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Making Learning Visible

Peer Review and the Scholarship of Teaching

March 26-28, 2004 Lincoln, Nebraska

A national conference investigating a vision of peer review of teaching which combines:

• inquiry into the intellectual work of a course
• careful investigation of student understanding and performance
• faculty reflection on their teaching effectiveness
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Conference Objective
This working conference will bring together the leaders of the peer review of teaching movement to explore the current status of peer review and to discuss how this form of peer collaboration contributes to larger conversations regarding the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Background
Faculty in higher education face tremendous difficulty in finding the time, resources, and expertise to document, assess, and improve student learning. Although student evaluations of teaching effectiveness are a useful tool for inquiring about what occurred during a course, there are aspects to the intellectual work of teaching that students are not able to evaluate effectively: Does the course have an acceptable level of academic rigor? Are objectives and topics appropriate to the course? Are evaluation methods fair? Does the course teach the needed skills to be successful in the workplace? Is the instructor current in his/her field? Since these areas are essential to effective teaching, student evaluations need to be supplemented. Unfortunately, there are few successful models for formal peer reviews of teaching. Often times, peer review is construed to be a simple observation of the colleague’s class session.

In contrast, a vision for peer review of teaching combines inquiry into the intellectual work of a course with a careful investigation and reflection of the quality of student understanding and performance. Over the past five years, a consortium of six universities (The University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Indiana University–Bloomington, The University of Michigan, Kansas State University, University of Kansas, and Texas A&M University) has developed campus communities that explore and apply peer review of teaching for documenting, promoting, and making visible the intellectual work of teaching. Faculty write a course portfolio providing examples and analysis of student work that demonstrates and reflects on the success of the course in helping students learn. The portfolio is posted on an electronic web site for peer sharing, discussion of curricular or programmatic issues, and for external review of the quality of student understanding. This conference seeks to highlight the work of the consortium and to sponsor conversations about the benefits and challenges to promoting peer review initiatives in postsecondary education.

History of this Project
Beginning in 1994, the University of Nebraska–Lincoln (UNL) joined eleven other universities in a national project organized by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE). Along with schools such as the University of Michigan, the University of Wisconsin, Northwestern University, Syracuse University, and the University of Georgia, UNL sent seven faculty to a summer institute on peer review. Working in discipline-based teams, this national group of faculty members helped shape and develop the kinds of interactions on teaching that would yield the most benefit for participating faculty.

In 1995 UNL received federal support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education to expand beyond the original team. Over subsequent summers, a total of thirty UNL faculty (from all nine UNL colleges) received summer fellowships to engage in peer consultation on teaching.

In 1999, the peer review project was expanded beyond UNL to introduce faculty peer review efforts to four additional universities: Indiana University, Kansas State University, the University of Michigan, and Texas A&M University. Major funding for the inter-university collaboration and peer review community development comes from the Pew Charitable Trusts Funding; faculty elaboration of learning in general education at UNL comes from the Hewlett Foundation Funding; operation of the Peer Review Project Team and fellowship support comes from the University of Nebraska Foundation (the Pepsi Quasi-Endowment Fund).
A Model for Peer Review of Teaching

Our vision of Peer Review of Teaching is a faculty-driven initiative that provides faculty with a structured and practical model for documenting and reflecting on both the quantity and the quality of student learning in their courses. Faculty are encouraged to explore not only what students learn, but also to assess how they learn. The benefits of peer review extend far beyond the level of an individual course. Peer Review promotes educational reform at three different levels – by assisting faculty in evaluating and improving their students’ learning, by building interdisciplinary campus communities that support and refine this inquiry into student learning, and by challenging established campus attitudes about teaching.

Through its focused investigation into student learning, Peer Review of Teaching:

• Promotes faculty awareness about the challenges posed by diverse student learners, spurring faculty to think beyond traditional or “one size fits all” teaching approaches.
• Aids faculty in verbalizing the assumptions and goals about teaching that may have, until now, remained implicit (to themselves and to their students).
• Fosters interdisciplinary conversation on teaching that is both focused and more profound than the usual sharing of teaching techniques. These conversations help faculty identify common teaching and curricular issues across academic disciplines.
• Develops faculty skills to rigorously assess and review teaching as they meet to discuss and respond to each other’s portfolios and the curricular and programmatic issues that they raise.
• Creates a community of campus faculty peers across disciplines who can promote policies regarding teaching and student learning.
• Challenges campuses to create a student-centered curriculum as faculty develop a common language for documenting and assessing teaching as intellectual work. When faculty become more knowledgeable about criteria for improved student performance, they challenge students to become more responsible for and involved in their own learning.

To engage in these goals, faculty participate in a structured fellowship program where they write reflective interaction memos about their teaching. The memos are shared with team members for response. Faculty also meet with other project participants to share and discuss issues emerging from one another’s investigations. At the end of the year, faculty link the three interaction memos together to create a course portfolio that reflects on the success of the course in helping students learn. Previous faculty participants have used their portfolios as evidence of teaching effectiveness for teaching awards, promotion and tenure files, and accreditation reviews.

One type of portfolio is the benchmark portfolio. A benchmark portfolio represents a snapshot of students’ learning within a particular course and enables faculty to generate questions that they would like to investigate about their teaching. The prompts that follow represent the types of questions that faculty participants consider as they develop their benchmark portfolios.

Interaction 1: Reflections on the Syllabus
The first memo asks faculty to discuss the course syllabus and reflect on the course goals and the intellectual rationale for these goals. Typical questions include: What is your course about? What is the content area covered? Who are your students (e.g., first, fourth year, graduate majors or non-majors)? What do you want students to know? What do you want them to be able to do?

Interaction 2: Capturing the Particulars of Instructional Practice
In the second memo faculty reflect on their teaching methods, course assignments, and course materials. Some questions include “What teaching methods are you using during your contact time with students and how do these methods facilitate students’ achievement of course objectives? How do you measure student learning via these methods?” and “In what ways do you expect your choices for methods, materials, and assignments to assist your students in meeting the goals of your course?”

Interaction 3: Documenting and Analyzing Student Learning
In the third memo, faculty reflect on student learning by analyzing samples of student work. Typical questions include: “Is there evidence of students meeting the specific learning goals you selected and where do you see such understanding?,” “What criteria do you use to assess student understanding?” and “Does performance represented by student work indicate students have developed an understanding for your field of study that will be retained or that students can apply to new contexts?”
A second type of portfolio is an inquiry portfolio. This portfolio focuses around a specific question or issue regarding teaching practices, course structures, and student learning over time. For our Peer Review program, faculty initially write a benchmark portfolio to identify issues or questions within their teaching. They then develop an inquiry portfolio focusing specifically on that issue or question. An inquiry portfolio provides faculty with opportunities to document improvement in their teaching over time and to assess the long-term impact of teaching changes, the success of teaching approaches, and the accomplishment of student learning. The prompts that follow are designed to help faculty begin this scholarly investigation into their own teaching.

**Interaction 1: Stating an Issue or Problem to Investigate**
Faculty begin conceptualizing their inquiry portfolios by identifying issues to investigate, especially discussing why this issue is significant for their students’ learning. They then reflect on the course’s history and development, provide a rationale for selecting a specific problem for investigation, and examine the issue’s history and significance within their teaching.

**Interaction 2: Developing a Methodology for Investigation**
Faculty next develop and describe their methodology for investigating the problem course materials or assignments, assessment of student work, etc.). This memo includes defining the problem, identifying types of classroom evidence (data) needed to study the issue more fully, conceptualizing sampling issues in the data collection process, and reflecting on the underlying assumptions of the methods that they have selected.

**Interaction 3: Analyzing and Assessing Findings**
The final memo has faculty analyze and interpret their collected data in order to answer the following questions: What do the data tell me about the problem/issue I originally chose to investigate? Do the data indicate my initial hypothesis is supported; or suggest that my initial hypothesis might be incorrect? Is there a new hypothesis emerging with respect to the issue I hoped to address? Are there new issues or questions emerging from the data that I hadn’t considered or that help me to reframe the issues?
Great Plains Art Collection in the Christlieb Gallery
The Collection consists of approximately 175 bronze sculptures, 160 paintings and
drawings, 100 other works on paper and several hundred photographs, and
includes artwork by Albert Bierstadt, William de la Montagne Cary, Robert F. Gilder,
William Henry Jackson, Frederic Remington, Charles M. Russell and Olaf Wieghorst.
The library donated by the Christlieb’s is an impressive 4,000 volumes, which
consists of several Western novels and many other fiction and nonfiction books
about the West and the Great Plains. Location: 1155 Q Street. Hours of Operation:
Tuesday – Saturday (10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.), Sunday, (1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.)

Mary Riepma Ross Media Arts Center
The Mary Riepma Ross Media Arts Center offers a comprehensive exhibition
program which acknowledges the moving image as the principal art form of this
century, is committed to screening a wide diversity of high quality film and video:
innovative American independent work including non-narrative, experimental films
and video; classic foreign and American cinema illustrative of traditional and
historical perspectives; documentaries which examine a wide variety of issues of
concern; and contemporary foreign cinema of substance. Location: 313 North 13th
Street. Show times:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>12:30, 2:45, 5:00, 7:15 &amp; 9:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>5:00, 7:15 &amp; 9:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>7:05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>5:00 &amp; 9:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>5:00, 7:15 &amp; 9:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>9:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>12:30, 2:45, 5:00, 7:15 &amp; 9:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites to See Near the University of Nebraska Campus

Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery and Sculpture Garden
The Sheldon Memorial Art Gallery and Sculpture Garden houses both the Nebraska
Art Association collection founded in 1888, and the University of Nebraska collection,
initiated in 1929. Together they comprise more than 12,000 works of art in all media.
This comprehensive collection of American art includes prominent holdings of 19th-
century landscape and still life, American Impressionism, early Modernism, geometric
abstraction, Abstract Expressionism, pop, minimalism and contemporary art.
Don and Velma Lentz Center for Asian Culture
The Lentz Center for Asian Culture is dedicated to the enrichment of knowledge and understanding of Asia. The Center's welcoming environment enables visitors to interact with Asian art objects, providing the opportunity for comprehension of the rich diversity and long history of Asian cultures. The permanent collection of the Lentz Center presents objects chosen for their historical importance, cultural significance, and aesthetic appeal. It includes ancient ceremonial bronzes, jade and ivory carvings, Tibetan ritual objects, Chinese and Japanese ceramics, and other items that reveal facets of traditional Asian civilizations. The changing exhibits feature Asian ceramics, paintings, prints, sculpture, textiles, and more. Occasionally, these exhibitions are accompanied by other Asian cultural and educational events, including lecture series, film festivals and concerts. Location: 1155 Q Street. Hours of Operation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5:00 p.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Nebraska State Museum – Morrill Hall
University of Nebraska State Museum has three floors of exhibits in Morrill Hall. These natural history exhibits highlight items from the Museum’s seven research collections, as well as basic scientific ideas. Attractions include Native American art of the Southwestern U.S., fossils of dinosaurs and ancient elephants, wildlife dioramas, and costumes, arts, and artifacts of Africa. Location: 14th and U Street. Hours of Operation: Monday – Saturday (9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Sunday (1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.)

Haymarket District
Whether it is night or day, the historic Haymarket District, with its galleries, restaurants, boutiques and turn of the century buildings, is just a few blocks away. Antique shops, art galleries and the first microbrewery in Nebraska draw visitors and locals daily. Location: Between 7th and 9th Street, from O street to R Street.
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Bernstein, Dan [Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence, University of Kansas] dbj@ku.edu
Berryman, Chuck [University Of Nebraska–Lincoln] cberryman1@unl.edu
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The following organizations have made generous contributions of support for the success of this conference:

- University of Nebraska–Lincoln
- American Association for Higher Education
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- The Pew Charitable Trusts
  and
- University of Kansas Center for Teaching Excellence