Senate Committee on Teaching and Advisement

Peer Teaching Observation Tool Revision Sub-Committee

Adelphi's original form:

https://faculty.adelphi.edu/wp-content/blogs.dir/952/files/2018/02/Guidelines-and-Form-for-Peer-Observation-PDF-.pdf

- Outlines pre- and post-meetings along with observation itself
- Identifies 3 key areas of observation including 1. **Subject matter**, highlighting course objectives, 2. **Presentation**, with teaching methods and technologies, and 3. **Student engagement**
- Concluding summary outlines performance strengths and areas of improvement
- Bears some resemblance to institutions such as Harvard or Cornell: e.g. https://bokcenter.harvard.edu/class-observations-grad

Collective Bargaining Agreement Language: Purposes (peer observation and pro dev)

"The UPRC, Chair, Dean, and faculty member to be observed will agree upon a list of **tenured faculty members who may perform an observation**. The Dean will then select a faculty member from the list to perform the observation. The observation report and the faculty member's response, if any, shall be forwarded to the UPRC. Normally, the UPRC will simply forward the observation to the Dean. If, however, the peer observation report identifies instructional concerns, the UPRC will forward the report to the Dean with the specific recommendations for professional development.

In circumstances where **recommendations for improvements are made, the faculty member shall be apprised that opportunities for professional development are available and shall participate in such opportunities**. The faculty member may request reasonable funding to support their participation in such professional development. Such requests will not be unreasonably denied. The Union shall be provided with a report each year describing the professional development afforded to faculty under this Article."

Collective Bargaining Agreement Language: Procedures for untenured/tenured

"Numerous studies have shown the value of a faculty member review system for both the faculty member and the University is a function of how well it is integrated into a professional development program. University resources will be committed to a faculty development program."

For untenured faculty "at least two peer observations of professional performance"

For tenured faculty:

"Every five (5) years each Dean will initiate a peer observation process for each tenured faculty member within his/her school. The Dean and the UPRC will participate in this process with the faculty member."

Collective Bargaining Agreement Language: Amendments (instrument and supplements)

"Any modification to the current peer evaluation instrument for the assessment of teaching by faculty to be used by the peer evaluator (and the Dean if necessary) may be proposed by the administration or the Union. **A representative committee of faculty** will be appointed by the Faculty Senate to work with the **Provost** and the **Deans** to develop such modification(s). Each Unit/department may also modify the supplemental portion of the faculty evaluation for its own Unit/department through meetings of the Unit Peer Review Committee (**UPRC**) and the Dean. Any modifications must be sent to the **Union**.

Peer observations of teaching will use standardized procedures that will have **evidence of their reliability and validity**. The current template will continue to be used except upon mutual agreement of the parties."

Proposed Form Revisions 1

https://docs.google.com/document/d/10-7b4SiEX9uDKfBi-D6XmB690vFNkr5C0vYwUPeZ5wQ/edit

- Members/units that have been (or will be) included: FSCTA, SCAIT, SEC, FCPE, FCRTP, ASC (including UPRC chairs), AAUP, Provost's Office (Liz Ciabocchi), College of Health Sci & Ed Tech Committee
- mostly updating learning platforms and clarity of language around the online environment so far (with lengthy discussions of how to approach this task):

Our existing peer review form under Item 2, #2 states: "Please comment on the utilization of appropriate methods and instructional technology"

It then lists "Blackboard, tables and charts, overhead projector, powerpoint, video, audio, scale model . . ."

We could perhaps start here with items from the rubrics and models below like the following: **"For online and blended courses in particular: Course management systems (Moodle/ Canvas/ Googleclassroom), Voicethread/Panopto, audio/video (e.g. YouTube clip), Zoom/ Googlehangout, Powerpoint/Prezi, etc.)"**

Proposed Form Revisions 2

https://docs.google.com/document/d/10-7b4SiEX9uDKfBi-D6XmB690vFNkr5C0vYwUPeZ5wQ/edit

*Section III question 1 could also be edited to reflect online and blended learning more fully:

1. Please comment on the Faculty member's ability to engage the attention of the students.

(For example, levels of student attentiveness, responsiveness, evidence of students being challenged, moving around class, changing formats, the kinds of questions students ask, voice tone, pacing, eye contact with students, etc.)

We could add a note on dimensions for online and blended courses:

"For online and blended courses, examples might include discussion posts with clarifying questions or additional suggestions for students, a variety of accessible modalities and building complexity of individual activities within the module being observed, links/referrals to appropriate campus online resources pertaining to learning goals such as Writing Center online chats or LibGuides, and/or use of instructor video/podcast/googlehangout to provide synchronous and asynchronous interaction that promotes additional student engagement."

Possible area for support?

"Tenured faculty who will be acting as observers will attend an orientation class taught at the Faculty Center For Professional Excellence."

Perhaps this would be a good starting point for a moodle or other course with the Quality Matters and other rubrics for faculty observers?

Adjunct Faculty Handbook - QM content

""**Course Quality**

Adelphi's online and blended courses are carefully designed and taught by our full-time and part-time faculty. Adelphi faculty focus on maintaining the same level of quality in online courses as on-campus, face-to-face courses. Engagement, personalized learning environments, interactivity and media rich content are paramount.

Many faculty use the Quality Matters Rubric provided by the Quality Matters Higher Education Program, a nationally recognized program designed to certify the quality of online courses and online components, as a guide for online course development. Faculty may also choose to use their own proven standards of quality for online teaching and learning.

Online and blended courses are evaluated and approved in the same manner as our on-campus, face-to-face courses."

Other Suggestions

*Some School of Education faculty involved in the revision of student teacher/candidate observation in K-12 classrooms suggested a focus on formative and summative evaluation with teaching observations over time, as well as discipline-specific tailoring of the observation itself

See examples here:

https://www.celt.iastate.edu/teaching/document-your-teaching/peer-observation-of-teaching-best-practices/

*Previous SCTA chairs helpfully noted that we have had a tradition of informal and formalized teaching observations and an **AU network** (needing updates) of faculty willing to be observed: https://fcpe.adelphi.edu/resource/committee-on-teaching-and-advisement/teaching-connections/peer-observations/

Next steps…

- Greater representation on subcommittee from those teaching online and blended courses?

- Sharing with Senate and full faculty to prioritize immediate and long-term approved changes across units? (Individual units/departments/disciplines might also make related discipline-specific changes via associated UPRCs)

- Other suggestions?