Peer Evaluation of Courses/Teaching in GSLL[1] [DRAFT]

Purpose
This document provides background information about peer classroom observation and proposes a system and peer evaluation form whereby faculty can be evaluated on their courses and teaching. A copy of this document should be attached to peer observation protocols submitted for reappointment, promotion, and tenure review.

Background
Unstructured peer classroom observation, i.e., those that are not based on a set of core criteria, can result in inconsistency and do not always address teaching practices that are valued by a department (AAAS, 2012). For this reason, the scholarly literature on teaching evaluation recommends that academic units spell out the best teaching practices for their field and define core criteria to use in the observation process (AAAS, 2012, Cornell). Feedback on teaching can be more effective in promoting growth and improvement when it focuses on specific issues, contains concrete information, and is based on specific data (rather than general impressions) (Brinko, 1993). To that end, a group of five instructors and faculty from the Department of Germanic & Slavic Languages & Literatures, partnering with facilitators from the NSF-funded Teaching Quality Framework (TQF) Initiative, have developed new standardized protocols for peer classroom observation that align with the TQF Initiative and are based on an established measure, the UTeach Observation Protocol (UTOP), developed at the University of Texas at Austin.

How the protocols will be used for evaluation of teaching in GSLL
These standardized tools, which replace the unstructured letters previously submitted for Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Review, contribute to the consistency and rigor of our evaluation of teaching, our comparison of teaching practices over time, and our development of a shared vision for teaching practice in GSLL. In addition, it is our hope that the structured form will better enable more formative assessment and self-reflection on teaching practices.

For reappointment, promotion, and tenure review, the instructor under review submits all classroom observation protocols completed by their peers to the PUEC. The instructor will also have the opportunity to reflect on these protocols when writing their teaching statements for reappointment, promotion, and tenure review, and in writing their self-reflection for annual merit review.

Table 1. Alignment of GSLL Peer Classroom Observation protocol items with components of effective classroom teaching from the TQF rubric. Protocol items that do not specify Content or Language Courses are common to both protocols.

Component of effective classroom teaching	Corresponding items in the Peer Observation Protocols
Goals, Content, and Alignment *What are students expected to learn from the courses taught? Are course goals appropriately challenging? Is content aligned with the curriculum and integrate other topics and/or courses?*	A3) Learning Goals A6) Prior Knowledge
Preparation for Teaching *Did the instructor demonstrate sufficient content, background, and pedagogical knowledge? Was the instructor well-prepared in terms of classroom mechanics (e.g. grading, prepping activities, materials, tech use, etc.)?*	A2) Tools and Resources A5) Active Learning A7) Depth (Content Courses) A9) Accuracy (Language Courses)
Methods and Teaching Practices *What assignments, assessments, and activities are implemented? Are methods appropriate for and aligned with the learning environment, the student population (inclusive ed, course level) and departmental, course, and student goals?*	A4) Participation A5) Active Learning A8) Critical Thinking (Content Courses) A8) Corrective Feedback (Language Courses) C1) Instructor strengths/expertise
Presentation and Student Interaction *Are methods from above implemented effectively? Are students supported (e.g. student/teacher interaction)?*	A4) Participation A7) Engagement (Language Courses)
Student outcomes *What impact do these courses have on learners? What evidence shows the level of student understanding? Are measures of learning (shift in student performance as a result of class/instruction) aligned with goals?*	A4) Participation A8) Corrective Feedback (Language Courses)

References Cited

American Association for the Advancement of Science. 2012. *Describing and Measuring Undergraduate STEM Practices*. A Report from a National Meeting on the Measurement of Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Teaching. https://live-ccliconference.pantheonsite.io/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Measuring-STEM-Teaching-Practices.pdf

Brinko, K.T. 1993. The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching: What is effective? *The Journal of Higher Education* 64(5): 574-593. Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2959994