Peer Review of Teaching:

A Manual for Peer Review

at IU Southeast

Sponsored by:

The Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence

and

The Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching

Table of Contents

Peer Review of Teaching

Selected Annotated Bibliography on Peer Review

Appendices

Peer Review of Teaching:
A Manual for Peer Review on the IU Southeast Campus

According to Hutchings (1996) "…teaching, like other forms of scholarly activity, is substantive, intellectual work. That is, teaching is a matter not simply of method and technique (though these are the aspects of teaching that have received the most attention) but of selecting, organizing, and transforming one's field so that it can be engaged and understood at a deep level by students. Like scholarly research, our courses are acts of intellectual invention, and our teaching of those courses enacts the ways we think about and pursue our fields of study. Seen in this way, the work of teaching … rightly belongs to and requires the attention of the community of scholars."

Specifically, Hutchings outlines three 'corollaries' of viewing teaching as scholarly work. **First**, teaching is a 'process of ongoing inquiry and reflection.' That is, in order to continue to be successful, the instructor must 'step back and examine' what occurs in the classroom and the impact of our teaching on student learning. **Second**, to be considered scholarly, teaching needs 'collegial exchange and publicness.' Peers are crucial for helping an instructor see what they do in the classroom from a more objective perspective. **Finally**, faculty members must take professional responsibility for the quality of their work as teachers. Just as peer review is used to set standards in traditional scholarship, faculty members must set such standards in teaching or be content with bureaucratic standards set by bodies outside academe.

The best method of assessing teaching relies on multiple sources of data (Brent & Felder, 2004; Chism, 2007). No single source of data – be it student evaluation of teaching forms (SETs), a peer review, or publications in the scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) – allow for a full evaluation of the teaching process. Brent & Felder (2004) have provided a comprehensive evaluation system as illustrated in the table below. Our goal is to outline the principles of one component – Peer Review – of a larger teaching evaluation process on the IU Southeast campus.

```
┌──────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│  Students      Peers        Instructor      Administrator                  │
│   rate          rate        discusses       and/or                         │
│                             and             committee                      │
│                             self-rates      rate                           │
│                                                                            │
│  Classroom    Classroom                                                    │
│  instruction  instruction   Philosophy                                     │
│                             and goals                                       │
│  Assessment   Assessment                                                   │
│  tools/methods tools/methodsᶜ All educational                              │
│                              activitiesᵉ                                   │
│  Out-of-class  Course                                                      │
│  interactionsᵃ materialsᵈ   Learning                                       │
│                             outcomes                                       │
│  Advising     Learning                                                     │
│  Mentoringᵇ   outcomes                               Dossier               │
│                                                                            │
│              Other supporting                                              │
│              materialsᶠ                                                    │
└──────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

ᵃ Including availability outside class and helpfulness in office hours
ᵇ Including research supervision
ᶜ Including assignments, tests, graded products, & mechanisms for getting student feedback
ᵈ Including syllabus, learning objectives, policies and procedures, test & course grades
ᵉ Including teaching, advising, mentoring (students and colleagues), developing courses, creating instructional materials, and carrying out educational research & development
ᶠ Including letters from students, alumni, local faculty, and faculty at other institutions

Adapted from Brent & Felder (2004)

Peer evaluation of teaching is a practice that has become more prevalent over the last 20 years (Bernstein, 2008; Cohen, 2003; Seldin, 1984). During 2012, the directors of the IU teaching and learning centers and the Faculty Colloquium on Excellence in Teaching (FACET) adopted ten best practices in peer review. The IUS Peer Review process reflects these best practices:

1. Frequent peer review of teaching enhances teaching and student learning.

2. Ideally, faculty should be involved in developing the campus peer review process.

3. Institutional leadership should support the peer review process and peer review should be considered in promotion and tenure evaluation.

4. Peer Reviewers are well trained; training is not a one-time process but must be ongoing to avoid drift from established procedures and mutually agreed upon criteria.

5. Peer Reviewers are ideally outside the discipline of the person being reviewed. Colleagues outside of the discipline may be best able to focus on aspects of pedagogy rather than focusing on content.

6. Summative and formative peer reviews are separate processes.
   a. Summative peer review is used for evaluation (promotion, tenure, teaching awards, etc.).

  b. Formative peer review is designed to assist in improving teaching and, therefore, should be confidential.

  c. Formative peer review is best conducted by a colleague who will not be evaluating the faculty member in the future for promotion or tenure.

  d. Formative peer review reports are the property of the faculty member and should not be required to be provided at any level of review.

  e. A faculty member should specify if they are requesting a formative or summative peer review prior to the beginning of the peer review process.

7. There are various types of Peer Review. All Peer Review should include a review of the course syllabus, exams/quizzes, and available course material.

8. A comprehensive Peer Review **may** also include classroom observation. When observing in the classroom, a pre-classroom visit with the faculty member is necessary followed by a feedback session. After the feedback session, a second classroom visit, followed by another feedback session is recommended. A single classroom observation is not recommended.

9. Multiple sources of information, methods of data collection, and points in time are necessary for a comprehensive peer review. Common sources of information would include: course syllabus, classroom materials (exams/handouts/etc.), student evaluations, classroom observations, and instructor self-assessment.

10. Feedback from a peer reviewer should be timely and include recommendations that can be implemented to improve student learning.

To be most effective, the peer evaluation process should be neutral, open, relatively unthreatening, and structured. Several factors are critical in ensuring a valid and fair peer review process. **First**, what questions are asked and answered by the reviewers is central. Some kind of replicable protocol is necessary to ensure fairness and accountability for the process. This is true for whatever data are being reviewed, whether course materials, classroom performance or student learning (Paulsen, 2002). Developing a set of questions to focus the reviewer can make the task less arbitrary and subjective. **Second**, the entire peer review process should be governed by a set of procedures established prior to any peer review. **Finally**, a training process ensures uniformity and eliminates some of the positive biases that have been shown to occur in such evaluation procedures. Positive bias refers to the tendency of faculty members to focus on the more positive aspects of a fellow faculty member's teaching and to ignore or downplay negative aspects. This natural tendency must be addressed if the peer review process is to be of value in

helping to improve the quality of teaching (Chism, 1999; 2007; Hammersley-Fletcher & Orsmond, 2004).

This document establishes the procedures and rationale for peer review of teaching for the IU Southeast campus. Peer review is established for two principal reasons: **First**, a formative peer review supports faculty in becoming effective in instruction, both in classroom delivery and in preparation for classroom delivery; **secondly**, a summative peer review establishes, in part, performance for the purpose of evaluation in the promotion-and-tenure review process or evaluation for teaching awards.

Principles Underlying Peer Review

- **Peer review plays a critical role in promotion, tenure, and professional development:**
  Peer review is widespread in academia. Faculty members regularly seek informal feedback from peers on their course topics, teaching methods, and student learning outcomes. Typically, these requests are voluntary and not subject to evaluation for promotion, tenure, nor financial compensation purposes. Likewise, a formally implemented procedure for peer review has been found to be most effective when the faculty member initiates the review. The need for a more formal peer review process most commonly arises when a candidate applies for reappointment/promotion and/or tenure. The candidate's teaching needs to be evaluated at the department, school, and/or university level. Observation and evaluation of teaching by peers is recommended in the IU Southeast promotion and tenure guidelines (IU Southeast Faculty Manual). It is in the interest of the candidate to receive peer reviews in order to document teaching performance. Peer review should be done with sufficient time to incorporate feedback and note changes **prior** to submission of any promotion, tenure, or third-year review.

- **Peer review should also be available to those who ask for it, with special consideration for first-year, second-year, third-year, and P&T candidates:**
  Peer review is helpful to all who teach. It is especially useful for new faculty (please see junior faculty timeline in Appendix H). Peer review is most productive when the faculty member requests it and when this process starts early in their teaching career. A formative peer review process beginning within the first year of the faculty member's teaching career allows the faculty member to generate substantial improvement in teaching that can then be the basis for later summative evaluations. By starting the process in the first year, the faculty member has an opportunity to evaluate his/her performance, decide what steps need to be taken for further development, and if desired, request a second-year evaluation. These first- and second-year evaluations are most useful if they remain confidential and the property of the faculty member unless the faculty member wishes to share them with the department for his/her annual review or other similar purposes (Bernstein, Jonson, & Smith, 2000).

- **IU Southeast provides support of peer review of faculty through training of peer reviewers and logistical administration by the Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE).**
  Additionally, numerous workshops relating to improvement of teaching are offered through the ILTE and the Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching (FACET).

What is Good Teaching?

Good teaching takes many forms. Perhaps one of the basic characteristics of good teaching is that students are learning. This learning, according to many experts, should occur in a positive, supportive environment rather than a negative, aversive environment. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the contribution of any single faculty member in relation to what a student has learned. Students enter the classroom with differing abilities, motivations, backgrounds, and levels of knowledge. End of course testing cannot differentiate what an individual faculty member has contributed to a student's overall knowledge level. Assessing these types of outcomes may best be done on a program level. However, it is possible – and expected - that faculty develop **embedded assessment in their courses to provide some information about student learning.** Such embedded assessment should, ideally, be part of any peer review discussion.

In addition to embedded assessment of student learning, research about the learning process has associated certain teaching practices with greater student learning. Chickering and Gamson (1987) offer seven principles based on research on good teaching and learning in colleges and universities. These principles are **not** about getting everyone to teach in the same way, they are about helping individuals to reflect on and evaluate their own approach to teaching. The list below incorporates not only the principles outlined by Chickering and Gamson, but also an eighth suggested by the recent literature on the assessment of student learning.

The Effective Teacher:

- Principle 1: **Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning**.

- Principle 2: **Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning (ADDED)**

- Principle 3: **Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners**.

- Principle 4: **Communicates and interacts effectively with students.**

- Principle 5: **Attends to the intellectual growth of students.**

• Principle 6:   **Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.**

• Principle 7:   **Incorporates learning beyond the classroom**.

• Principle 8:   **Reflects on, monitors and improves teaching practices.**

Specific questions that allow a peer reviewer to engage a faculty member in assessing whether these principles are being met in a specified course might include:

Principle 1: **Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning**.

- Is the depth and breadth of the material appropriate for the level of the course and the students?

- Does the faculty member emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?

- Is the material selected by the faculty member appropriate for the specified goals and objectives?

- Has the professor clearly outlined his/her goals and objectives for the course? Would a student know?

- Are materials designed in a clear, logical, and appropriately structured format?

- Is there evidence of short and long term planning?

- Does the course syllabus reflect course policies?

Principle 2: **Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning.**

- Does the instructor have assessable learning objectives?

- Are the faculty member's course objectives reflected in course assignments and grading?

- Do daily course lessons and assignments aid the student in achieving final course objectives? Are these built sequentially?

- Are the evaluation techniques appropriate to curricular goals and objectives?

- Are a variety of evaluation techniques being used?

- Are assignments and exams directly related to curricular goals and objectives?

- How does the instructor assess to see if the learning objectives are being achieved?

- What procedures are used at the end of the semester to assess student learning?

- How does this course fit into the overall assessment goals of the discipline?

- How does the instructor utilize assessment information in teaching this course?

- If applicable, does the course meet the appropriate General Education category criteria and assessment guidelines?

Principle 3: **Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners**.

- Does the faculty member help students learn to apply what they are learning?

- How are the students reacting to the lesson?

- Are course materials logically organized?

- Is there sufficient time between assignments?

- Is evaluative feedback provided promptly?

- Does the faculty member keep personal problems outside of the classroom?

- What procedures are used during the semester to assess whether students are learning the material prior to a quiz or exam?

Principle 4: **Communicates and interacts effectively with students.**

- Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about teaching?

- Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about the subject matter?

- Are the faculty member's interactions with students conducive to learning?

- Does the faculty member show interest in students and their learning?

- Does the faculty member communicate effectively (oral and written)?

- Is the faculty member's use of humor appropriate?

- Does the faculty member use effective active listening skills?

- Are course assignments returned promptly?

- Is confidential information handled ethically?

- Does the faculty member recognize and deal effectively with crisis issues in students (e.g., substance abuse, suicidal behavior, and mood changes)?

Principle 5: **Attends to the intellectual growth of students.**

- Are the faculty member's goals appropriate for the level of the course and the students?

- Is higher-order learning or critical thinking a part of the curriculum?

- Are materials designed to challenge and stimulate students who quickly master basic goals and objectives?

- Is material previously learned incorporated into subsequent course materials?

- Are supplemental materials available when the students need them?

Principle 6: **Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.**

- Does the faculty member recognize when students do not understand? How is this handled?

- How does the faculty member deal with students of diverse backgrounds?

- What accommodations are made for students with varied learning styles?

- Does the faculty member model respect for students and faculty?

- Does the course syllabus provide information for students who may have difficulty in the course?

Principle 7: **Incorporates learning beyond the classroom**

- Do assignments require students to apply material learned in class to his/her own life?

- Do class discussions make use of prior student learning?

- Do any class assignments require students to work together outside of class?

Principle 8: **Reflects on, monitors, and improves teaching practices.**

- What are the implications of the observed student behaviors for the faculty member's approach to teaching?

- What reflections does the faculty member report on the success of this course?

- How has this course changed as a result of assessment data and reflection?

These categories and questions are intended as an organizational framework and not a checklist. All peer reviews, however, should begin with a thorough review of course materials developed by the faculty member.

Is Peer Review Formative or Summative?

Formative Assessment

Keig and Waggoner (1995) describe formative assessment as information gathered for the purpose of improving and developing teaching. That is, the information obtained is meant to *inform* change. In order to accomplish this change, the feedback provided must be specific and concrete enough to suggest actions for improvement. Frequently, formative assessment is requested well before the end of a semester of teaching, so that the faculty member may use the information to improve teaching in the current course. For example, consider a professor who asks her students, halfway through the semester, to write a few sentences about how the current instruction has promoted or hindered learning. This faculty member has gathered information that she may now use to make teaching and learning more effective. The formative feedback process entails requesting information, making sense of the information, and implementing changes based on the information collected. This process belongs to faculty members.

They are responsible for making all decisions along the way. They may gather, analyze, and react to the information on their own or they may decide to invite a colleague or peer reviewer to assist in this process. In the case of the professor whose students responded in writing to the current instruction, the faculty member chose the method of collecting data and, after reading students' responses, determined which of the issues would be addressed. Several other examples of formative feedback exist. Faculty may opt to conduct classroom assessment for the purpose of improving teaching. They may videotape their teaching in order to reflect on teaching development. They may invite trained peer reviewers to conduct small "student focus group" interviews with students. Finally, they may ask a trained peer reviewer to provide feedback about a course. In all of these examples, only the faculty member who initiated the formative feedback process need see the results.

Summative Assessment

Cavanagh (1996) describes summative evaluation of teaching as a judgment about teaching that is used to make a decision—a decision about promotion, tenure, or teaching awards. A summative evaluation of teaching attempts to *summarize* the complex phenomena of teaching. It typically consists of global ratings of teaching, thus, reducing teaching to generalities. An

example of summative evaluation is end-of-course student ratings (SET's). Most SET's prompt students to rate six to ten aspects of teaching (e.g., organization, clarity, enthusiasm, etc.), and they ask students to make an overall, summarizing judgment of the instruction. Although some universities then average these ratings and provide them to faculty as summaries of their teaching, IU Southeast provides the raw data to the faculty members. Faculty members are then responsible for summarizing the data as they see fit and have complete control over sharing these data. Although at IU Southeast we have some choice (depending on your discipline) about the actual items on the instrument by which we are evaluated; we do not choose the time of the semester at which we are evaluated. In addition, many faculty members would argue that, if they wish to receive positive evaluations, the SET's must be included in annual reports and dossiers for reappointment/promotion and tenure.

On most campuses, it may seem that SET's are the ONLY type of summative data available to make decisions about teaching. Summative peer review, however, offers a viable addition to the use of SET's. Bernstein, Jonson, & Smith (2001) found that peer review led to increased student performance when the peer review led to the faculty member improving the quality of feedback to learners and when the faculty member appropriately raised the expectations of student performance. These types of results would definitely be of interest in summative evaluation.

Issues Involved in the Co-Existence of Formative and Summative Assessment

The distinctions just drawn between these two concepts exist at the definitional level; in practice, the two are intertwined. Many faculty members may begin with formative assessment. Using formative assessment requires little risk and allows the faculty member to improve his/her teaching prior to any summative decisions being made. When a summative decision point is reached, it is not uncommon for faculty members to submit formative assessment reports to assist in the decision making process. Likewise, the extensive training given to those who provide formative assessment has led to significant improvements in the quality of peer review. Providing the same training to those involved in summative peer review allows for a more fair and objective decision to be reached.

When a campus uses both formative and summative peer review, those who make decisions about a candidate and who might be involved in summative peer review at the time of reappointment/promotion and tenure should not be involved in any aspect of that candidate's formative assessment. Unintentionally, early 'inadequacies' of the candidate uncovered by formative assessment may color the perceptions of the individuals if they are the same individuals who are making summative decisions. One solution to this problem is to have formative assessment conducted by faculty members outside the candidate's discipline.

Campus Procedures

Please note that reviews run the gamut and many fall into the "topical" review category. For these types of reviews, the methods utilized are based upon conversations between the reviewer and the faculty member being reviewed.

- Initial Request: Any faculty member desiring peer review simply contacts the ILTE. The ILTE will ask the faculty member if they prefer a formative peer review or a summative peer review. When requesting a summative peer review, the faculty member will also indicate to the ILTE the administrative person to whom the summative report should be provided. In addition, the ILTE will request that the faculty member complete a brief questionnaire, available at the ILTE or on the ILTE website, which outlines what the faculty member would like to achieve with the peer review (A copy of this form may be found in Appendix B). This form allows the faculty member to specify the type of peer review they are requesting. A list of **three trained peer reviewers outside the faculty member's discipline** will be prepared by ILTE. Ideally, peer reviewers will be from outside the school; in all cases, peer reviewers assigned by the ILTE must be outside the discipline of the faculty member. In the case of both formative and summative peer reviews, the ILTE will record that a request for formative peer review was made and that a particular peer reviewer conducted the review. In the case of summative peer review, a copy of the summative peer review will be provided to the administrative person identified by the faculty member.

- Selection of Peer Reviewer: The ILTE will contact the first peer reviewer on the list to see if he/she is available. If the peer reviewer is available, the name of the peer reviewer is provided to the faculty member requesting the review. The faculty member must agree to the peer reviewer. Once the faculty member has accepted a peer reviewer, the ILTE informs the peer reviewer and then steps out of the process.

- First Meeting: Once the selection process is complete, the peer reviewer schedules an appointment to meet with the faculty member. During this meeting, the peer reviewer

17

will explain the process of peer review, answer any questions, briefly discuss review goals, and review course materials. A systematic review of course materials is an **essential** component of a thorough peer review. In addition, a copy of **discipline-specific criteria used to evaluate teaching** will be provided to the peer reviewer. A discipline-specific or school-specific promotion/tenure criteria document is required according to the IU Southeast Faculty Manual (Twenty Sixth Edition, B-14 §5). Reviewing this document helps to ensure that the peer review reflects these criteria. For face-to-face (F2F) courses, a date is set for the peer reviewer to attend the faculty member's class. If the course is online, the peer reviewer should be added to the course site to allow for further review.

- F2F Classes:
  - Class Observation: Ideally, **two observations of a F2F class should occur**. However, the final decision about the numbers of observations will vary depending upon the needs of the faculty member and what the peer reviewer believes to be most valuable. During the observation, the consultant will look for several instructor behaviors, student behaviors, and evidence to support the instructional goals outlined by the faculty member.
  - Second Meeting: The peer reviewer schedules a second meeting with the faculty member to review observations and make suggestions for improvement. Suggestions may be made about course materials or about classroom issues.

  - Class Observation: Once again, this **may** be one observation or two depending upon the faculty member and consultant.

Final Report Preparation: The peer reviewer prepares a report (see Appendix E for what should be included in a report). In formative reviews, this report will be given ONLY to the faculty member. In summative reviews, a copy of the report is also provided to the administrative person identified by the faculty member at the outset of the review. In summative reviews, the reviewer may choose to write a letter rather than a formal report. (See Appendix F for a suggested letter outline.)

- Final Meeting: The peer reviewer meets with the faculty member to discuss the report and to make recommendations for continued improvement.

- Peer Reviewer: Submit a memo to the ILTE **stating the date of the two observations**, if applicable, and the date the final report was written.

The Brass Tacks of Being a Peer Reviewer

What makes a good peer reviewer?

The literature suggests that faculty respect peer reviewers who have been recognized as outstanding teachers and have been through a training process. At IUS, we invite only those faculty who have been recognized for their teacher and who have successfully completed training to serve as peer reviewers. Peer reviewers **must also attend regular training updates to maintain their status** as an ILTE/FACET Peer Reviewer.

For the majority of peer reviews of F2F classes, classroom observation is a requirement of peer review.   The literature suggests that the primary characteristics of effective peer observers are closely related to characteristics of good teachers. An effective observer must:

- **Be sensitive** – must be able to empathize with the person being observed,

- **View teaching improvement** as an important objective of the observation process,

- **Be reflective** about his/her own teaching,

- Be a **good listener,**

- Have the ability to give advice – **constructive feedback**,

- Take the observation **process seriously** – carefully prepare for the observation, and

- Accept the **validity of differing teaching methods and styles**, even when the teaching method of the person being observed differs widely from his or her own.

What should I do in my first meeting with the faculty member?

During your first meeting, you will explain the process, allow the faculty member to ask whatever questions he or she has, renew student learning objectives, discuss review goals, and prepare for the first observation, if applicable. The following questions might be used to help prepare for the observation:

- *What are the goals for the class I will attend?*

- *What are your plans for achieving these goals?*

- *What teaching/learning activities will be taking place?*

- *Is this class typical of your teaching style? If not, why?*

- *What would you like me to focus on during this observation?*

Schedule the date of the observation and the date you and the faculty member will meet for feedback (this date should be no longer than **two weeks** from the date of the observation).

What should I not do?

There are many things to avoid once you are aware of them; however, most of us still catch ourselves engaged in these errors.

- *The 'Halo' Effect*
  Allowing one positive factor, or prior positive feelings, to outweigh all other aspects of assessment.

- *The 'Reverse Halo' Effect*
  Opposite of the 'halo' effect. Allowing one negative factor, or prior negative feelings, to outweigh all other aspects of the assessment.

- *Leniency*
  Being uncritical in order to avoid controversy or because you dislike conflict.

- *Central Tendency*
  Evaluating everyone as 'average' because it is less trouble.

- *Tunnel Vision*
  Focusing on only one part of the performance rather than the whole performance.

- *Going Through the Motions*
  Not taking the evaluation seriously, making up your mind in advance, or boredom.

- *The Expert*
  Using your own teaching performance as criteria for judgment rather than agreed-upon evaluation standards. This is one of the most common problems when just beginning as a reviewer. Be cautious using absolute statements such as "you should never use overhead transparencies."

- *Gotcha*
  Using the evaluation for political purposes or personal revenge.

Review of Course Materials: What am I looking for?

- *Reviewing the syllabus:*
  - Organization: A clear organization allows students to quickly find information and to understand what is expected of them. Read through the syllabus using a student's perspective. What questions would you have as a student in this class? In some ways it is easier to review a syllabus for a course outside your area of expertise. It is easier to place ourselves into the position of a student reading the syllabus when we haven't created our own version of the syllabus for a particular course. Information that should be on all syllabi include:
    - Contact information including office hours
    - Required texts/readings
    - Course description
    - Student learning objectives
    - Requirements (assignments, exams)
    - Grading scale
    - Course policies
    - Disability statement
    - Course Calendar
  - Development of a warm climate: Good syllabi convey a warm, welcoming environment, providing a glimpse into the personality of the instructor. Features that help to convey such an environment include effective use of white space, images or cartoons used in an appropriate manner, writing in the first person, and a more casual writing style. Do not overwhelm students with a syllabus. Overly long syllabi (> 10 pages) can be simplified by providing links to materials posted on your Oncourse page. Likewise, a very short syllabus (< 3 pages) probably fails to provide the specificity students require.
  - Student Learning Objectives: Frequently, faculty get into the habit of organizing their courses around their selected text. Instead, courses should be organized around what the instructor expects the student to be able to do once completing the course. That is, if students are expected to be able to compare and contrast major theories in a field, the course readings should expose the student to the major theories and

formative and summative assignments should first model, allow for practice, and then evaluate the student's ability to do this. Student learning objectives, then, are the crux of a successful course. These learning objectives must be written in a measurable manner. For example,

- "Students are expected to understand major theories" is a poor student learning objective.

What does the instructor mean by 'understand?' How will she/he know if the student understands? **A better learning objective is:**

- "Students will identify the major tenets of the theories of learning," **or**

- "Students will compare and contrast major theories"

It is typically easiest to write student learning objectives by beginning each objective with an action verb. If you think about what behaviors, thoughts, and feelings you hope to impact during the semester it can be easier to organize and create these student learning objectives. Help in writing student learning objectives may be obtained through the ILTE.

In 1956, Bloom developed a taxonomy illustrating levels of intellectual behavior relevant to student learning. One of his students, Lorin Anderson (1999) updated these levels. Many faculty utilize Bloom's taxonomy (Anderson, 2003) when creating their student learning objectives (see table next page). There are several action-verb lists available online that have been compiled for this purpose (See, for example, http://www.potsdam.edu/offices/ie/assessment/upload/Action-Verb-List-For-Writing-Student-Outcomes.pdf; http://www.efc.dcccd.edu/Core/SLO-MVC.pdf).

There is no magic number of student learning objectives (or outcomes) nor is there any requirement as to the number of student learning objectives at any particular level of Bloom's taxonomy. However, there are certain guidelines. The absolute number of student learning objectives should be between 5 and 9. Student learning objectives should not reflect a simple listing of each behavior expected of students but should reflect more complex learning outcomes (Gronlund, 2000). For example, "students

should be able to calculate a mean" might be replaced with "students should be able to calculate the statistics needed to determine answers to their hypotheses."

In a similar vein, introductory level classes should be distinct from upper-division classes in the complexity of the learning objectives written. Certain courses spend more of their time ensuring a knowledge base; the learning objectives should reflect the focus of the course. For upper-division courses that focus on application, critical thinking, and synthesis, the learning objectives should also reflect these items. Be sure to double-check that learning objectives are also reflected in the assessment tools created for the course.

New/Old Level of Cognitive Skill	Useful Words to Assist in Developing Student Learning Objectives
Remembering/Knowledge: can the student recall or remember the information?	define, duplicate, list, memorize, recall, repeat, reproduce, state
Understanding/Comprehension: can the student explain ideas or concepts?	classify, describe, discuss, explain, identify, locate, recognize, report, select, translate, paraphrase
Applying: can the student use the information in a new way?	choose, demonstrate, dramatize, employ, illustrate, interpret, operate, schedule, sketch, solve, use, write
Analyzing: can the student distinguish between the different parts?	appraise, compare, contrast, criticize, differentiate, discriminate, distinguish, examine, experiment, question, test
Evaluating/Synthesis: can the student justify a stand or decision?	appraise, argue, defend, judge, select, support, value, evaluate
Creating/Evaluation: can the student create new product or point of view?	assemble, construct, create, design, develop, formulate, write

- *Reviewing assignments and exams:* All assignments and exams should be tied to student learning objectives. Ideally, the syllabus clearly provides students an understanding of this link. When reviewing assignments and exams, you should evaluate whether this link

exists. For example, if the instructor indicates that they wish students to apply and analyze, do the assignments and exams match this level of Bloom's taxonomy, or are the assignments and exams focused on remembering/knowledge? Be careful not to assume higher levels of cognitive skill – or lower levels for that matter – can only be assessed in one way. Multiple-choice exams, for example, are typically written in such a way that they reflect the lower levels of Bloom's taxonomy. However, it is possible to create multiple-choice questions that reflect higher levels of the taxonomy. Similarly, we tend to think of essay questions as reflecting higher levels of the taxonomy; depending upon how the question is written, the essay question may only reflect lower levels of the taxonomy.

Other features to consider when evaluating assignments and exams include:

- Spacing of feedback opportunities within the semester

- Clarity of writing, especially with regard to instructions

- Ease of feedback: are assignments and exams constructed in a manner to allow immediate feedback; are rough drafts required for research papers, etc.?

- At a minimum, assessment at the end of each unit.

- Multiple forms of assessment within each unit.

- At least one assessment/assignment that cuts across the units, reflecting higher level cognitive skills

- Work should be paced throughout semester

- Clear policies for accepting late work

- Clear grading criteria

- Specify when student should expect feedback from professor

How should I begin discussion of the observational data?

The following questions are examples of the kinds of reflective questions that are often used. There are many other possibilities.

- Did the lesson proceed in the way you had planned it? Why?

- Did the students react to the lesson in the way that you thought they would?

- What specific things did you do to help the students understand difficult parts of the lesson?

- Did you do anything that confused the students or made it difficult for them to understand the lesson?

- What did you do in the lesson to allow for individual differences in students' learning styles or abilities?

- Do you think your students learned all that you wanted them to learn in this lesson? What brings you to this conclusion?

- What did you do to encourage the students to participate actively in the lessons?

- What were the primary learning goals/points for this lesson? How did/will you assess whether students learned them?

- What did you learn about teaching from this class?

- If you were to teach this lesson again tomorrow, what would you do differently? Why?

How do I give constructive criticism?

Essential Elements of Constructive Criticism

- Give positive feedback first – begin by providing positive reflections to the faculty member. Your positive comments should be specific.

- Follow positive feedback with an opportunity for the faculty member to comment – after providing your positive feedback, allow the faculty member to tell you what he/she thought went well and what they thought did not go well.
- Positive phrasing – with a little forethought, almost any situation can be described in a more positive way. For example, compare "You didn't call on a single student by name; why haven't you learned their names?" with "I liked the way you called on students to share their thoughts but I noticed you didn't call them by name. What methods are you using to learn student names?"
- Concreteness – comments should be grounded in specific, observable behavior.
- Action-orientation – point out problem area (s), provide the faculty member a chance to comment about these problem areas, and together develop a specific plan of action to follow.
- Focus – provide feedback on behavior the faculty member can change.

- Affirmation – acknowledge achievements and efforts toward change.

- Confirm the message – check that what you are saying is what the faculty member is hearing.

Example:

> ***I was very impressed with the beginning of your lecture. Using the opening sketch allowed students to recall what you covered in the previous lecture and gave them the opportunity to question you about anything that still needed clarification. I also like how you introduced the new material for the day. Using the story from the newspaper was a great way of getting students to engage and to set up the main points you wanted to cover. What parts of the class do you believe went well?*** Allow the faculty member to share. Then work into, ***What parts of the class concerned you? What do you believe needs improvement?***

Use this discussion to bring up your concerns as well. In most situations, the faculty member will address each of your concerns without you even having to broach the items.

Confidentiality

What do you mean by confidentiality?

Faculty members need to feel confident that the peer reviewer is not sharing his/her opinions of a colleague's teaching in an unprofessional manner. Whenever you are a peer reviewer in a formative review, the information is **completely confidential**. This means that you, as the peer reviewer, do not reveal **who** you reviewed, nor do you reveal any information about the content of the review. In a formative peer review, the written report is provided **ONLY** to the faculty member who was reviewed. In a summative peer review, the written report is provided not only to the faculty member but also to the previously identified administrative person with the prior understanding that the information may be used for personnel decisions. Although less confidential, those seeking a summative review still have the right to expect that the peer reviewer will not be discussing their strengths and weaknesses in a casual manner. Remember, there are two types of peer reviews: Summative and Formative. Formative reviews are the confidential property of the faculty member and should, at **most**, only be summarized in one's dossier. Summative reviews are sent to both the faculty member and the identified administrative person/persons and **can** be included in dossiers.

What if …. ?

What if the Chancellor or the Dean asks whether a faculty member is seeking assistance?
They won't. In the time the ILTE has been operating, no administrator has asked the ILTE Director to violate the ILTE policy on confidentiality. If this question arises, simply tell them that confidentiality binds you and they should speak to the Director of the ILTE.

What if I'm asked to write a letter of recommendation for a faculty member for whom I have provided peer review? May I?
Of course! The letter, however, must not contain any information acquired through the formative peer review process. Of course, if the candidate asks you to include information, you may. You may also include information obtained through a summative review process. Once again, to be safe, discuss this with the person you reviewed before writing your letter. In all situations, you may mention that the two of you have discussed teaching methodology.

Doesn't this policy penalize the faculty member?

The literature is clear that formative assessment and summative assessment need to be complementary but separate. This is in the best interest of the faculty. There is nothing to prevent the faculty member from utilizing the information from his or her formative report to supplement one's dossier. It is recommended that the faculty member **summarize the report and reflect on how this report led to continued efforts at improving teaching**. Simply attaching the report is not appropriate or fair to the peer reviewer. The peer reviewer wrote the report with the expectation that it would remain confidential.

Considering the Context in Peer Review

For many faculty, teaching has always involved face-to-face (F2F) teaching. That is, the faculty member is physically present in a classroom with his or her students in the same classroom. Distance education (including online and hybrid courses) and flipped classrooms are also becoming more common. In addition to these variations in teaching environment, many faculty also teach intensive courses that are designed to meet over a shorter span of time – perhaps four to six weeks – than the traditional 16 week semester. Finally, more faculty are also offering study abroad courses. Peer Review is no longer limited to F2F teaching environments; peer review procedures, with a little tweaking, can be used in any teaching environment.

*Intensive Guidelines***:** Time is the major issue in intensive courses. The instructor meets with students a limited number of times, perhaps as few as four to six. Given these restrictions, the instructor must plan carefully to take full advantage of class time.

Specific considerations in intensive courses include:

- Pre-Assignments: Students are frequently provided an assignment that is to be completed prior to the first class. The assignment is typically communicated to students using OnCourse or email. It is important that such pre-assignments include a requirement that the student acknowledge having received the assignment prior to class. Ideally, the presence of pre-assignments could be included as information provided to all students in SIS/OneStart when they enroll in the course.

- Expansion of Course Boundaries: Given the limited F2F time in an intensive course, student learning is facilitated if the instructor utilizes out-of-class time effectively. This might include:

   - Online examinations

   - Forum discussions

   - Group assignments

- Assessment of Required Reading: In an intensive course, the instructor needs to be able to assume the students have completed the readings. There is little time to repeat the material from the required readings during class time. Instructors cannot assume students have read the material. Assessment of the required readings can take many forms including online quizzes, in-class quizzes, Socratic questioning techniques during class, etc.

Study Abroad Guidelines: In study abroad courses, instructors are confronted with many challenges not present in traditional F2F courses. **First**, depending upon the study abroad experience, there may or may not be a classroom experience. Some study abroad courses have separate content lectures; some integrate content into the study abroad experience. **Second**, if the study abroad portion of the course is for any extended time period, the personal characteristics of the students – and the faculty member – play a large role in the success of the course. The study abroad experience may be the first time some students have left home or left the country. Homesickness, difficulty tolerating differences between people, fatigue, and culture shock can all change reasonable students (and faculty) into seemingly ungrateful, vindictive monsters. Faculty will differ in how they handle these situations. The same principles that outline appropriate classroom behavior – respect, civility, focus on student learning – should be present in coping with these difficult situations abroad. It may be especially important to help faculty engaged in study abroad experiences to maintain their role as instructor and not become more of a 'friend' or colleague to any subset of students.

Specific considerations in Study Abroad courses include:

- Specific assessment tools for the content of the course and the success of the study abroad experience.

- Self-reflective assignments that integrate course content and the study abroad experience.

- Procedures to introduce students to the culture(s) they will experience prior to departure. Specific, detailed information is best.

- Flexibility on the part of the students and the faculty involved in study abroad is critical to a successful experience. Specifically address situations where students – and the instructor – demonstrated or failed to demonstrate flexibility.

- Rubric for assessing the study abroad learning (please see Appendix G).

Distance Guidelines: Distance education has been used for over 100 years in the United States. However, with updated technology, distance education has become more popular. Within IU, we have a number of modalities that fall under distance education. These include courses taught fully online, hybrid courses, and synchronous distance learning called "distance other" within IU. According to IU definitions,

1. 'Online all' classes are taught entirely asynchronously using digital communication. Students are not bound by time or place.
2. 'Hybrid traditional' classes meet in person but at least 25% of their traditional meetings are replaced by online interaction and activity.
3. 'Distance other' classes are courses where the majority of the education is provided via distance, usually over a video bridge, and everyone is participating at the same time.

Through K-12 education, students have developed certain classroom norms. They walk in, sit down at a desk, and wait for the teacher to speak at the front of the room. In distance courses, the students lack these norms. This is why an effective instructor must be abundantly clear to students as to what is expected of them. Some elements that should be explicit and easy to find in the course materials are:

- Synchronous vs. asynchronous schedule: Students need to know when they are required to physically be present in the 'class.' This can mean on-campus or logging in at a certain time.
- Technological requirements: Students should be able to access the technologies needed for the course. If certain technologies are needed, it is helpful to provide ways that students can 'tour' the technology.
- Technology assistance: Students should be able to easily locate help for technological problems. Providing a link to 24/7 technology services would be of assistance to students.

Other technological concerns for faculty include:

- Course technology should be current and aligned with the course objectives.
- Is material used appropriately in light of copyright requirements?
- Are all links current?

The instructor does not need to be a 'techie,' but the instructor must be very comfortable with the chosen pieces of technology. That is, have practiced using the technology before class and have some ability to explain the technology to their students.

Specific considerations in **'online all'** courses:

Beginning in 2013, IUS has adopted Quality Matters for use with online course development. (Please see Appendix A for the Quality Matters Rubric Standards 2011-2013 edition that we will be using at IUS.) Quality Matters (QM) is a nationally recognized program, developed by faculty and designed to be faculty-centered, that focuses on using a peer review process to certify the quality of online course design. QM is being used in colleges and universities across and beyond the United States. At IUS, Peer Review goes beyond QM as it looks at additional elements of a quality course including implementation of the course, faculty readiness, and student-faculty interaction during the course.

- Online course syllabi should reflect the same best practices as other course modalities
- Specific course design issues for online all courses include:
    - Material chunked into units or modules
    - Instructor provided introduction to each unit or module. Usually this would include module or unit specific learning objectives/outcomes.
    - Should be one very early assignment to allow students to introduce self
- Policies for communicating online are a necessity. These policies need to include:
    - How to contact the instructor (what mode and when)
    - When to expect a response from the instructor
    - Civility expectations and clear descriptions of professional written communication
- Building community: Without F2F contact, it is up to the instructor to design a course that engages students into their course community. The following techniques work well to build community:
    - Introductory podcast or video from the instructor welcoming students to class and explaining what the class will address. This can also be a separate area of the course just to meet the instructor. The goal is to humanize the instructor. At the

least, a photo should be posted. Reviewers should encourage faculty to use audio/video introductions, which can be done from your desk!

- o Opportunity for online discussions should be provided. These discussions should, in some way, be monitored by the instructor. Best practices would involve having all students participate and respond to comments from each other. Grading criteria that specify the quality of these responses are advised.
- o Opportunities for students to work directly with other students

Specific considerations in 'hybrid traditional' courses:

- The first meeting of the course should be F2F. This allows for creating a community of learners and to clarify any confusion about course assignments. Many prefer to have the last meeting of the course be F2F as well. This may allow for the final exam to be given under controlled conditions and to allow for the community to process their experience.

- Asynchronous portions of a hybrid course should be interactive and should flow seamlessly with the F2F portions of the course. It should not feel to students that two separate courses are being taught.

Specific considerations in 'distance other':

- During synchronous learning, faculty must ask questions that allow students to apply what they are learning
- Specific guidelines are needed for asking and answering questions during synchronous learning
- Faculty should speak clearly, distinctly, and slower than in a F2F class
- Faculty should position themselves in the room in a manner that conveys openness to students in all locations (e.g., don't turn your back to the camera which may indicate that you are ignoring your distance students)
- Faculty should ask questions approximately every 10 minutes
- Faculty should 'try out' visuals in advance to ensure they can be seen

Flipped Classrooms: A traditional classroom is faculty-driven and students perform homework tasks on their own time. In a flipped classroom, students receive course content outside of class (often as video lectures, or "vodcasts") so that students and faculty can better engage with material during class. This flipping of content delivery and homework does not require increased time on behalf of the professor or student. Rather, it changes the way in which students are presented content, engage with course content materials, and how they interact with the professor and their peers.

Specific considerations in flipped classrooms:

- How is the flow maintained between assignments outside of class and the classroom?
- How does the instructor ensure that assignments outside of class, in particular readings, are being completed?
- Look for evidence that the instructor balances the distribution of work among students in various teams or groups.
- Look for a variety of in-class activities.
- Look for how in-class activities align with student outcomes/objectives.
- Don't be surprised by the absence of lectures. Focus on how the instructor facilitates meeting the learning objectives/outcomes.

Other Teaching/Learning Assessment and Improvement Methods

Obviously, peer review is not the only possible method to evaluate the effectiveness of a course. Peer review is a great way for a professor to discover how he or she can improve performance in the classroom. It is not very useful in determining what students like best or least about a particular class or program of study. Different methods (student questionnaires, focus groups, pre- and post-tests) may be used to obtain a more complete picture of the teaching and learning experience. Peer Review may also identify areas of improvement for a faculty member that would benefit from a longer-term mentoring relationship. The ILTE has developed a **Teaching Consultation program** to provide a longer-term mentoring relationship for faculty wishing to improve their teaching. Teaching Consultation involves a more comprehensive review of teaching than a traditional Peer Review and it cuts across several or all courses taught by the faculty member.

A. Student Focus Groups

As part of the training procedure at IU Southeast, peer reviewers may also be trained in facilitating Student Focus Groups. A trained peer reviewer interviews students (using pre-selected questions from the faculty member) designed to assess whether the students are learning what the faculty member intends.

A faculty member initiates this process with a request to the ILTE. Once such a request is made, a trained peer reviewer will contact the faculty member and schedule an appointment with them to review the process. During this initial meeting, the entire process is explained and the faculty member supplies the peer reviewer with the course syllabus, other appropriate course materials, and explains course objectives. Just as in the procedures described under Peer Review above, using Student Focus Groups still begins with a systematic review of course materials prepared by the faculty member. Together the peer reviewer and the faculty member create a series of questions that address the concerns the faculty member has expressed. The creation of appropriate questions is one of the critical aspects of this approach. Questions should probe the breadth and depth of student understanding. A class time is scheduled when the peer reviewer

will interview the students. During the interview, the faculty member will not be in the class. Following this Student Focus Group, the peer reviewer will meet with the faculty member to report on the results of the interviews. A final report is written by the peer reviewer and given to the faculty member. The report is the sole property of the faculty member.

Why use Student Focus Groups?

Directly interviewing students provides a greater sense of what students are actually learning, what impact various pedagogical techniques might be having on students, and what kinds of connections to other course material the students were able to make. Many professors report that the information they receive from Student Focus Groups is richer and more directly relevant to their courses than the standard student evaluation of teaching forms.

What is the Peer Reviewer's Role?

Peer Reviewers must:
- Meet with faculty member to review course materials and to create questions for the Student Focus Group

- Interview students

- Meet with faculty member to report on results of Student Focus Group

- Prepare and submit a summary report outlining the results of the Student Focus Group (See Appendix D for what should be included in such a report).

Guidelines for Peer Reviewers Conducting Student Focus Groups

- It is preferred that peer reviewers not be linked with faculty from their own discipline.
- On this campus, interviews are conducted with all students in the course.

- Total time for the interview should be at least 30 minutes but no more than 45 minutes.

- Peer reviewers should take notes regarding the tenor and substance of the student-interviewer discussions.

- The peer reviewer should attempt to ensure all students are heard and all opinions are equally weighted.

- It is best to conduct a Student Focus Group near the end of the semester, preferably when only three or four class sessions remain.

Reviewing course materials: What should I look for?

By looking through the sections above describing 'good teaching' and 'areas to cover,' you should develop a sense of what topics you would like to consider when reviewing course materials. Each course will differ and the goals each faculty member will have will differ. In spite of this, a few general questions should always be addressed:

- *Goals/objectives:*
    - Has the professor clearly outlined his/her course goals and student learning objectives for the course? Would a student know?

    - Is class time and assignments geared toward achieving the goals and objectives the faculty member has outlined?

- *Assignments/class time:*
    - Are materials designed to challenge and stimulate students who quickly master basic goals and objectives?

    - Are materials designed in a clear, logical, and appropriately structured format?

    - Is material previously learned incorporated into subsequent course materials?

- *Is there evidence of short and long term planning?*
    - Evaluation of Students:

- Are the evaluation techniques appropriate to curricular goals and objectives?

- Are a variety of evaluation techniques being used?

- Is the effectiveness (student success) of student learning objectives being evaluated?

- Are assignments and exams directly related to curricular goals and objectives?

What type of questions should the students be asked?

Asking good questions is critically important. Some experts have stated that failure to ask appropriate questions is the most common reason for failure of these types of focus groups. Developing questions for the Student Focus Groups must be taken in two stages.

- *Stage One:*

  During your meeting with the faculty member, ask she/he what questions she/he would like you to ask the students. What concerns does the faculty member have about the course? What aspects of the course does the faculty member believe are going well? What aspects are problematic? Record all of these questions. Be sure that the faculty member has given you at least four to five questions that she or he would like answered.

- *Stage Two:*

  Prior to meeting with the students, take the questions the faculty member has provided, possible questions that have occurred to you, and the following list of questions:
  - *What do you like most about this course?*
  - *What do you like least about this course?*
  - *What does the professor do that helps you the most in learning the material?*

o *Is there anything the professor does that makes it hard for you to understand the material?*

o *What would you like to see the professor do differently?*

o *Is there anything that other professors have done that helped you to learn?*

Rewrite all questions in an open-ended format. There might be one question that cannot be re-structured in an open-ended form. If this question is critical, keep it. If it isn't critical, omit it. Organize the questions so that you begin and end the Student Focus Group on a positive note. It is recommended that you write the questions out on a sheet that you can take with you to the Student Focus Group. You may only have time for about five to six questions, so choose carefully. Prepare a few extra questions in case the class moves quickly.

What is the best way to conduct the Student Focus Group?

Faculty members using procedures such as the Student Focus Group conduct the interviews in a slightly different manner. The manner suggested here has been in effect on the IU Southeast campus for the past seven years and has been highly effective. To date, no problems have arisen with the approach. As we conduct more Student Focus Groups, we may discover variations that would increase our effectiveness.

- Prior to attending the class where you are to conduct the Student Focus Group, the faculty member should be asked to explain that a consultant working with the ILTE would be coming to the next class. Explain that the consultant is coming to discover how the class is going and what can be done to improve the class for future students. Request that the faculty member explain that the consultant will interview the students as a group while the professor will be out of the room. Also ask the faculty member to explain to the students that their comments will be confidential.

- On the day of the Student Focus Group, place the students into a circle around you. If the desks do not move, see if you can move the students into another classroom or go outside, weather permitting. If the class has over 40 students, see below for procedures for large classes.

- Begin the session by introducing yourself and asking the students if they know why you are there. If they cannot answer, give them the same information you had requested the faculty member to provide and emphasize the confidential nature of the proceeding (Do not assume the faculty member did not provide the information. Some classes won't respond to you at first and you will need to warm them up.). Specifically state that you will be taking notes but that you will not give the professor any detail about which student said what (if you don't know the students, use that as further evidence that you couldn't possibly reveal who said what).

- Start the actual interview with an easy, positive question. The nature of the question will vary depending upon the class. Gauge which students are responding. You will want to give all students a chance to respond so specifically ask students to respond when they do not spontaneously respond. Even when most of the class seems to agree on a point, be sure to ask if there is anyone who does not agree.

- Frequently, after you ask one or two questions, the class will begin to volunteer information that answers questions that you have yet to ask. Don't stifle them. Provide responses that keep the conversation going as long as you are getting useful information. Don't worry if the students take the conversation into areas you didn't expect.

- When time is running out, be sure that students who have not participated have a chance to add any additional information. It is okay to turn to a student who has not responded and say, "I've noticed you haven't said very much. What is your reaction to how this course is going?"

- Finally, end the conversation on a positive note. A good final question might be, "What do you like best about this class?"

What about large classes?

For classes with 35 or more students, a different approach is recommended. First, prepare your questions in a written format with sufficient space between the questions for short answers to be written. Make enough copies for groups of five students plus a copy for yourself. On the day of the Student Focus Group, provide general information as a large group. Then split the class into groups of five students. Ask each group to select a spokesperson. Allow the groups about 15 minutes to talk about the questions you have provided. While the groups talk, walk among them asking them to explain more about a particular comment or to share an example of something they are discussing.

At the end of the group time (you may shorten the time if they are all done early), have the class reform into a whole. Try to put them in a layered semi-circle around you if at all possible. Ask the group spokespeople to share their answers. Have each spokesperson deliver one response then move to the next spokesperson until all responses are given. Encourage anyone who wants to add to the comments to do so.

B. *Teaching Consultation*

Similar to other review options, a Teaching Consultation begins with a request from a faculty member to the ILTE. The request from the faculty member for a teaching consultant should include a list of teaching-related items to be addressed by the consultation process. This list may be self-generated by the faculty member or generated in concert with a person outside the ILTE. Given the extended nature of the contact between the teaching consultant and the faculty member being reviewed, the ILTE will make every effort to ensure that the faculty member is comfortable with the teaching consultant assigned. The teaching consultant is a faculty member who has been trained in peer review and recognized by the ILTE to address the teaching-related items indicated by the faculty member.

At the initial meeting between the teaching consultant and the faculty member, a plan will be made to address the items indicated by the faculty member. This plan should include the teaching-related items to be addressed in the consultation process, the nature of the contact between the faculty member and the teaching consultant (e.g., classroom observations, student focus groups, one-on-one consultations, etc.), the breadth of the consultation (e.g., one course, two courses, all courses, etc.), and the length of the consultation (e.g., two months, one semester, six months, one year, etc.).

Throughout the Teaching Consultation process, the teaching consultant will make recommendations and provide feedback to the faculty member. An assessment process will be agreed upon between the teaching consultant and the faculty member. At the end of the Teaching Consultation, the teaching consultant will provide a final report (see Appendix H) including a description of activity, recommendations, assessment results, and other relevant information to the faculty member. The Teaching Consultant will also provide a memo to the ILTE with the beginning date and the ending date of the teaching consultation.

Types of Teaching Consultation

- Formative – The consultation process and any reports generated are kept private between the faculty member and the consultant.
- Summative – A summative consultation includes a summative review at the end of the process that is sent to a designated administrative person.
    - o In the case of a summative consultation, the ILTE recommends that the teaching-related items to be addressed are created through a joint process of the faculty member and the person to whom the summative review will be provided.

Teaching Consultation Detailed Process

- The faculty member contacts IU Southeast's ILTE with a request for a Teaching Consultation.

- o Requests should be made by June 1st for a Teaching Consultation to begin in the fall semester.

- o Requests should be made by December 1st for a Teaching Consultation to begin in the spring semester.

- o An ILTE staff member will review the request and prepare a list of two possible teaching consultants:

    - Teaching consultants must have completed the Peer Review training

    - Teaching Consultants must have completed a minimum of two Peer Reviews

- o If available, both names will be provided to the faculty member who will be able to choose.

- o If only one possible teaching consultant is available, the faculty member will be given that name.

- The faculty member and consultant arrange for an initial meeting where the faculty member brings a detailed list of teaching-related items to be addressed during the consultation.

    - o Similar to other peer-review processes, it is recommended that the initial meeting be held off-campus or in a neutral place on campus.

- The faculty member and the consultant create an action plan to address each of the items on the detailed list. This plan is to be executed by the faculty member. The plan will include items such as methods of improvement and suggested methods for documenting the improvements.

- Each School has guidelines for promotion and tenure related to teaching effectiveness. These guidelines will be factored into the consultation process and the generated plan so that improvements will be observable by promotion and tenure evaluators.

- Optionally, the faculty member and consultant can identify and include in the action plan other methods to influence future evaluations (e.g., promotion and tenure) of teaching effectiveness. These *other* methods are with respect to the School's normal guidelines

for promotion and tenure. An example of another method of evaluation might include a peer review of teaching.

- The timeline for the teaching consultation process can be significantly more than the timeline used for a peer review of teaching. The teaching consultation process might last as long as six months to one year, with much of the planning occurring at the front-end of the process.

- With respect to the list of specific teaching-related items to be addressed by the consultation, if an item has a modicum of vagueness, then the consultant will work with the faculty member to more explicitly define the particular item prior to developing a plan to address the item.

Annotated Bibliography

Anderson, L.W. (1999). *Rethinking Bloom's taxonomy: Implications for testing and assessment.*

This paper describes a work in progress on a second edition of "Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain," also known as "Bloom's Taxonomy" (B. Bloom and others, Eds., 1956). The new edition will be grounded in the collective wisdom of the original "Handbook," but will incorporate contextual and conceptual changes that have taken place since its publication. Like the original, the new handbook will contain five chapters describing the background, structure, and implications of the revised taxonomy; but the second section, instead of containing sample objectives and test items, will contain vignettes illustrating applications of the revised taxonomy in schools. The new edition will make a distinction between knowledge as the process of recall and knowledge as the content that is recalled, designating the first category of the cognitive process dimensions as "remember." Cognitive processes will be conceptualized somewhat differently, with the acknowledgment of a broader range of contextual factors that influence learning and the use of cognitive processes. Three implications of the expected changes are noted. First is the importance of diversity in educational assessment. Another aspect is considering the relationships among tasks in designing assessment; and still another is the realization that the structure of the taxonomy is more likely to be evident in the scoring rubric than in the tasks themselves. The new "Handbook" is a work in progress, and the revised taxonomy has yet to be completed. It is not yet known how learning, curriculum, instruction, and assessment will interface in the final version. [Abstract from author]

Anderson, L.W. (2003). Benjamin S. Bloom: His life, his works, and his legacy. In Barry J. Zimmerman and Dale H. Schunk (Eds.), *Educational Psychology: A Century of Contributions.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

This chapter records the legacy of Benjamin S. Bloom. The author describes Bloom's works, gives a short biographical history, and reviews Bloom's influence on the field of educational psychology. The author describes Bloom's work with the University of Chicago's Board of Examinations and the university's Department of Education at which he spent most of his academic life. The works reviewed (6 books and 1 brief article) span 35 years and include: "Problem-Solving Processes of College Students," "The Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook 1: The Cognitive Domain," "Stability and Change in Human Characteristics," "Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation," "Human Characteristics and School Learning," and "Developing Talent in Young People." The article is "Learning for Mastery." Bloom was not influenced greatly by the prevailing educational zeitgeist; he used methods and followed paths of inquiry not currently popular at the time of study. Other themes in Bloom's work include his beliefs in the power of educational environments, especially on problem-solving skills, and in the vastness of human potential, and his feelings on the purpose of education and the purpose of schooling in our society. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2010 APA, all rights reserved).

Arreola, R.A. (1999). Steps in developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. Presented at the 24th Annual POD Conference in Split Rock, PA.

In this workshop Professor Raoul A. Arreola, (*Director of Educational Evaluation and Development, University of Tennessee Health Science Center, Memphis) provided participants with practical, proven models for developing and using a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. As Professor Arreola states, "Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system involves integrating the *technical requirements* of good measurement with the *political process* of building consensus around shared *values."* [Abstract from editor]

Bernstein, D. J. (2008). Peer review and evaluation of the intellectual work of teaching. *Change*, *40*(2), 48-51.

The article discusses various resources for peer review of college teaching developed by Pat Hutchings and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE)The workbook "From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching" has been used by 12 colleges which offers structured interactions guided by set of questions. "Making Teaching Community Property" describes how teachers respond to the students and what they learn from their engagement. "The Course Portfolio" presents an analysis of student success, performance and goals. [Abstract from EBSCO*host*]

Bernstein, D.J. & Edwards, R. (2001). We need objective, rigorous peer review of teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 47(17).*

In this short article authors Daniel Bernstein (*Professor of Psychology at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln) and Richard Edwards (*senior vice chancellor for academic affairs at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln) review the history of instructor evaluation as they build their argument for interactive peer review. That is, going beyond the borders of individual campuses to share expertise among different institutions and developing a community of professors "who can recognize, evaluate, and replicate excellence in teaching." [Abstract from editor]

Bernstein, D.J., Jonson, J., & Smith, K. (2000). An examination of the implementation of peer review of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 83,* 73-86.

In this article, authors Daniel J. Bernstein *(*Professor of Psychology at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln)*, Jessica Jonson (**Coordinator of University-wide Assessment of Student Outcomes at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln)*, Karen Smith (*Professor of Psychology at Truman State University*) describe The University of Nebraska at Lincoln's peer review project program in order to serve as a guide to other institutions wanting to use the same process. [Abstract from editor]

Brent, R., & Felder, R.M. (2004). *A Protocol for Peer Review of Teaching*. Proceedings of the 2004 American Society for Engineering Education Annual Conference & Exposition. Salt Lake City, Utah.

 A peer review protocol that serves both formative and summative functions has been implemented at North Carolina State University. For summative evaluation, two or more reviewers use standardized checklists to independently rate instructional materials (syllabus, learning objectives, assignments, tests, and other items) and at least two class observations, and then reconcile their ratings. For formative evaluation, only one rater completes the forms and the results are shared only with the faculty member being rated rather than being used as part of his/her overall teaching performance evaluation. Pilot test results of the summative protocol show a high level of inter-rater reliability. This paper presents a brief overview of the reasons for including peer review in teaching performance evaluation and the problems with the way it has traditionally been done, describes and discusses the protocol, summarizes the pilot test results, and demonstrates how the use of the protocol can minimize or eliminate many common concerns about peer review of teaching. [Abstract from author]

Cavanagh, R.R. (1996). Formative and summative evaluation in the faculty peer review of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 20,* 241-248.

In this paper, Ronald R. Cavanagh (*Vice President for Undergraduate Studies, Syracuse University) argues that if faculty peer review of teaching is to overcome institutional marginalization, its formative and summative components must use rules, criteria, and standards for effective teaching that are agreed upon by the faculty in the academic unit. According to Cavanagh, only such a process can produce the credibility needed for faculty development and personnel decisions. [Abstract from editor]

Centra, J.A. (1999). *Reflective faculty evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

In this book John A. Centra (*Professor and Chair of the Higher Education Program at Syracuse University) presents the reader with approaches and issues on college and university faculty evaluation with a special emphasis placed on careful consideration for all of the parties involved. Professor Centra stresses the importance of active methods of teaching and the necessity to evaluate those methods in less conventional ways. [Abstract from editor]

Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z.F., (1987). Seven principles for good practice
      In undergraduate education. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, Inc./Wingspread.
      [Available by contacting the Seven Principles Resources Center, P.O. Box 5838,
      Winona State University, Winona, MN 55987-5838; (507) 457-5020]

In this piece, Arthur W. Chickering (*Distinguished Professor of Higher Education at Memphis State University) and Zelda F. Gamson (*a sociologist who holds appointments at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston and in the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education at the University of Michigan) elaborate on the results gained from fifty years of research on the way teachers teach and students learn. The main goal of Chickering and Gamson was to identify practices, policies, and institutional conditions that would result in the best possible undergraduate education. In short, "Good practice in undergraduate education: 1.) Encourages contact between students and faculty. 2.) Develops reciprocity and cooperation among students. 3.) Encourages active learning. 4.) Gives prompt feedback. 5.) Emphasizes time on task. 6.) Communicates high expectations. 7.) Respects diverse talents and ways of learning." [Abstract from editor]

Chism, N. (1999). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

This bestselling book by Nancy Van Note Chism (Professor in the Core Campus (Bloomington and Indianapolis) Program, Higher Education and Student Affairs, Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis) includes discussions of important foundational issues of peer review as well as practical forms and ideas gathered from disciplinary groups and institutions throughout the United States. [Abstract from editor]

Chism, N. (2007) *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.

The new edition of this bestselling book builds on the author's extensive administrative and consulting experience as well as scholarship on faculty rewards. It includes additional discussion of important foundational issues as well as practical forms and ideas gleaned from disciplinary groups and campuses throughout the nation. Updated to reflect the emphasis on student learning as the ultimate goal of college teaching, it incorporates new ideas and references from the literature. The most notable change in this edition is a discussion of peer review within special contexts for teaching, such as clinics, studios, and practice settings. The turn to active engagement in learning has also led to increased use of problem-based learning, the case study method, and other approaches that traditional forms for peer review do not address. Similarly, the explosion of the use of instructional technology calls for an articulation of new approaches to evaluating web-based instruction. [Abstract from Amazon]

Cohen, J. (2003). Documenting Teaching Excellence within Peer Review of Teaching.
      Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 58(2), 115-118.

Analyzes the basis of a valid peer review for teachers. Student ratings; Student testimonials; Classroom observation; Faculty reputation; Scholarship about teaching and learning. [Abstract from EBSCO*host*]

Cohen, P.A. & McKeachie, W.J. (1980). The role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching, *Improving College and University Teaching, 28*, 147-154.

In this article Peter A. Cohen (*Assistant Director of the Office of Instructional Services and Educational Research at Dartmouth College) and Wilbert J. McKeachie (*Director of the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching at the University of Michigan) state that the role of faculty colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching is not defined adequately. Therefore, a distinction must be made between summative evaluation conducted for administrative decisions and formative evaluations designed to improve teaching. [Abstract from editor]

French-Lazovik, G. (1981). Peer review: documentary evidence in the evaluation of teaching. In Milliam J (Ed). *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

[Abstract unavailable]

Gronlund, N.E. (2000). *How to Write and Use Instructional Objectives (6th Ed.)* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

[Abstract unavailable]

Hammersley-Fletcher, L., & Orsmond, P. (2004). Evaluating our peers: Is peer observation a meaningful process? *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 489-503.

Peer observation of teaching can be seen as a means by which the quality of the teaching and learning process in higher education establishments is both accounted for and improved. The majority of the literature to date has focused on the mechanisms for implementing peer observation systems and its links to enhanced professional practice. However, little attention has been given to the complexities involved in delivering the peer observation process, and how it may be managed and integrated in order to maximize benefits for teaching and learning. This article reports on an evaluation of two systems of the peer observation within one 'post 1992' university. It utilizes data from semi-structured interviews with lecturers, and identifies the need for a clear focus and goals. It also illustrates the necessity to see both the breadth and depth of the process. [Abstract from author]

Hutchings, P. (1996). *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE.

In this book, Pat Hutchings (*Vice President of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching) lays out nine chapters with nine strategies which faculty members can use to document and publicize their teaching; from the "teaching circle," to "course portfolios." The book includes case studies of faculty who have utilized each strategy and guidelines for good practice. [Abstract from editor]

Keig, L. & Waggoner, M.D. (1995). Collaborative peer review: The role of faculty in improving college teaching, *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2,* Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

In this report Larry Keig (*Adjunct Professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Counseling at the University of Northern Iowa College of Education) and Michael D. Waggoner (Associate Professor and Head of the Department of Educational Administration and Counseling at the Northern Iowa College of Education) argue for the central involvement of faculty in collaborative peer review for the improvement of college teaching. The authors discuss the possible roles of peers, some popular methods, case studies, and the possible benefits to students, faculty, and institutions. [Abstract from editor]

Killen, R. (1995). Improving teaching through reflective partnerships. *To Improve the Academy, 14,* 125-141.

In this paper, Roy Killen explains to the reader "how both experienced and inexperienced faculty can improve their teaching and their students' learning through a systematic process of reflecting on their day-to-day teaching by collaborating with a "reflective partner." [Abstract from editor]

Millis, B.J. (1987). Colleagues helping colleagues: A peer observation program model. *The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, *7(1),* 15-21.

[Abstract unavailable]

Paulsen, Michael B. (2002). Evaluating teaching performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2002 (114), 5-18.

Examines the fundamental concepts, principles, and practices that characterize the most effective of contemporary approaches to the evaluation of faculty teaching performance.
[Abstract from author]

Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation: A Critical Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

By comparing other evaluation systems being utilized across the United States, Peter Seldin (Distinguished Professor of Management Emeritus at Pace University) draws on over ten years of research to provide administrators and faculty with the opportunity to improve their evaluation practices. [Abstract from editor]

Shulman, L.S. (1995). The peer review of teaching: A framework for action: Three distinctions. *A Project Workbook.* Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

[Abstract unavailable]

*Titles at time of publication.

Appendices

Appendix A
Quality Matters Rubric Standards 2011-2013 edition with Assigned Point Values

QUALITY MATTERS PROGRAM — QM

For more information visit www.QMprogram.org or email info@qualitymatters.org

Quality Matters Rubric Standards 2011 - 2013 edition with Assigned Point Values

Standards			Points
Course Overview and Introduction	1.1	Instructions make clear how to get started and where to find various course components.	3
	1.2	Students are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.	3
	1.3	Etiquette expectations (sometimes called "netiquette") for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are stated clearly.	2
	1.4	Course and/or institutional policies with which the student is expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.	2
	1.5	Prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.	1
	1.6	Minimum technical skills expected of the student are clearly stated.	1
	1.7	The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and available online.	1
	1.8	Students are asked to introduce themselves to the class.	1
Learning Objectives (Competencies)	2.1	The course learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable.	3
	2.2	The module/unit learning objectives describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives.	3
	2.3	All learning objectives are stated clearly and written from the students' perspective.	3
	2.4	Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate and stated clearly.	3
	2.5	The learning objectives are appropriately designed for the level of the course.	3
Assessment and Measurement	3.1	The types of assessments selected measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources.	3
	3.2	The course grading policy is stated clearly.	3
	3.3	Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation and are tied to the course grading policy.	3
	3.4	The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the student work being assessed.	2
	3.5	Students have multiple opportunities to measure their own learning progress.	2
Instructional Materials	4.1	The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives.	3
	4.2	The purpose of instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.	3
	4.3	All resources and materials used in the course are appropriately cited.	2
	4.4	The instructional materials are current.	2
	4.5	The instructional materials present a variety of perspectives on the course content.	1
	4.6	The distinction between required and optional materials is clearly explained.	1
Learner Interaction and Engagement	5.1	The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives.	3
	5.2	Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.	3
	5.3	The instructor's plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.	3
	5.4	The requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.	2
Course Technology	6.1	The tools and media support the course learning objectives.	3
	6.2	Course tools and media support student engagement and guide the student to become an active learner.	3
	6.3	Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.	3
	6.4	Students can readily access the technologies required in the course.	2
	6.5	The course technologies are current.	1
Learner Support	7.1	The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to access it.	3
	7.2	Course instructions articulate or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.	3
	7.3	Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help students succeed in the course and how students can access the services.	2
	7.4	Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's student support services can help students succeed and how students can access the services.	1
Accessibility	8.1	The course employs accessible technologies and provides guidance on how to obtain accommodation.	3
	8.2	The course contains equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content.	2
	8.3	The course design facilitates readability and minimizes distractions.	2
	8.4	The course design accommodates the use of assistive technologies.	2

Appendix B
FACET/ILTE Peer Review Request Form

FACET/ILTE Peer Review Request Form

Requestor Information: (required for all peer reviews, any type)

Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

School: _____

Course to be reviewed: _____

Day / time taught: _____

Location _____

Semester: _____

General Education Course:

NA   Yes   Gen Ed Goal(s) being met_____

Teaching modality

Face-to-face   Hybrid   Online   Distance   Flipped

Type of Review:

General Formative   General Summative   Student Focus Group   Teaching Consultation

Topical Formative   Topic to be reviewed

Other: Please Describe   _____

Send a copy of the report to (optional)

Additional comments or information you would like to provide:

(Helpful information to include: (this is for third-year, FACET or required school review)

Mail to:
ILTE
Library 219 _____
FOR ILTE USE ONLY
Semester assigned_____   Semester to be completed_____
Reviewer Assigned:_____
Date:_____   Entered_____

Appendix C
FACET/ILTE Peer Review Report Format

Peer Reviewer:
Faculty Member Reviewed:

Dates of Classroom Observations (if applicable):

Narrative:
   Review of course goals and student learning objectives as outlined by faculty member. Be mindful of assessment mechanisms and grading rubrics.

   If applicable, provide general education details (category, assessment mechanism, etc.)

   Review of course materials provided to peer reviewer by faculty member.

   If applicable, description of the first observation conducted by the peer reviewer.

   If applicable, summary of feedback session to faculty member and what steps the faculty member planned on the basis of this feedback.

   If applicable, description of the second observation conducted.

   Summary of feedback session to faculty member and what steps the faculty member planned on the basis of this feedback.

Summary:
   In this section, the peer reviewer should pull together the entire process. Interpretation is okay here but should be used sparingly.

Recommendations (Formative reviews only):
   Based upon the entire process, what additional changes could the faculty member make?

Ranking:
   For summative reviews only, provide a ranking of Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. This ranking should be consistent with the discipline specific criteria of the instructor.

Appendix D
FACET/ILTE Student Focus Group Report Format

Peer Reviewer:

Course and Faculty Member Reviewed:

Date of Student Focus Group:

Narrative:

     Review of course goals and objectives as outlined by faculty member.

     Review of course materials provided to peer reviewer by faculty member.

     Listing of the questions asked of the students.

     Description of the interview process and the student reactions to the interview process.

     Summary of student comments. No interpretation of student comments should occur in this section.

Summary:

     In this section, the peer reviewer should pull together the student comments with their own impressions of the course materials. Interpretation is okay here but should be used sparingly.

Recommendations:

     Based upon student comments and the peer reviewer's review of course materials, what possible changes could the faculty member make?

Appendix E

FACET/ILTE Teaching Consultation Report Format

Peer Reviewer:
Faculty Member Reviewed:
Course or Courses Included in the Consultation:
Beginning Date of Consultation:
Ending Date of Consultation:

Narrative:

Review of Teaching Consultation goals and objectives as outlined by faculty member.

Plan of action developed by faculty member and teaching consultant.

For each item on the plan of action:
- Review related course goals and objectives

- Review related course materials

- Review areas of difficulty or concern

- Review methods to address difficulty or concern

- Review assessment methods

- Review feedback provided to faculty member

- Review faculty member's response to feedback

- Review faculty member's progress

Summary:

In this section, the peer reviewer should pull together a brief summary of the Teaching Consultation. Interpretation is okay here but should be used sparingly.

Recommendations (Formative consultation only):

Based upon materials reviewed, observations, and interactions with the faculty member, what additional steps need to be taken?

Ranking:

For summative consultations only, provide a ranking of Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. This ranking should be consistent with the discipline specific criteria of the instructor.

Appendix F
Suggested Format for Summative Review Letter

I. Introduction
   a. Use candidate's name, unit, and reason for letter.
   b. Describe the basis for your evaluation—teaching dossier, classroom observations, etc.
   c. State the standards used, e.g. "IU Southeast Psychology Dept. Standards for teaching that were provided to me."
   d. Give sentence bio of your relevant qualifications (FACET reviewer, taught for years in similar area, whatever)
   e. State whether you know candidate and if so, capacity
II. Body of letter
   a. In general, one paragraph per major standard/area.
       i. Give main idea "Professor X provides clear learning goals for students" or Professor X has been very active in curriculum design."
       ii. Give a few concrete examples.
       iii. Point out anything that is particularly unique or commendable
   b. If there is something outstanding that does not fit a standard, you may still include it.
III. Evaluative section
   a. End with a paragraph that clearly states your evaluation, using the terms that they use in criteria, e.g. excellent, satisfactory, unsatisfactory for IU Promotions. You can include more explanation and use other adjectives, but be sure to emphasize their "official" terms.
   b. Nuances
       i. Excellent cases
       ii. Be clear throughout about areas of strength.
   c. Satisfactory cases
       i. No need to be brutal—a lukewarm review with a "satisfactory" evaluation at the end is clear. (Damning with faint praise.) If something is particularly problematic, mention it.
   d. What if my evaluation is in between two standards? "Good?"
       i. You can say it is "good," but still use magic words.
       ii. "Overall, I would judge his teaching as very good. That is, he clearly surpasses the standard for "satisfactory, but does not quite reach the standard for excellence."
   e. Unsatisfactory cases
       i. You will need to be more specific about the problems and use the term "unsatisfactory" at the end.

Appendix G

DUS Study Abroad Assessment
Specific Student Learning Outcomes and Evidentiary Measures
(Student capabilities, capacities, and values)

Goal Area 1: DISCIPLINARY KNOWLEDGE
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Synthesize academic/disciplinary concepts with real world phenomena

Some examples of evidence:
- Identify approaches to solving a problem from multiple disciplines
- Infer relationships among various sources of information
- Apply disciplinary concepts to situations encountered abroad

2. Improve critical thinking skills

Some examples of evidence:
- Explain the issues involved in a particular problem
- Identify and critique assumptions in written and verbal arguments
- Analyze the context in which ideas and arguments are raised
- Evaluate alternative perspectives and explanations

3. Gain an international perspective of career/discipline

Some examples of evidence:
- Compare/contrast the way their academic disciplines are viewed and practiced in their host countries and the US (including use of particular research methods, dominant perspectives, etc.)
- Compare/contrast the way their chosen career fields are viewed and practiced in their host counties and the US (including status of career field, salaries, entry requirements, benefits, scope of work, etc.)

Goal Area 2: SOCIAL/EMOTIONAL GROWTH
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Build independence

Some examples of evidence:
- Record and describe instances of independent travel
- Record and describe instances of new knowledge acquired related to living in host country with little guidance or support

2. Gain self-confidence

Some examples of evidence:
- Describe instances of hardship or obstacles encountered and list strategies they employed to overcome them
- Employ new strategies for interacting effectively with other people in different situations
- Voice and defend views they hold that are unpopular

3. Develop self-awareness

Some examples of evidence:
- Identify events, situations, and people that have influenced their values, attitudes, perceptions, and sense of self
- Record and describe personal perspectives/attitudes that have changed as a result of study abroad
- Describe personal goals and life/career direction
- Catalog their strengths and weaknesses
- Identify their own emotions and evaluate their effect

4. Develop empathy

Some examples of evidence:
- Articulate a narrative that demonstrates the ability to perceive another's point of view
- Listen actively by verbally summarizing another individual's views in a sensitive manner
- Demonstrate a willingness to learn from those who are culturally different from themselves

5. Increase tolerance for ambiguity

Some examples of evidence:
- Choose to engage in situations and activities involving appropriate levels of risk
- Record and describe instances of situations in which they adapted their behavior to specific situations
- Use knowledge, diverse cultural frames of reference, and alternate perspectives to think critically and solve problems
- Demonstrate coping and resiliency skills in unfamiliar and challenging situations

Goal Area 3: STATE OF THE PLANET AWARENESS
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Develop awareness of the political and economic state-of-the-planet

Some examples of evidence:
- Provide examples of world conditions and global trends (i.e. relations of power in interlocking structures of class, race, and gender, and global governance bodies)
- Provide examples of economic and political interdependency among nations
- Reflect on the type of articles in the host country media compared to US media

2. Increase awareness of alternative transportation and housing options

Some examples of evidence:
- Compare and contrast transportation systems (use of cars versus greater use of bicycles and various forms of public transportation
- Reflect on living arrangements (use of individual houses versus greater use of apartments)
- Articulate other lifestyle arrangements that exemplify methods of saving energy and reducing impact on the environment

3. Increase tolerance for living in regions of the world that have alternative or more challenging physical environments

Some examples of evidence:
- Report on strategies used to deal with extreme cold or heat, heavy rains, and other aspects of climate
- Consider how mountains, rivers, beaches, and other physical aspects of the environment affect everyday activities and provide different types of recreational opportunities

Goal Area 4: INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Explore the nature of culture, in general

Some examples of evidence:
- Define culture and identify a range of life practices that are affected by culture
- Describe various cultural rituals and practices of their own culture

2. Gain specific knowledge of host culture

Some examples of evidence:
- Describe various cultural rituals and practices of the host culture

- Interpret specific cultural rituals and practices in light of some of the foundational aspects and beliefs of their host society

3. Become conscious of one's own cultural perspective

Some examples of evidence:
- Articulate a narrative that demonstrates an understanding of their home culture in global and comparative context (i.e. recognizing that the home culture is one of many diverse cultures and that alternate perceptions and behaviors may be based in cultural differences)
- Reflect on the part of their identities that are culturally-derived

4. Engage diverse expressions of culture

Some examples of evidence:
- Compare, contrast, and evaluate elements of their own culture and host cultures (attitudes, values, ways of thinking/learning)
- Record and describe a variety of interactions with diverse individuals both while abroad and once returned
- Interpret issues and situations from more than one cultural perspective

5. Develop international goodwill and global citizenship

Some examples of evidence:
- Articulate a narrative that demonstrates appreciation for various cultural frames of reference as well as the language, art, religion, philosophy, and material artifacts of different cultures
- Demonstrate a resistance to cultural stereotyping
- Choose to engage in diverse cultural situations

6. Adapt effectively in cross-cultural settings

Some examples of evidence:
- Provide examples of situations in which they adapted their behavior to interact effectively with those who are different in various situations, such as academic settings, social venues, and professional/work environments
- Provide examples of situations in which they collaborated with individuals who are different in order to accomplish something of mutual interest or need
- Demonstrate proficiency in the host language
- Describe verbal and non-verbal communication patterns or customs of the host culture that may differ from communication patterns or customs in the home culture

Goal Area 5: LANGUAGE LEARNING
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Improve language competency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing

Some examples of evidence:
- Describe and provide evidence of language improvement in speaking and listening
- Describe and provide evidence of language improvement in reading and writing
- Reflect on the limitations of one's own language in communicating across cultures

2. Engage with others in the host language

Some examples of evidence:
- Articulate a narrative that demonstrates improved comfort in conversing in the host language
- Reflect on the potential for misunderstanding with language
- Describe instances of conversations with host country individuals/groups in the host language
- Seek out opportunities to continue studying and practicing the host language upon return to campus

Goal Area 6: LIFELONG LEARNING
Through study abroad, students will be able to:

1. Pursue continuous global learning

Some examples of evidence:
- Identify and engage in opportunities for cross-cultural, international, and comparative learning
- Choose to participate in global opportunities on campus upon re-entry
- Maintain ties with host country and culture

2. Explore international opportunities after graduation

Some examples of evidence:
- Identify opportunities for post-graduation service, such as Peace Corps or other international service organizations
- Identify major companies and organizations in student's career field that may provide opportunities to work abroad
- Identify universities and/or nationally competitive scholarship programs that will provide opportunities for academic study or research in an international context
- Articulate skills learned abroad in resumes, cover letters, and job interviews

Appendix H
FACET/ILTE Junior Faculty Peer Review Timeline

FACET policy on peer review:
- Peer review is a process, not an event.
- Peer Reviews are only conducted at your request.

Two types of peer review: Summative and Formative
- Formative reviews are the confidential property of the faculty member and should only be summarized in the faculty member's dossier.
- Summative reviews are sent to both the faculty member and an identified administrative person (or persons) and can be included in dossiers. Reviewers understand that their report may be used when making personnel decisions.

Suggested Timeline

Year One, Fall or Spring Semester:
Internal Formative Review
- Someone from your department or school should perform a basic review to insure minimal school/department expectations are being met and that you are being supported.
- Ideally, one or more senior faculty in your discipline will contact you about observing your class.
- Contact ILTE during the spring of your first year to schedule a peer review for the following fall.

Year Two, Fall Semester:
Formative Peer Review
- The ILTE will match you with a FACET Peer Reviewer based in the information provided in the request form.
- Additional types of peer review are available including Student Focus Groups; contact the ILTE for additional information.

Year Two, Spring Semester:
- Implement one or more of the recommendations from your peer review.
- Document the process to show growth. The documentation can be used in annual reports, etc.

Year Three, Fall Semester:
- Document your results in your dossier.
- Consider requesting a second formative peer review for another course or to address remaining concerns.
- Consider requesting a summative peer review that would be conducted in the spring and might be useful for promotion/tenure.