments through the CALS Teaching & Advising Committee
- Developed and gave a “Hallmarks of Effective Teaching” seminar to Dept. to demonstrate to reviewers what to look for in their course observations
- Piloted the new process in spring and maymester 2017
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Peer Review Components

- Review of course materials
- Pre-observation meeting
- Observation of at least 2 class sessions
- Post-observation meeting
- Written report that follows template provided

Initially estimated that the process would take approximately 15 hours
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Additional Assistance

▪ For reviewers
  – Attend a Hallmarks of Effective Teaching seminar (by Wendy and Anne)
  – Attend a seminar/workshop on conducting a successful peer evaluation

▪ For instructors
  – Seek out assistance on how to assemble a teaching portfolio
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The Pilot Study

- 7 instructors reviewed
- Teams of 2 and 3 reviewers, across ranks, 11 faculty in total involved
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Successes of Peer Review Process: Benefits of Reviewing Course Materials

Benefits of reviewing course materials:
- Excellent approaches to syllabus design
- “Fresh eyes” on a syllabus helps catch errors
- Informs faculty about course content and how it fits into curriculum
- Faculty learned how courses could dovetail better together, strengthen student learning
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Successes of Peer Review Process: Pre- and Post- Observation Meetings

- Pre- and post-observation meetings most beneficial for instructor and reviewers
  - Learned about University regulations
  - Teaching tips and strategies, and inspiration
  - Opportunity for open discussion about strengths and weaknesses of course
  - Learned more about others’ subject area
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Successes of Peer Review Process: 2-3 Class Observations

- Opportunity to see instructor/class interaction first hand
- Get ideas for your own class
- Learn new information
## Peer Review Process: The Final Report

### Successes

- Template provided ensured final reports were consistent across reviewers
- Forced reviewers to note successes of course AND give constructive criticism
- Dept. head and upper admin. valued thoroughness
- Reviewer reflection on what they learned/how they could improve their own teaching

### Challenges

- Most time consumptive aspect of the process
- Some faculty felt some categories were redundant
- Realization that some of the categories were not reviewers’ job

---
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Overall Reaction

Positives

- Dialogs about teaching
- Seen as valuable by faculty
- Actual process of peer review helps reviewers on their teaching
- Builds relationships between faculty
- Helps junior faculty with teaching early

Negatives

- A lot of work for faculty member with small teaching load
- Difficult to get all data into report
- Entire process is a bit cumbersome—can we simplify it?
- A few faculty not willing to do all steps
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Best Practices

- Point of Contact person to
  - Help organize overall effort
  - Send gentle/not so gentle reminders
  - Be available for assistance

- Lead reviewer assigned to help drive assigned review

- Rough draft of report completed and used to guide post-observation discussion

- Include research and extension faculty as additional reviewers
Remaining Hurdles

- Add a course materials assessment rubric to process
- Streamlining data into final report (most time consumptive part)
- Will successful completion of peer review process occur if not championed by one person? (and if not, can that be added to a faculty member’s SME?)
- Metrics

NACTA 2017, Purdue University
What’s Next?

- Fine tune the process one more time
- Encourage other departments in college to pilot
- Embed best teaching practices AND best peer review into Dept. and College kick-off events; seminar series, etc.
- Ensure faculty receive credit for participating in review process
We need to hear from you!

- Ms. Anne Spafford
  Associate Professor
  Dept. Horticultural Sciences
  NC State University

- Dr. Wendy Warner
  Associate Professor
  Dept. Agricultural & Human Sciences
  NC State University

Thank you!