CCI Recommends . . . Five articles on using peer review

Atwood, C.H., Taylor, J.W., and Hutchings, P., *Why are chemists and other scientists afraid of the peer review of teaching?* Journal of Chemical Education, 2000. **77**(2): p. 239-243.

Highlights and addresses several barriers common to implementation of peer reviews: fear, ignorance, lack of time (an example of conducting a peer review in one hour is given) and general questions that come up. Rationale in support of peer reviews includes motivation for self-improvement, additional feedback besides student evaluations, academic recognition of teaching and alternatives to bureaucratic accountability.

McManus, D.A., *The two paradigms of education and the peer review of teaching.* Journal of Geoscience Education, 2001. **49**(5): p. 423-434.

This article serves as an excellent introduction to the comparison of the teaching-centered and learning-centered paradigms of education, especially with regard to peer review of teaching for RTP decisions. The author compares the characteristics of teaching-centered and learning-centered models in regard to assumptions about education, educational goals, assessment of results, classroom environment, instructor's responsibilities, the instructor-student relationship, and student goals. He suggests that students learn best through active learning, by connecting new information to existing knowledge, by participating in a community of learners, by controlling their own learning, and by making observations and exploring concepts before learning terminology.

Hutchings, P., *The peer review of teaching: Progress, issues, and prospects*. Innovative Higher Education, 1996. **20**(4): p. 221-234.

Hutchings addresses several issues regarding peer reviews that make it difficult to implement on campuses. Some mentioned in the article include: 1) Going Public with Teaching ; 2) Establishing Standards; 3) Identifying the Appropriate Peers; 4) Finding the Right Methods and Strategies; and, 5) Time.

Kumrow, D., and Dahlen, B., *Is peer review an effective approach for evaluating teachers?* The Clearing House, 2002. May/June: p. 238-241.

Student teachers were randomly assigned to one of three groups. Each group was different types of feedback. The group receiving feedback from supervisors and colleagues as well as attending seminars where they could discuss their teaching performance and instructional strategies felt they gained valuable insight into their teaching performance through peer observation and feedback.

Mundy, V., and Grabau, L.J., *Planning for peer review of teaching.* Journal of Natural Resources for Life Science Education, 1999. **28**: p. 31-36.

Highlights eight steps to solid planning of peer reviews: 1) articulate desired outcomes, 2) describe good teaching in the department, 3) create a process to choose reviewers, 4) create a process to schedule reviews, 5) crate a process for carrying out reviews and reporting data, 6) train reviewers, 7) create opportunities for follow-up and professional development, and 8) reward participation.