Developing a comprehensive system of evaluating courses and teaching effectiveness

September 23, 2021
Report and Recommendations of the Special Senate Committee for Evaluating Course and Teaching Effectiveness

Table of Contents

1. PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS AT MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY

The aim of this proposal is to provide an optional process for peer review. This process supports teaching development and effectiveness while assisting Academic Staff Members (ASMs) and instructors with creating materials and providing documentation to be used in teaching dossiers employed by tenure and promotion and teaching award committees. As such, this proposal for peer review procedures at Memorial aims to provide ASMs and instructors with resources to support their work and careers both pre- and post-tenure. The process can be employed by instructors for formative, summative, or diagnostic assessment:

- **Formative peer evaluation** aims to provide constructive feedback on teaching; used for improvement of teaching practice as a means of professional development.
- **Diagnostic peer evaluation** seeks to identify areas for improvement in teaching, be it in course materials (plans, content, readings, etc.), delivery or assessment of student learning, and to provide constructive feedback.
- **Summative peer evaluation** aims to assess the degree to which the instructor implements effective teaching practices, as outlined by pre-identified criteria; used for decision-making purposes (e.g., tenure, promotion, and awards).

Peer review is a central professional practice in academic work, and can support both the development and assessment of teaching and increase professional recognition of the scholarly work of teaching and learning as central to our academic mission. This process and the related instruments shall be overseen and reviewed at regular intervals (at least every 10 years, as noted below) by the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning. It is proposed that the Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) house and manage the instruments / forms, information and resources, training in peer review, and website of peer reviewers. The committee recognizes that this will likely require additional resources. While this work overlaps with some areas for which CITL is responsible (providing information and resources on effective teaching practices), it also places additional responsibility in their purview (e.g. provision of training to reviewers, hosting and maintaining the website, constructing the forms as per the proposed guidelines).

Formative Context

This proposed model for peer review of teaching effectiveness draws upon peer review processes at five other institutions, as well as literature on criteria and methods of assessing teaching effectiveness. This proposal also relies upon and draws from the CAUT document referenced in the MUNFA Collective Agreement (CA) (Clauses 11.29 (a) and 12.13(a)) and works to provide a bridge between the CA and that document in supporting ASMs' and instructors' scholarly work as teachers.

Many institutions have implemented peer review processes as an additional way to collect information on or provide assessment of teaching practice. For this work, materials were reviewed from University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, University of Toronto, Texas A and M University and The University of New South Wales (Godbout-Kinney, 2020). The Canadian universities were included because a) they employ a peer review of teaching process, and b) they had public details available describing the process. University of Alberta identified Texas A and M in their material, and the University of New South Wales was identified in the grey lit as an exemplar institution for the peer review process. The review of these institutions reveals the following five common elements that indicate best practice.

- The process should clearly indicate if the peer review aim is formative, summative, diagnostic or some combination thereof.
- Goals for any peer review process should be clearly established.
- Peer reviewers should receive training in the peer review process.
- Optimally, an institution will have a pool of reviewers from which instructors choose.
- Criteria should be set to increase consistency of reviews, while flexibility should be incorporated by having instructors choose which of the set criteria will be employed for the review process. This supports appropriate peer review for a range of teaching approaches and formats, and can include a fuller range of desired outcomes of the peer review process (e.g., formative, diagnostic, or summative; focused, or broad ranging).

Statement of Purpose for Peer Review of Teaching Process

The purpose of the proposed, optional, peer review process for teaching is to:

1) Support the professional development of ASMs and instructors through the process of peer review of teaching, both in performing as a reviewer, or being reviewed.
2) Create positive effects on teaching and learning culture at Memorial (e.g., support the recognition of teaching as central scholarly work in congruence with the Collective Agreement; increase the legibility of teaching accomplishments; provide clear pathways for achieving and assessing competence and excellence in teaching).
3) Provide scaffolding and tools for ASMs and instructors to use in promotion and tenure processes and award submissions and decisions, as well as feedback that can be formative (i.e., contributes to teacher development), summative (i.e., can be used for decision-point assessments on an ASM or instructor's effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher), or diagnostic (i.e. to provide peer assistance 'trouble-shooting' with particular aspects of teaching and learning).

Optimally, this peer review process will support development and assessment of practices that lead to teaching effectiveness and scholarly competence and contribute to the teaching excellence envisioned by Memorial's Teaching and Learning Framework, Memorial's Strategic Framework for Indigenization, and equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives related to teaching and learning. Throughout this proposed process for peer review of teaching, the committee has worked to incorporate the intention of "acknowledging diverse career paths, traditions and values, ways of knowing, and forms of communicating knowledge" (MUNFA Collective Agreement, p. 40). This has been done by providing a process where flexibility and variation both on the foci of review, and the criteria used are central components.

Peer Review of Teaching and Collective Agreements at Memorial

Any system for evaluating teaching effectiveness must respect the terms of Memorial University's collective agreements with the Faculty Association (MUNFA) and the Lecturer's Union (LUMUN). While both collective agreements are silent on the issue of peer review, both require that instructors at Memorial demonstrate competence and effectiveness in teaching. Additionally, both collective agreements explicitly recognize the academic freedom of ASMs and instructors.

Memorial has committed to respecting academic freedom. Therefore, peer evaluation procedures should in no way undermine an ASM's or instructor's ability to teach material they deem appropriate, using methods they deem appropriate. The proposed procedures for peer evaluation of competence and effectiveness in teaching are therefore first and foremost, optional, and also flexible enough to allow for differences with respect to teaching approaches, methods, and course content.

MUNFA COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

In the MUNFA Collective Agreement, there is no reference to how a peer evaluation of a candidate's teaching effectiveness might be conducted. As such, any initiative to implement a process for peer evaluation of teaching must be initiated by the ASM or instructor of their own volition.

The collective agreement is clear that recommendations and decisions for tenure and promotion are based on the evaluation of the submitted documentation by the faculty member following the suggestions in the CAUT Teaching Dossier (which is included in Appendix B of the MUNFA Collective agreement). The MUNFA Collective Agreement relies upon the CAUT Teaching Dossier (2007) to provide guidance on peer review. In section 3.2.6 of the CAUT document it suggests the inclusion of "Statements from colleagues who have observed teaching either as members of a teaching team or as independent observers of a particular course, or who teach other sections of the same course" (p. 18). The collective agreement, through the CAUT document therefore supports a peer review process as a means for collecting statements from colleagues about teaching effectiveness. The process outlined here is one among many possible routes toward documenting teaching effectiveness.

LUMUN COLLECTIVE AGREEMENT

Per Course Instructors (PCIs) are covered under the LUMUN PCI collective agreement. Teaching evaluation of PCIs is not a peer-based approach under the collective agreement as evaluations are the responsibility of the Administrative Head. There is no reference to peer review of a PCI's teaching in any of the relevant clauses in the LUMUN agreement. Similar to MUNFA, any such process should only be done at the initiative of the individual PCI to be used in building a teaching dossier, or for self-directed diagnostic or teaching development purposes.

Addressing Bias

Part of the task of Special Senate Committee on Evaluating Course and Teaching Effectiveness (ECTE) is to address the problematic nature of student evaluations of teaching, which are prey to implicit and explicit bias (Bandy, 2015; Hahn and Gawronski, 2019; MacNeil, Driscoll and Hunt, 2015; Mengel, Sauermann and Zölitz, 2017). The committee recognizes however, that implicit bias also influences peer review, a fact acknowledged by the Canada Tri-Council Agencies' unconscious bias training module[1]. As such, peer review of teaching effectiveness does not completely resolve biases that present in student evaluations of teaching. To address this, the proposed process suggests:

1) mandatory unconscious bias training for reviewers and available peer review training;
2) active involvement of ASMs and instructors in selecting foci and criteria for review;

[1] For details, see https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/bias/module-eng.aspx?pedisable=false

3) use of multiple reviewers for summative purposes (e.g. assessment for tenure and promotion or award candidacy); and
4) structured opportunity for instructor response to review(s).

The incorporation of these four components works to address possible bias, as well as other challenges presented by formalizing procedures for peer evaluation of teaching competence and effectiveness. These additional challenges include the possibility that interpersonal conflict may play out in the peer review process, and workplace stress and anxiety may be provoked by peer evaluation.

Criteria for Proposed Procedures

Given the above-noted concerns, and the contexts provided by collective agreements with MUNFA and LUMUN, the sub-committee on peer review of teaching competence and effectiveness recommends procedures for peer review which are:

1) Flexible: Procedures proposed for peer review aim to accommodate differences across schools, faculties, departments, units, and individuals with respect to what constitutes appropriate teaching methods, style, and course content. There may be other such areas not identified here, which require accommodation.
2) Responsive: The formal procedures proposed aim to clearly respond to the above-listed concerns with respect to bias, interpersonal conflict, and workplace stress.
3) Optional and Consensual: As the collective agreements are silent on peer review, it cannot be mandated. The proposed formalized procedures should be understood as producing a supportive mechanism for documenting and improving teaching competence and effectiveness, of which interested ASMs and instructors can avail, but which is not mandatory.

Proposed Peer Review of Teaching Procedures

The following sections present a flexible template of procedures that can be adapted to accommodate differences across schools, faculties, departments, units and individual educators. They are designed to be adapted to meet the goals set by the instructor for any peer review process that is undertaken.

SELECTION OF FOCI OF ASSESSMENT

The focus of assessment in a peer review is determined by the instructor. It may include, for example, peer observation, clinical observation, or review of teaching and learning materials, activities, or artifacts.

TEACHING AND LEARNING MATERIALS, ACTIVITIES AND ARTIFACTS

A variety of teaching and learning materials, activities, and artifacts may be selected for consideration during the peer review process. Instructors and ASMs should clearly identify any artifacts or activities to be assessed in their review. Choice of artifacts, activities or both will vary according to the purpose of the review. A formative review for teaching development could, for example, seek focused feedback on specific artifacts or activities, while a summative review for assessment purposes is recommended to include a broader range of artifacts, materials, or activities to provide a fuller picture of an educator's practice. Lastly, a diagnostic review will focus on the area the instructor seeks more focused support and feedback (i.e. feedback on a particular assignment or teaching activity).

Artifacts, materials and activities may include, but are not limited to, the items listed below. This list may be further customized by the instructor to reflect the products of teaching and learning that are unique to their instructional practice. For a summative review (which produces material that supports a comprehensive teaching dossier to be submitted for assessment), it is recommended that three to five foci be identified for review to ensure both range and depth of review. Some possible foci are outlined in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Foci for Peer Review

FOCI	EXAMPLES
REFLECTIVE PRACTICE	• STATEMENT OF TEACHING PHILOSOPHY • POST-TEACHING REFLECTIONS • STUDENT EVALUATIONS • DESCRIPTION OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS IN TEACHING • POSSIBLE PLANS FOR REDESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION
PLANNING & DESIGN	• LESSON PLANS • ARTICULATED GOALS, TEACHING OBJECTIVES, OR LEARNING OUTCOMES • SYLLABI
CONTENT	• ONLINE COURSE CONTENT (E.G. ONLINE MODULES) • DESCRIPTION & RATIONALE FOR CHOSEN INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD, STRATEGY, OR ACTIVITY
ASSESSMENT	• ASSIGNMENTS OR ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES • TESTS OR EXAMS • EVALUATION RUBRICS • SAMPLES OF WRITTEN FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS
OBSERVATION	• DIRECT OBSERVATION OF TEACHING (IN-PERSON OR ONLINE SYNCHRONOUS, MAY BE RECORDINGS)

SELECTION OF SUCCESS INDICATORS AND CRITERIA FOR ASSESSMENT

In addition to selecting foci for assessment, criteria must be chosen that will be used to evaluate the competence and effectiveness of those materials or practices. The following list provides suggested criteria for review and assessment; however, this list is neither comprehensive nor are all criteria applicable in every circumstance. For a summative review intended to inform decision points it is advisable to include 5-10 criteria. Fewer than five may result in an insufficient range, more than ten may result in insufficient depth of review.

1) Clear communication of desired student learning outcomes (e.g., the skills, processes, or material to be learned, practiced or mastered)
2) Clear communication of course material and content
3) Clear communication of assessment methods

4) Responsive communication with students
5) Promotes student engagement with material
6) Appropriate use of teaching technology to enrich student learning
7) Preparedness and organization
8) Clear connection between desired learning outcomes and student assessments
9) Encouragement of student-instructor interactions that support learner engagement and student success
10) Promotion of classroom community that supports collaborative learning
11) Encourages student reflection to support learner engagement and knowledge retention
12) Encourages or provides opportunity for appropriate application, or practice or both
13) Recognizes and supports a wide range of learning styles
14) Creativity of assessment techniques and assignments
15) Creativity of relaying course material, content or both
16) Provides rational progression through material, content, or skills to support depth of engagement or preparation for future learning, or both
17) Displays knowledge of and capacity to implement curricular and instructional design attentive to equity, diversity, and inclusion
18) Displays knowledge of and capacity to implement curricular and instructional design attentive to indigenization
19) Promotes a respectful learning environment for all
20) Creates materials and resources that support desired programme, disciplinary, or institutional goals and outcomes (i.e. displays strategic engagement with desired outcomes for students that extend beyond the course itself).
21) Ability to encourage engaged discussion and student-centred learning
22) Displays knowledge of and engagement with scholarship of teaching and learning
23) Contributes to a vibrant, reflective, and engaged teaching and learning culture within the institution

PEER REVIEW TEAM MEMBER ROLES

Peer review of teaching involves several active participants, including both the instructor or ASM, and the reviewers. Ideally, peer review of teaching can help provide feedback for development and growth (formative) as well as feedback that can be used in creating a teaching dossier to inform decision-making assessments (summative). It can also be used for diagnostic purposes at the initiation of the instructor.

Reviewers may include educational developers and instructional designers when the purpose of the review is formative or diagnostic. For summative review, it is recommended that ASMs or instructors who are experienced in teaching serve as the peer review team. Experienced ASMs and instructors are encouraged to consider incorporating their work as teaching and learning peer reviewers in their own teaching dossiers to provide further documentation in support of applications for promotion or nominations for awards. The recognition of peer review activity as a form of teaching effectiveness in and of itself will likely incentivize ASMs and instructors to participate as peer reviewers. Potential peer reviewers will be nominated or self-nominated for inclusion in the peer review pool, as per the process outlined below to identify reviewers. An application form should include:

- Name
- Department

- Rank or Role
- Area(s) of content expertise (discipline, sub disciplines, etc.)
- Areas of pedagogical expertise and experience (types of assessment, forms of delivery, etc.)
- A brief statement of the nominated reviewer's suitability for the role (200 - 300 words)
- Signature of nominator (unless self-nominated)
- Signature of nominee

IDENTIFICATION OF REVIEWERS

A 'pool' of teaching peer reviewers will be identified following the process below. All faculties, schools, and departments are encouraged to nominate reviewers for this 'pool', such that there is choice of reviewers in the event there is a conflict of interest identified with one or more reviewers and the ASM or instructor being evaluated.

In consultation with the University Conflict of Interest Committee (COI), it was determined that serving as a reviewer does not preclude someone from serving on that instructor's Promotion and Tenure Committee. All peer reviewers shall:

1) be nominated by colleagues and/or department heads, or through self-nomination (a draft nomination form is included in Appendix A);
2) complete unconscious bias training (through existing online training modules used by the university);
3) complete a workshop on peer review of teaching facilitated by CITL staff; and
4) following this process of nomination, and training, the peer reviewer is listed in the pool of peer reviewers.

CITL will not participate in the peer review process directly unless the assistance of Course Developers or Instructional Designers is requested by an instructor or ASM as part of a formative review process. However, this proposed process does recommend that CITL offer nominated ASMs and instructors training in the peer review process, and that the information on the pool of available reviewers be hosted and maintained on the CITL website. This will likely require additional resources, as this is work that would be done in addition to existing tasks of the unit.

Information about the members of the peer review pool will be made publicly available on a website hosted by CITL. This public listing of the Memorial pool of reviewers will contribute to a teaching and learning community that extends beyond Memorial; providing information on possible external reviewers to colleagues at other institutions; and publicly validating the professional accomplishment of experienced educators. Details related to the reviewers to be publicly listed will include:

1) The reviewer's area of content expertise (discipline, sub disciplines, etc.).
2) The reviewer's areas of pedagogical expertise and experience (types of assessment, forms of delivery, etc.).
3) A brief bio and statement of teaching philosophy. A photograph (optional) may accompany this bio and statement.

It is within in the purview of peer reviewers to assess their capacity to perform requested peer reviews, and accept or decline requests to perform peer review.

Role of Reviewers

It is the role of peer reviewers to:

1) Self-assess their current capacity to perform requested peer reviews and respond to requests in a timely manner.
2) If requested, meet with the instructor or ASM to discuss teaching goals.
3) Review and assess selected artifacts and activities of teaching and learning (this may include direct observation of teaching or review of recorded teaching).
4) Provide written feedback, reflection, or assessment for formative and summative reviews.
5) If requested, meet with the instructor or ASM to discuss assessment of artifacts of teaching and learning provided.

Role of the Instructor

It is the role of the ASM or instructor to:

1) Choose if they will employ peer review for either professional development, or as part of their work to documenting teaching effectiveness.
2) Select reviewers to request to perform the desired review for their own assessment (this selection should include reflection on/rationale for requested selection connected to the instructor's teaching practice and any areas identified for development). This reflection or rationale will be provided to the reviewer.
3) Select the teaching and learning materials, artifacts, and activities for review in their assessment.
4) Select the success indicators or criteria to be used in their review of teaching and learning materials, artifacts, and activities.
5) Respond in writing to reviewers' reflections and assessment, as desired.
6) If the review is being conducted for both formative or diagnostic ***and*** summative assessment (that is, teaching development and decision point assessment), the instructor may choose to incorporate reviews and responses into their Teaching Dossier. In such cases, it is recommended that full reviews be included in the appendix if referenced in the dossier.

TIMING

In determining the timing of a peer review, scheduling, estimated time to complete, and frequency should be taken into consideration.

Peer reviews should be scheduled at times deemed appropriate by the instructor and when peer reviewers are available. It is recommended that peer reviews occur between weeks 3 and 12 of a semester (weeks 2 and 5 of a six-week session). This will allow participants to avoid the busiest times of a semester, or session.

ESTIMATED TIME REQUIREMENTS FOR PEER REVIEWERS

- Initial meeting with ASM or instructor and any other participating reviewers, including any preparation required—1-2 hours.
- Document and artifact review – 3-5 hours; includes review of selected materials and preparation of report (feedback and reflection), and if requested, meeting with ASM or instructor to discuss comments and assessment.

- Peer observation – 3-5 hours; includes in-class observation or review of recorded teaching, preparation of letter (feedback, reflection, assessment), and if requested, meeting with ASM or instructor to discuss comments and assessment.

FREQUENCY

- Formative (i.e. to support professional development in teaching) – at the request of instructors.
- Diagnostic – ad hoc, as requested by instructor
- Summative (i.e. to support decision point assessments) – It is recommended that instructors who choose to employ a peer review process as part of documenting teaching effectiveness engage the peer review process at least one year preceding submission of applications for renewal, tenure, or promotion, or one year before the deadline for teaching award nominations.

STEPS

The table below, Table 2, outlines the steps involved in conducting the peer review and indicates who is responsible for carrying out each step. It should be noted that the process is initiated and guided by the instructor undergoing review, who selects and requests the reviewer(s), identifies the goals of the review (formative, summative or diagnostic) and chooses the foci and criteria for assessment. The intention is to provide the framework for a process that can be used to meet a range of purposes.

As with all aspects of this process, the steps outlined below are intended to be flexible and may be adapted or customized. Additionally, some units may have unique settings that will require custom solutions (e.g. clinical settings in nursing).

Table 2

Suggested Peer Review Steps and Participants

	STEP	CONDUCTED BY
1)	Reviewer(s) selected and requested. The Instructor being reviewed selects and requests from the pool of trained peer reviewers available (see “Peer Review Team Member Roles,” above). The instructor decides how many reviewers will be used for the review process being initiated. A team of three reviewers is recommended for summative reviews to ensure a range and balance of perspectives and to increase reliability of the assessment; only one reviewer may be required for formative and diagnostic assessments. N.B. If an instructor would like to have someone perform peer review that is not selected from the pool, it is recommended that the person selected receive training from CITL prior to commencing the review process, and complete unconscious bias training.	The instructor

2)	Identification of goals, foci, and criteria for assessment. The instructor will identify and articulate their goals for the review (whether formative or summative, focused or wide-ranging). They will then select the teaching & learning materials, activities, and artifacts to be reviewed (3-5 foci), and identify the criteria that will be used in assessing those foci (5-10).	The instructor
3)	Initial meeting takes place. An initial meeting of the instructor and the reviewer(s) should take place to: a) discuss goals and the foci of assessment. b) identify and customize instruments to be used during the review (see "Instruments", below). c) Establish a timeline for the review.	The instructor; the reviewer(s). May invite input from an instructional designer or educational developer.
4)	Conduct the review. Following the agreed-upon timeline, the reviewers will conduct the review, incorporating the selected instruments and the foci of assessment.	The reviewer(s), in consultation with the instructor. May invite input from an instructional designer or educational developer.
5)	Provide feedback to the instructor. The reviewer(s) will prepare documented feedback, to be provided to the instructor. The feedback document should include: a) any completed instruments used in the review b) a letter, that provides: • an overview of the selected foci of assessment; • a brief description of the review process; • The reviewer's assessment, using the agreed upon criteria, citing the evidence being used to support that assessment; and • any comments, advice, and/or suggested future directions emerging from the assessment.	The reviewer(s)
6)	Final reflection and debriefing (optional, to be held at the request of the instructor). The instructor and the reviewers may meet to:	The instructor; the reviewer(s). May invite input from an instructional designer or educational developer.

	a) review and discuss the feedback document, and any questions, thoughts, or ideas arising from the document. b) identify and explore any outcomes or next-steps emerging from the review. c) reflect on the peer review experience.	

INSTRUMENTS

To support and structure both formative and summative peer review, the use of consistent instruments that incorporate flexibility, opportunity for provision of constructive feedback, and assessments that clearly draw from observations in relation to stated criteria can bring clarity and reliability to reviews. The use of consistent forms can also make responses across different reviewers comparable in ways that support the creation of reliable data for use in teaching dossiers, or for reflection and further professional development (Bandy 2015).

SAMPLE INSTRUMENTS

In selecting a suitable form for use in the peer evaluation, the purpose and type of evaluation should be considered (i.e. formative, summative, or diagnostic).

Three sample instruments are provided in Appendix B:

- “Peer Review of Teaching – Observation (f/d)” (intended to guide observation of instruction in formative or diagnostic reviews)
- “Peer Review of Teaching - Material Review (f/d)” (intended to guide review of the foci of assessment in formative or diagnostic reviews)
- Peer Review of Teaching – Summative (s)” (intended to guide summative reviews)

These examples contain base information which may be adjusted as desired. For example, instructor A may wish to focus on a new instructional method and instructor B may wish to focus on student engagement. As each would be focusing on different criteria, the ‘Area of Focus’ section of the template and criteria/statements being used for assessment would be updated to reflect the desired focus of each review.

Conclusion

The peer review of teaching process proposed in this document is optional. It aims to create a structure for formative, summative and diagnostic peer review of teaching that is flexible, responsive, and which supports the teaching and learning objectives of the university while always foregrounding instructor autonomy and professional development. The ECTE views this optional process as supportive of ASMs and instructors who wish to avail of supportive peer evaluation, and clearly establishes mechanisms for documenting teaching effectiveness. With regard to summative assessments, it also establishes mechanisms for documenting a commitment to teaching and learning that increase consistency, reliability and validity of assessments, providing much-needed scaffolding for individual ASMs and instructors to support providing evidence of teaching effectiveness. Finally, this proposed process provides institutional acknowledgement of and professional development for peer review of teaching through the process of creating a pool of trained peer reviewers. The committee notes the benefit of making institutionally legible the work of peer review of teaching, work that often occurs informally among peers, and is therefore labour made invisible.

Once approved, this peer review process should be reviewed and evaluated for possible revision by the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning as the committee deems necessary, and at minimum, every 10 years.

2. MEMORIAL'S REVISED COURSE EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (CEQ): RATIONALE AND APPROACH

Renewed purpose of the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) at Memorial

Updated and approved by Senate in December 2019, the purpose of the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ) has been revised to be one part of a broader approach to course evaluation, where a student questionnaire is intended to collect constructive information about learning experiences in courses, rather than measures of teaching effectiveness. Research indicates student ratings are not a reliable measure of teaching effectiveness and are more accurately a measure of student opinions on teaching (Hornstein, 2017).

With the revision, any claim that the CEQ results provide a standard measure of teaching effectiveness is removed. Consequently, the intent of the process to assist students with course selection has also been removed. The revised purpose statement does, however, acknowledge that the CEQ serves a significant role in providing an opportunity to students to give feedback on their learning experience.

With the revised purpose in mind, and within the context of the terms of reference of the Special Committee of Senate to Develop a Comprehensive System of Evaluating Courses and Teaching Effectiveness (ECTE), a revised course experience instrument (see p. 21 for the revised instrument, now retitled as the Course *Experience* Questionnaire) has been developed and is being proposed to be adopted. The proposed revisions to the CEQ instrument, by providing instructors with insights from students, are intended to assist in informing future teaching practice.

The ECTE has also recommended changes to the process of collecting, analysing, and distributing CEQ results to support the revised purpose. If the revised instrument is adopted, the Senate Committee on Course Evaluation (SCCE) will continue to play a key role as detailed in SCCE's terms of reference to further develop processes, protocols and guidelines not explicitly addressed here (see the last section on p. 24 for next steps).

It is important to note that the current CEQ is not used to collect feedback from learners in the Faculty of Medicine, as well as in diploma and certificate programs at the Fisheries and Marine Institute. It is not the intention of this report to change this scope if the proposed revisions to the instrument are approved.

Survey design considerations

BIAS AND STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING (SET)

Literature (Peterson et al, 2019; Hornstein, 2017; Uttl et al, 2017) supports that there is both gender and racial bias within typically constructed student evaluations of teaching (SETs). Even "objective" factors are rated differently based on instructors' gender, age or race. Simply, when evaluated using typically constructed SETs men tend to score better than women. Men are often perceived to be more competent, organized, and professional than their female counterparts. Men who are native-English speakers tend to score the highest regardless of academic discipline, aside from Engineering. Faculty members of colour score lower on SETs, and if they have accented English, the score is lower still. All these findings are a critical concern.

The ECTE is directly addressing these limitations by shifting to an instrument that:

- provides feedback on the course experience (not teaching effectiveness); and
- is a formative tool to inform future classroom practice (not a tool for summative evaluation).

Regardless of the shift in instrument design to align with the new purpose of the CEQ, the members of ECTE recognize that there are elements of question design and data analysis that can reduce the likelihood of introducing (but never eliminate) bias into an instrument and have worked to take these into account.

For example, a preamble to the revised CEQ identifies the role that bias can play in completing surveys like the CEQs. Limited research suggests that addressing the issue of bias with students in this way is an approach to decrease discrepancies in results between female and male instructors (Peterson et al., 2019).

Members of the ECTE recognize that providing feedback on the course experience does not eliminate the ways that bias can inform student responses. We believe a strength of the revised focus on the course experience is that it shifts the focus of feedback away from instructor actions. This, in turn, could prevent more direct racist, sexist, homophobic, ageist, or ableist attacks. A limitation that remains, however, is that both conscious and unconscious bias can inform perceptions of a course learning experience. To mitigate the impact bias may have on an instructor, and as described in further detail, below, the individual results of the revised CEQ are only intended to be shared with and used by the individual instructor.

REVISED CONSTRUCTS

The overall intent of the revised survey design is to develop a course experience instrument, the results of which could be used to inform instructors' future practice in the classroom, rather than acting as an independent measure of teaching quality. Hence, questions drafted **do not** ask students to rate teaching effectiveness, but do ask students to answer questions related to four core constructs:

1) Course delivery and learning experience
2) Assessment and feedback
3) Supportive learning environment
4) Students' self-evaluation of their own learning and involvement in the learning process

These four core constructs were selected for their alignment with:

- current evidence on characteristics of a high-quality student learning experience; and
- the University's Teaching and Learning Framework.

Based on information collected from environmental scans of similar student experience instruments and a review of the literature, fourteen questions have been selected to align with these four core constructs. Question 11 uses a "Never-Always" scale, Question 12 requires a "yes-no-don't know" response, and Questions 13 & 14 are open-ended. Ten questions are answered using the same 5-point Likert scale of "Strongly Disagree-Strongly Agree".

The fourteen questions were selected as a balance between the tension of creating an instrument that is short enough to support higher response rates, while long enough to ask a necessary number of questions to be insightful. Furthermore, each of these constructs can further be mapped to a strategic priority of the Teaching and Learning Framework (see Table 3, below, for the alignment):

- Accessibility: embrace diversity and help remove learning barriers.
- Engagement: implement principles of good teaching practices to help foster student engagement and a high-quality learning experience.
- Success: facilitate learning by integrating personalized supports and services tailed to individual needs.

Table 3

Constructs aligned with sub-items and Teaching and Learning Framework strategies

CORE CONSTRUCT	TYPES OF SUB-ITEMS	ALIGNMENT TO TLF STRATEGIES
COURSE DELIVERY AND LEARNING EXPERIENCE	EXECTATIONS, DELIVERY, ACTIVITIES, OUTCOMES	ENGAGEMENT/SUCCESS
ASSESSMENT & FEEDBACK	PERCEIVED VALUE OF ASSESSMENTS, TIMELY FEEDBACK	ENGAGEMENT/SUCCESS
SUPPORTIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	PARTICIPATION, RESPECTFUL ENVIRONMENT	ACCESSIBILITY, SUCCESS
STUDENTS' SELF-EVALUATION OF THEIR OWN LEARNING AND INVOLVEMENT IN THE LEARNING PROCESS	SELF-RATED IMPROVEMENT IN KNOWLEDGE, INTEREST, ATTENDANCE, REASON FOR TAKING THE COURSE	ENGAGEMENT

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK

As reported in Kreitzer & Sweet-Cushman (2021), the use of qualitative (or open-ended) comments shows the "clearest evidence of gender bias" (p. 7). The revised course experience questionnaire includes two open-ended questions (Q 13 & Q 14) as it is acknowledged that many instructors value open-ended feedback for course improvement. The ECTE, however, recommends that these questions are only available to instructors who *opt-in* to collecting this feedback.

This will require the adoption or development of a technological system through which instructors can elect to opt-in to collecting data on these questions. By default, the revised course experience instrument would not collect open-ended feedback.

It is important to note that instructors still can ask and receive open-ended feedback from students using other means. The Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL) has resources developed to guide instructors in the supplemental collection of feedback from students outside of the specific institutionally supported process that the CEQ represents.

INSTRUMENT CUSTOMIZATION

Questions in the proposed fourteen-question survey will be the core question set and should not be altered, however, the ECTE strongly supports the option of customization of the instrument with additional questions. This will require the selection of a technological system that permits this kind of customization through online means (versus the current Instructor Provided Questions process).

Currently, through consultations with the SCCE and facilitated by the Centre for Institutional Analysis and Planning (CIAP), individual academic units can add unit-specific questions to the current CEQ (e.g., Faculty of Nursing). The ECTE recommends that academic units continue to be able to add additional questions to the revised instrument. The process for unit-level customization would need to be developed based on the technological system selected for questionnaire administration. It should be noted that as questions are added to the revised instrument, the unit-specific questions will alter the overall purpose of the instrument.

If a new technological system is developed or procured which allows for the straightforward customization (e.g., through online means) of the instrument by individual instructors, we recommend allowing instructors the ability to add additional questions to the survey. Currently, there is a consideration of workload that makes this level of customization unfeasible given the present technological system.

In summary, customization of the questionnaire by adding additional questions to the survey is strongly supported by the ECTE. Currently, the technological system that facilitates the CEQ does not allow for this level of customization. As such, the ECTE recommends that a new system be developed or procured with this affordance in mind.

Members of the ECTE leave the implementation of question customization to the leadership of the Senate Committee on Course Evaluation should the revised CEQ instrument be adopted.

Process considerations for collecting student feedback on the course experience

Previous CEQ results were received and processed by CIAP, guided by Senate policies and procedures for the course evaluation process. While the policies and procedures that will guide the collection of student feedback for the revised CEQ will need to be reviewed and likely re-developed if the revised instrument is adopted, there are several considerations the ECTE has identified related to process.

ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY OF SUBMITTED FEEDBACK

The ECTE believes that a balance needs to be struck between 1) allowing a forum for students to share their feedback of the course experience free of any concerns that their feedback would impact the relationship with their instructor and 2) ensuring that instructors are not subject to racist, sexist, homophobic, ageist, or ableist comments.

To achieve (in part) the first aim, students must be assured that no identifiable information will ever be provided to the instructor when responses are reported; that is, while the system will necessarily tie their identity to their responses to present the right course forms to the right students, reporting to the instructor (and academic unit where applicable) will always be done anonymously.

Current policy states that with five or fewer CEQ respondents, the results are not included in aggregate numbers. Given the proposed shift in focus, this policy will require further discussion. Any revised minimum number of respondents will need to ensure, in part, student anonymity.

To achieve the second aim, the ECTE is recommending that the system of collecting data allow for feedback submitted to be tied to the individual students and a process for addressing comments of significant concern be developed. As we have noted above, the identity of students would never be made available to instructors, or academic unit if applicable.

Submitted feedback from students would be expected to be constructive and related to the improvement of the course or provide feedback on the learning experience, and this will continue to be stressed to students at the time they complete the form. As such, we recommend a mechanism be developed for instructors to be able to flag a problematic comment. Flagging is not intended to be a mechanism to register disagreement with a submitted comment.

Problematic in the case of comments would be those that the instructor believes constitute an offence against persons, as articulated in the student code of conduct, section 5 "offences." This would include but is not limited to: uttering threats; harassment; and intimidating. A comment flagged by an instructor would need to be accompanied by a written rationale for flagging, aligned to the student code of conduct.

The ECTE recommends constituting a sub-committee of the SCCE to review flagged comments and accompanying rationales. The sub-committee would act as an independent third-party, and if a comment meets a threshold (as listed in the student code of conduct, section 5 "offences"), it would be referred on as a complaint under the student code of conduct. We note that the current technological system that supports the CEQ process, coupled with current policy, does not allow for such a comment flagging mechanism, and building in this technical capability and accountability is a key component of collecting open-ended feedback.

We also note that the formal proposal of an institutional process to review flagged comments is outside the scope of the ECTE but the establishment of a process is another key component of collecting open-ended feedback.

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

The purpose of the revised course experience instrument identifies instructors as the primary audience, and instructors will have an opportunity to receive results for use as part of their continual reflection, review, and development of their teaching practice. With the adoption of a new CEQ instrument, instructors would continue to be provided with a report that offers a summary of the ratings and feedback.

The summary report would include the following results:

For question 1 — 12

Summarized data, specifically:

- the distribution of scores,
- the number of responders and
- response rate.

For question 13 — 14

Submitted comments provided in text, by question.

Providing an average score for questions 1 to 12 is not recommended. As described by Stark and Freshtat (2014), understanding the distribution of responses offers more insight into the plurality of learning experiences than an average score can. It also discourages comparing average scores between instructors, and so it is not recommended that aggregate scores or any other comparative data be part of the instructor reports.

The ECTE recommends timing for reporting remain the same: currently, CEQ results are not released until after the deadline for replacement grade submission as published in the University calendar. The focus of the revised instrument is to provide feedback to instructors. We acknowledge that with the current CEQ, a copy of an instructor's summary report was sent to the academic department head and/or Dean. It is the recommendation of the ECTE that aggregated, unit-level data is shared in a report with academic unit administrators for the purpose of providing information about teaching and learning in the unit and for curricular improvement. This report would include the data from customized questions added to the instrument by an academic unit, if applicable. Program administrators would not have access to individual instructor data: results would only be reported in aggregate at the level of the academic unit or program.

A new report will need to be developed for aggregated, unit-level data. The unit-level report would not include responses from questions 13 & 14 as they likely cannot meaningfully be aggregated without disclosing identifiable instructor information. Verbatim comments should not be provided.

Current Academic Unit Planning processes clearly state that CEQ results are not to be included. Further discussion should take place to determine if this new unit-level report of aggregated data recommended by the ECTE would be permissible for inclusion in AUP self-studies or accreditation processes going forward.

Data to inform formal evaluation processes (e.g., promotion and tenure) is collected by faculty members from a variety of sources, guided by the collective agreement and CAUT Teaching Dossier. Assuming the proposed revisions to the CEQ instrument are approved by Senate, it would become one such source that an instructor could include. Additional sources of data could include the proposed Peer Review of Teaching process, and data collected independently by the instructor.

With regards to sharing results with students on the student self-service site for the purpose of selecting courses, this is no longer a stated purpose of the revised process.

Validating the instrument

The validity of any questionnaire depends on the degree to which the evidence supports the proposed interpretations of the questionnaire's outcome (Artino et al., 2014).

In the effort to develop an instrument that requires students to reflect on their learning experience and not to rate the quality and effectiveness of the course instruction, the language used in the items is intentionally student-centric and references to, or questions regarding, effectiveness, quality, or "overall quality" are not included. Students are still asked to consider the important aspects of their learning experience as relates to four core constructs, and as such, questions do refer to course components such as learning outcomes, presentation of materials, assessment and feedback, and the learning environment. Questions are also included to help students gauge their own level of engagement as part of their reflection of the course experience.

To evaluate validity, various statistical comparative experiments can be used to assess the association, content, interpretation, response process, and the outcomes between the instrument and other measures. There are differences between the previous and revised CEQ instruments in various aspects, including the design and core constructs, and no questions are retained exactly in the new version.

Based on these differences and particularly in the absence of comprehensive statistical studies, we assessed the revised instrument's validity sources through various criteria. These criteria include face validity, content validity, response process validity, expert validation, and construct validity:

1) **Content Validity:** All committee members examined the revised instrument, unanimously confirming that the questions are relevant to the core constructs and that essential factors have not been omitted (Polit & Beck, 2006; Waltz et al., 2005).

2) **Expert Validation:** The revised instrument was evaluated by at least eight committee members who were subject matter experts in teaching effectiveness, teaching evaluation, and assessments. Based on the committee members' expertise, experience, and knowledge, an explicit consensus was achieved about the proposed questions' quality and relevance to the core constructs. Further feedback was sought on the instrument from the University community, and revisions to questions were made based on that feedback. Consequently, the expert validation of the revised instrument was established (Rubio et al., 2003).

3) **Response Process Validity:** When a new course evaluation questionnaire is developed, it is vital to evaluate how students interpret and respond to them. Are the questions worded in a way that produces a systematic bias in the responses? Through extensive discussions, we examined the questions and their wording. We also asked for student feedback on the revised instrument, and through this process have confidence that students will understand the proposed questions, and their interpretations will resemble the questionnaire's proposed purposes. Hence, the revised instrument meets the response process validity (Karabenick et al., 2007).

4) **Construct Validity:** This criterion examines the degree to which the instrument measures the intended constructs of the survey (Messick, 1995). The timelines and scope of the ECTE did not permit a comprehensive statistical analysis (for example, factor analysis) to quantify the construct validity. In the absence of such statistical analysis, the evaluation processes provided the members with confidence that the instrument questions can adequately measure the four core constructs.

Once initial data is collected, further work on the instrument's validation could take place under the guidance of the SCCE. We believe further efforts are needed to determine the degree to which the instrument can measure the appropriateness and the adequacy of the core constructs.

We recommend that comprehensive quantitative and statistical review be conducted to evaluate the validity and robustness of the revised instrument. Various statistical methods can be used to achieve these goals, including different forms of factor analysis, structural equation models, latent class analysis, cross-validation methods, and contrast analysis.

It is also essential to note that a single study cannot alone prove or disprove an instrument's validity. The overall validity should be assessed through a continuous process of evaluation, re-evaluation, and re-development. The validity can only be established based on the correlations from various reviews.

The revised Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) instrument

What follows is the proposed introduction and questions for the revised Course Experience Questionnaire instrument, as would be presented to students for completion.

QUESTIONNAIRE INTRODUCTION

Sharing feedback on your learning experience in this course plays a key role in providing your instructor with meaningful information around what has worked well in a course, and what could be considered for improvement. The responses you share here will provide your instructor with your perspective on elements of the course design and facilitation.

Research on course evaluations tells us that students' answers can be influenced by unconscious and unintentional biases about the appearance, age, race, gender, and sexual orientation of the instructor. Carefully considering each item objectively will help reduce unconscious bias.

Your responses are voluntary and no identifiable information (e.g., name or student number) is *ever* provided to your instructor when reporting CEQ results. Class ratings (aggregated) and submitted comments (verbatim) will be shared with your instructor after the final grades for the course have been submitted to the Registrar's Office. Do not include any identifying information in any written answers. You are advised to write only what you wish your instructor to see. Please remember to submit respectful comments that will help an instructor improve the course experience. Your responses will be linked to you within the CEQ system. Disrespectful open-ended responses can be flagged by your instructor during the reporting stage. If flagged, the comment would be reviewed by an independent third party, and could be referred on as a complaint under the student code of conduct. With any resolution, your identity would never be disclosed to your instructor.

Your feedback is powerful: please focus your responses on the course learning experience.

[Privacy Statement to be added in consultation with the IAP Office]

REVISED QUESTIONNAIRE

Question	**Course Delivery and Experience**						
1	It was clear to me what I was expected to know and be able to do (the learning outcomes) to successfully complete this course.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
2	I achieved the learning outcomes for this course.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
3	Course material was present ed in a way that helped me learn.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know

4	The learning activities in this course improved my comprehension of course concepts.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
	Assessment and Feedback						
5	The assessments in this course helped me learn course concepts.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
6	I received timely feedback on the work I submitted.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
7	Feedback provided on work I submitted helped me learn course concepts.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
	Learning Environment						
8	I felt comfortable asking questions in this course.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
9	I felt there was a respectful learning environment in this course.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
	Self-assessment						
10	My knowledge of this subject area improved from taking this course.	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	NA/ Don't know
11	I attended scheduled class sessions in this course:	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	NA/There were no scheduled class sessions
12	This course is required for my program.	Yes	No	Don't know			

	Open-ended feedback	
13	What specific aspects of the course contributed in a positive way to my learning experience?	
14	In what specific ways could my learning experience in this course have been improved?	

Next steps in adopting revised CEQ

If the revised CEQ is adopted there will be follow-up steps required to support moving forward with an updated process, some of which have been noted in previous sections and are outside the scope of the ECTE. It is recommended that the SCCE have oversight of these next steps, working in consultation with the Centre for Institutional Analysis and Planning, the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning, and other units as needed and establishing sub-committees as appropriate.

1) Develop or procure a technological solution for the administration of the CEQ.

- The requirements for the system will be identified to maintain existing critical functionality and to address the recommendations in this report, including customization of the questionnaire by instructors and academic units, the ability to support a process for flagging comments, flexible reporting options, Single Sign On, and Banner integration, and various options for administrative access.
- Timelines for implementation will need to be determined and communicated.
- Resource allocation, including on-going funding and staff time, will need to be determined.

2) Update and develop the policies and procedures for the CEQ.

- The existing policies and procedures will need to be revisited to determine what principles and processes to maintain and/or revise, including reporting content and distribution, guidelines for interpreting CEQ results, SCCE sub-policies, and the continued validation and evaluation of the instrument.
- New protocols will need to be developed and incorporated into the policies and procedures to address the recommendations in this report, including customization processes/guidelines and the details around flagging comments (process and responsibility). Specific guidelines for the retention and disposal of data and reports should also be developed as part of the updated policy.

3) Enhance education and awareness for specific user groups.

- Education and awareness for:
  - instructors should address policies and procedures, customization, and availability of resources to support course development (syllabi, learning outcomes, etc.).
  - students should address policies and procedures, the importance of student feedback on their course experience, use and reporting, and how to give constructive feedback.
  - academic administrators and units should address policies and procedures and use of results.

REFERENCES

American Educational Research Association (AERA), American Psychological Association (APA) & National Council on Measurement in Education (NCME). (1999). *Standards for education and psychological testing.* Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Artino Jr, A. R., La Rochelle, J. S., Dezee, K. J., & Gehlbach, H. (2014). Developing questionnaires for educational research: AMEE Guide No. 87. *Medical teacher*, *36*(6), 463-474.

Bandy, J. (2015). *Peer review of teaching*. Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/peer-review-of-teaching/

Canada Research Chairs Program Tri-Council Agency, Government of Canada. (2019). *Unconscious bias training module.* https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/bias/module-eng.aspx#.

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2007). *CAUT teaching dossier*. https://www.caut.ca/docs/default-source/professional-advice/teaching-dossier.pdf

Centre for Innovation in Teaching & Learning, Memorial University. (2020). *Quality guidelines for distance education courses*. https://blog.citl.mun.ca/instructionalresources/course-design-checklist/

Godbout-Kinney, K. (2020). *Summative Peer Review Report* [Unpublished report]. Memorial University.

Government of Canada. (2018, November 18). *Unconscious bias training module*. https://www.chairs-chaires.gc.ca/program-programme/equity-equite/bias/module-eng.aspx?pedisable=false

Hahn, A., & Gawronski, B. (2019). Facing one's implicit biases: From awareness to acknowledgment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 116*(5), 769-794. doi: 10.1037/pspi0000155

Hornstein, H. A. (2017). Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance. *Cogent Education*, *4*(1), 219. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2017.1304016

Karabenick, S. A., Woolley, M. E., Friedel, J. M., Ammon, B. V., Blazevski, J., Bonney, C. R., ... & Kelly, K. L. (2007). Cognitive processing of self-report items in educational research: Do they think what we mean? *Educational Psychologist*, *42*(3), 139-151.

Kreitzer, R. J., & Sweet-Cushman, J. (2021). Evaluating Student Evaluations of Teaching: a Review of Measurement and Equity Bias in SETs and Recommendations for Ethical Reform. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09400-w

Lecturers' Union of Memorial University of Newfoundland. (2019). *Memorial University Lecturers' Union (LUMUN) Per-course instructors agreement*. https://www.mun.ca/facultyrelations/academic/instructors/LUMUN_PCI__CA_2019.pdf

MacNeil, L., Driscoll, A., & Hunt, A.N. (2015). What's in a name: Exposing gender bias in student ratings of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education, 40*(4), 291-303. doi: 10.1007/s10755-014-9313-4

Memorial University of Newfoundland. (2020). *Strategic framework for indigenization 2021-2026*. https://www.mun.ca/indigenous/indigenous-affairs/reports/IndigenizationStrategicFramework.pdf

Memorial University of Newfoundland. (2018). *Teaching and learning framework 2023: Teaching innovation / learning excellence*. https://www.mun.ca/vpacademic/TLF_2023.pdf

Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association. (2019). *Collective agreement between Memorial University of Newfoundland and Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association, April 30,* *2019 – August 31, 2020.* https://www.mun.ca/facultyrelations/academic/asm/Final_MUN-MUNFA_CA_2019.pdf

Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., & Zölitz, U. (2019). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association, (17)*2, 535-566. doi: 10.1093/jeea/jvx057

Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*. 50(9): 741–749.

Peterson, D. A., Biederman, L. A., Andersen, D., Ditonto, T. M., & Roe, K. (2019). Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. *PLOS ONE*, *14*(5). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216241

Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in nursing & health*, *29*(5), 489-497.

Rubio, D. M., Berg-Weger, M., Tebb, S. S., Lee, E. S., & Rauch, S. (2003). Objectifying content validity: Conducting a content validity study in social work research. *Social work research*, *27*(2), 94-104.

Stark, P., Freishtat, R., & Lauer, C. (2014). An Evaluation of Course Evaluations. *ScienceOpen Research*. https://doi.org/10.14293/s2199-1006.1.sor-edu.aofrqa.v1

Uttl, B., White, C. A., & Gonzalez, D. W. (2017). Meta-analysis of faculty's teaching effectiveness: Student evaluation of teaching ratings and student learning are not related. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *54*,22–42 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.08.007

Waltz C. F., Strickland O.L., & Lenz E.R. (2005). *Measurement in nursing and health research*. 3rd ed. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

APPENDIX A

Note: This and all other forms should be created and made available through CITL, in connection with the site that lists Peer Reviewers. The committee notes again that this may require additional resources for CITL to administer, as this work is in addition that that which they already perform. Review of the forms is the purview of the Senate Committee on Teaching and Learning as part of their oversight of the process.

Peer Reviewer Nomination Form (required content, not final format)

Instructions: Please provide the information requested for each of the areas noted below.

Name: ______________________________

Department: ______________________________

Rank or Role: ______________________________

Area(s) of content expertise (discipline, sub disciplines, etc.).

Areas of pedagogical expertise and experience (types of assessment, forms of delivery, etc.).

A brief statement of the nominated reviewer's suitability for the role (200- 300 words).

Signature of nominator (unless self-nominated) ______________________________

Signature of nominee ______________________________

APPENDIX B

Sample Peer Review Instruments

Peer Review of Teaching – Observation (f/d)

***Instructions**: This form is to help guide formative or diagnostic peer review session(s). Peer review sessions should be collegial and supportive in provision of constructive feedback. Capture the relevant details in each section.*

Section A – Background

***Instructions**: Enter the background information relating to the instructor and instructional context under peer review.*

Date ______________________ **Instructor** __________________________ **Course** _________________________

Learning Outcomes: note any course learning outcomes that are relevant to today's class.

Instructional Goals for the class: note what the instructor hopes to accomplish in today's class.

Section B – Observation of Instruction

***Instructions**: For each of the statements provided, indicate the degree to which the instructor effectively demonstrated the skill, knowledge or disposition SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree. Notes may be captured in the space provided.*

Criteria/Statement **(N.B. *these are examples only, and should be chosen by the instructor, using the list of 23 success indicators as a guide or starting point*)**	**SD**	**D**	**Neither**	**A**	**SA**	**N/A**
Instructor demonstrates strong command of subject matter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teaching session is logically organized for clear communication	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Appropriate use of instructional materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities for teacher-student interaction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities for student-student interaction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assessments that align with learning outcomes and content covered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appropriate adaptation of instructional strategy (e.g. lecture, cases, demonstrations, questioning, discussions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

NOTES:

Section C – Constructive Feedback for Instructor

***Instructions**: Following the peer review of an instructional lesson or teaching and learning artifacts (e.g. syllabus, teaching plan, multimedia, assessment items), begin recording constructive feedback to the instructor by answering the questions provided. Additional feedback may be added, as appropriate.*

What strengths did you see the instructor demonstrate?

In what ways could the instructor consider improving their teaching practice?

Section D – Signatures

Peer Reviewer(s)	______________________	Instructor	______________________
	______________________	Date	______________________

Section E – Instructor Reflections (Optional)

Peer Review of Teaching – Material Review (f/d)

***Instructions**: This form is to help guide formative or diagnostic peer review. Peer review should be collegial and supportive in provision of constructive feedback. Capture the relevant details in each section.*

Section A – Background

***Instructions**: Enter the background information relating to the instructor and instructional context under peer review.*

Date ______________________ **Instructor** __________________________ **Course** _________________________

Section B – Material Review

***Instructions**: Identify the type of instructional material being reviewed in the space provided below. Then, for each of the statements provided, indicate the degree to which the instructional material effectively illustrates the criteria (SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree). Notes may be captured in the space provided.*

Instructional material under review: ____

Criteria Statements (N.B. *these are examples only, and should be chosen by the instructor, using the list of 23 success indicators as a guide or starting point and as appropriate for the chosen foci or focus of assessment.)*	**SD**	**D**	**Neither**	**A**	**SA**	**N/A**
Employs teaching design that supports equity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Provides rational progression through material, content, or skills to support depth of engagement or preparation for future learning, or both	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clear communication of desired outcomes (e.g., the skills or material to be learned, practiced or mastered, or both)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clear communication of assessment methods	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Recognizes and supports a wide range of learning styles	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Promotes a respectful learning environment for all	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Employs creative assessment techniques and assignments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Learning outcomes, content, and assessment and activities which are solidly aligned (support each other)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

NOTES:

Section C – Constructive Feedback for Instructor

Instructions*: Following the peer review of instructional material, record constructive feedback to the instructor by answering the questions provided. Additional feedback may be added, as appropriate.*

What strengths did you see in the material?

In what ways could the instructor consider improving their instructional material?

Section D – Signatures

Peer Reviewer(s)	____________________	Instructor	____________________
	____________________	Date	____________________

Section E – Instructor Reflections (Optional)

Peer Review of Teaching – Summative (s)

***Instructions**: This form is to help guide the summative peer review session(s). Peer review sessions should be collegial and supportive in provision of constructive feedback. Capture the relevant details in each section.*

Section A – Background

***Instructions**: Enter the background information relating to the instructor and instructional context under peer review.*

Date ____________________ **Instructor** ____________________ **Course** ____________________

Learning Outcomes: note relevant course learning outcomes.

Instructional Goals for the class: note known instructional goals the instructor has for the course.

Section B – Observation of Teaching

***Instructions**: For each of the statements provided, indicate the degree to which the instructor effectively demonstrated the skill, knowledge or disposition. SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree. Notes may be captured in the space provided.*

Criteria/Statement (N.B. *these are examples, and should be chosen by the instructor, using the list of 22 success indicators as a guide)*	**SD**	**D**	**Neither**	**A**	**SA**	**N/A**
Instructor demonstrates strong command of subject matter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Organization in teaching session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Appropriate use of instructional materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities for teacher-student interaction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunities for student-student interaction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assessments that align with learning outcomes and content covered	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Appropriate adaptation of instructional strategy (e.g. lecture, cases, demonstrations, questioning, discussions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Section C – Instructional Material

Instructions: *Identify the type of instructional material being reviewed in the space provided below. Then, for each of the statements provided, indicate the degree to which the instructional material effectively illustrates the criteria SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree. Notes may be captured in the space provided.*

Instructional material under review:

Criteria/Statement (N.B. ***these should be chosen by the instructor, using the list of 22 success indicators as a guide)***	**SD**	**D**	**Neither**	**A**	**SA**	**N/A**
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

NOTES:

Section D – Constructive Feedback for Instructor

Instructions*: Following the peer review of instructional material, record constructive feedback to the instructor by answering the questions provided. Additional feedback may be added, as appropriate. You may wish to include aspects of your notes in the summative peer review letter you will write following this peer review.*

What strengths did you see in the material?

In what ways could the instructor consider improving their instructional material?

Section E – Signatures

Peer Reviewer(s)	______________________________	Instructor	__________________________
	______________________________	Date	______________________________

Section F – Instructor Reflections (Optional)