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Goal of this presentation

1) Start conversations about peer-review of teaching
2) Share what happened in my department
3) Brainstorm research directions for teaching reviews

Student evaluations of teaching (SET)
(or several thousand of my evaluations summarized in 4 sentences)

The professor is clear except when she is confusing

The professor talks too fast except when she's going too slowly

This class is too hard except when it's easy

The professor is insert odd inappropriate comment on personal appearance or personality

Non-pedagogical factors heavily influence evaluations

A 30-sec soundless video clip could predict end of semester student evaluations

| Table 3  |  
| Correlations of Molar Nonverbal Behaviors With College Teacher Effectiveness Ratings (Student Ratings) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$r$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>.77**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>.82***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liable</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not) anxious</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimistic</td>
<td>.84***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global variable</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.  

Ambady & Rosenthal (1993)
Students are biased

Frequency of "genius" in student comments

http://benschmidt.org/profGender
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Is there any value for SETs?

Think - Pair - Share

1) What are the benefits of SETs? Have you ever changed something in your teaching because student comments?

2) If you could re-write the SET for your campus, what would be the most useful question to include?

SETs have statistical issues

The course instructor shows enthusiasm for and is interested in the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>A+</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Categorical data

Which summary variables are most important?

Who should evaluate faculty and how?

UC Berkeley Department of Statistics (2013)

Faculty provide a teaching statement, syllabi, notes, websites, assignments, exams, videos, statements on mentoring, or any other relevant materials

At least before every "milestone" review (mid-career, tenure, full, step VI), a faculty member attends at least one of the candidate’s lectures and comments on it, in writing. Distributions of SET scores are reported, along with response rates. Averages of scores are not reported.

Note: reviewing one lecture is ~4hr time commitment for reviewer

Stark & Freishtat. 2014
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Evaluation Tools

Lesson design and implementation, Propositional Knowledge, Procedural Knowledge, Student-teacher classroom interaction, Student-student classroom interaction

Who should evaluate faculty and how?

Evaluation Tools

Relies heavily on Likert scales


Student Engagement

Large fraction of students (80+) clearly engaged.

Small fraction (10%) obviously engaged.
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Self-Assessment

TPI (Wieman and Gilbert, 2014)

To create the inventory we devised a list of the various types of teaching practices that are commonly mentioned in the literature. We recognize that these practices are not applicable to every course, and any particular course would likely use only a subset of these practices.

We have added places that you can make additions and comments and we welcome your feedback.

It should take only about 10 minutes to fill out this inventory.

Give approximate average number:

- Average number of times per class: pause to ask for questions
- Average number of times per class: have small group discussions or problem solving
- Average number of times per class: show demonstrations, simulations, or video clips
- Average number of times per class: show demonstrations, simulations, or video where students first record predicted behavior and then afterwards explicitly compare observations with predictions
- Average number of discussions per term on why material useful and/or interesting from students’ perspective
- Comments on above (if any):

### What else should reviewers do?

U Tennessee (~15-20 hr commitment)

- Take the TENN TLC training session, if needed
- Meet with the department head or college/departmental Coordinator of Peer Teaching Reviews
- Gather and review:
  - Teaching philosophy
  - Course descriptions
  - Syllabi
  - Online sites (e.g., flipchart)
  - Teaching materials
  - Assessment examples
  - Formative feedback, if collected
- Meet with the faculty member, especially to understand his or her perspectives on teaching
- Understand the learning objectives for the course and for the classes to be observed, the pedagogy used, and the assessment of learning methods
- Few during the semester or year:
  - Observe 3-4 class settings or combinations of other outreach/teaching situations (e.g., Clinical Teaching, Service Learning)
    - Completed Observation #1: Date
    - Completed Observation #2: Date
    - Completed Observation #3: Date
    - Completed Observation #4: Date
- Conduct in-class student evaluation (without faculty member present), and meet with faculty member afterward

### Should reviews be formative or summative? Can they be both?

Formative and Summative Evaluation in the Faculty Peer Review of Teaching

Ronald R. Cavanagh (1996)

- Link mission and reward structure
- Create mentoring communities
- Distinguish between summative and formative
- Situate evaluations in context (student outcomes & learning goals)

Peer Coaching: Professional Development for Experienced Faculty

Therese Huston • Carol L. Weaver (2008)

Reciprocal peer coaching
- set goals
- voluntary participation
- confidential
- assessment
- formative evaluation
- institutional support

### Think - Pair - Share

1) What is the most important category and criteria for formative assessment (e.g. type/frequency of active teaching, inclusive classroom)?

2) What is the most important category and criteria for summative assessment?
Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

- Multiple classroom visits
- Establish a rubric
- Observers should be trained
- Pre & Post-class meetings
- Voluntary
- Formative feedback is NOT part of promotion
- A summary statement is appropriate for P & T

Future directions?

1) Re-design of student evaluations. Can students be trained to give useful evaluations?

2) What kinds of research questions can be addressed in a multi-campus study. Self-assessments of teaching before & after coaching?

3) Can PULSE rubrics be used to assess change at the department, school and institution level?

4) How should we measure effective teaching (or should we)? Standardized assessments? Exam quality and scores? Samples of student work?

Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

1) Pre-quarter meeting
2) Observation #1: Week 2 with Pre & post class meeting
3) Optional Mid-quarter evaluation
4) Observation #2: Week 8 with Pre & post class meeting
5) Post-quarter meeting

Reward for mentor/coach: $1500 towards research

Future directions

Think - Pair - Share

What kinds of research questions related to faculty peer-review can be addressed across UC campuses?