

Assessment of Reception for Implementing Peer Review of Teaching

Rate the extent to which you think these arguments are compelling to your faculty overall.

4 = Especially compelling

3 = Somewhat compelling

2 = Not very compelling

1 = Not at all compelling

Rational for Peer Review

___ Professional responsibility argument: As professionals, it is our responsibility to maintain and oversee standards of practice in the work of our colleagues.

___ Reward argument: Teaching won't reward properly until it is subject to inspection by peers, just as research is. Peer review will raise the status of teaching.

___ Development of standards argument: Initiating peer review of teaching will result in the articulation of standards of practice, which we have not had before now.

___ Faculty Expectation argument: Having a peer review of teaching program in place will help all faculty know expectations and get feedback on their performance.

___ Motivation argument: Making teaching public through subjecting it to peer review will encourage faculty to put more energy into their teaching.

___ Accountability argument: Peer review of teaching will help satisfy public demands for accountability in higher education.

___ Mandate argument: Peer review is being mandated across colleges. We have to come up with something we can live with.

___ Evaluation improvement argument: Thorough evaluation of teaching requires multiple viewpoints (students, peers, self). Our present system of relying mostly on student opinion to judge teaching is unacceptable: Peer review will increase in fairness. Peers are the best source for judging such things as the accuracy and currency of the course content.

Total score for strength of rationales:

Reservations About Peer Review

___ It is too hard to define a peer. Specialization, small numbers of faculty in a unit, differences in rank, personality factors, all get in the way of finding appropriate parties for good peer review.

___ Peer reviewers are too vulnerable. Legal issues and political repercussions within academic unit can inhibit the potential for a peer reviewer to be honest.

___ There is no time to add peer review responsibilities to what faculty are already doing.

___ There are no standards for good teaching, so peer review is too subjective. Faculty don't really know how to judge teaching.

___ Teaching is not valued anyway, so investing in peer review is wasteful.

___ Peer review is being foisted on us.

___ Our present system of evaluation of teaching works fine without changing the way in which we approach peer review of teaching.

___ It is awkward for faculty to judge their colleagues' teaching. Teaching seems private and faculty don't like to set themselves up as knowing more about teaching than their peers do.

___ If peers review teaching, those under review will be afraid to experiment or take risks.

Total score for strengths of reservations:

Strength of rationales - strength of reservations =

Ways of strengthening rationales:

Ways of addressing reservations:

Source:

Chism, N. (2007). Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook (2nd edition). Bolton, MA; Anker Publishing.