Final Report from the Task Force on Stockton Institute for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET)

Task Force Member	Rank	Program
Elizabeth Shobe, Co-Chair	Professor	Psychology
Meg White, Co-Chair	Associate Professor	Education
Muntakim M Choudhury	Assistant Professor	Business Studies
Kim Furphy	Associate Professor	Occupational Therapy
Jung Ah Han (Jenny)	Assistant Professor	Marketing
Douglas M Harvey	Associate Professor	Instructional Technology
Robin Hernandez-Mekonnen	Associate Professor	Social Work
Mina Jafarijoo	Assistant Professor	Computer Information Systems
Mary Kientz	Associate Professor	Occupational Therapy
Quynh Nguyen	Assistant Professor	Computer Information Systems
Mary Padden-Denmead	Associate Professor	Nursing
Thierry Saintine	Assistant Professor	General Studies
Elyssa B. Smith	Assistant Professor	Counseling

Faculty Senate Motion

"Peer Evaluation is a significant service contribution for faculty and important to the tenure and promotion process. Faculty Senate proposes to create a faculty-led task force to examine the current model of training peer evaluators and develop recommendations on the future of SIPET. The Senate authorizes the Senate executive to constitute the membership of the proposed task force."

Task Force Objectives

The Stockton Institute of Peer Evaluation of Teaching Task Force (SIPET TF) developed several objectives to examine the current model and develop recommendations. All SIPET TF members were provided with the current SIPET MOA (2013), the current SIPET syllabus, the 2022 SIPET Blackboard course, SIPET 2021 and 2022 Final Reports submitted to the Provost, and all SIPET surveys and data collected in 2021 and 2022. These materials were reviewed by the SIPET TF members and used where relevant to the objectives. These objectives were:

1. Determine if the current SIPET model aligns with the University and negotiated expectations (MOA).
2. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the current model including benefits to SIPET participants, improvements that could be made, and general experiences as peer observers.
3. Understand the perspective of faculty members who have not attended SIPET including areas where SIPET training is advantageous or can de-emphasize, reasons for non-participation in SIPET for the purpose of increasing SIPET participation.
4. Gain the perspective of junior faculty on the teaching evaluation process including benefits and concerns to emphasize aspects of the SIPET model that can enhance teaching through the evaluative process.

5. Determine impediments to SIPET participation. Determine if the current timing and modality of SIPET (Summer, on campus) is desirable and sufficient.
6. Review peer evaluation of teaching training practices at other institutions that could be adapted in SIPET.

Background of SIPET

SIPET is a valuable resource for faculty at Stockton. It is one of the few places where faculty members can deeply examine effective teaching, discuss effective practices, and find common ground to support the teaching craft. Training peer observers to recognize effective teaching in a variety of pedagogical styles, classroom modalities, and courses results in a more equitable, transparent personnel process, elevates the teaching craft, and promotes conversations about teaching.

Embedded in the mission of our university is the value of excellence in teaching and dedication to student learning.

"Our faculty and staff recognize a responsibility to engage our students in the development of ideas across and within disciplines, both inside and outside the classroom. We strive to enhance the student learning experience, by utilizing proven pedagogical methods, research, creative activity, and advancements in technology, which support the promotion of life-long learning." (Stockton University Mission Statement)

One way to accomplish this is to support faculty to achieve teaching excellence, and SIPET is one of the few avenues available to tenured faculty members that focuses exclusively on pedagogy and creates a culture of teaching support by providing training to experienced faculty on best practices in formative and summative evaluations of teaching. Not only does SIPET highlight the value of consistent and thorough examination of teaching effectiveness throughout one's career, but it also encourages connection between senior and junior faculty members that respectfully and supportively bind their shared commitment to and understanding of teaching excellence that aligns with University mission, values, and standards. The current SIPET model is based on the scholarly literature on methods of effective peer evaluations that accomplish the summative evaluations used in personnel files, while also strongly encouraging formative evaluations that pervade the faculty body's sense of accomplishment, pride in the institution, and centrality of teaching excellence at Stockton. SIPET's purpose and values may be best understood by review of its most recent syllabus, attached here in Appendix A. SIPETS goals very clearly include:
   o Create an environment in which the value of peer-evaluation of teaching is supported.
   o Enhance knowledge, skills, and attitudes related to the peer observation process.
   o Expand the number of tenured faculty who are well-trained to observe and evaluate teaching.

General Findings

The findings of this SIPET TF clearly indicate that SIPET achieves its goals. The experience is highly valued by its participants, has a strong impact on professional development, and enhances peer observation and evaluation skills. These findings complement and reiterate the evidence provided by the CTLD Director, Dr. Kathy Klein, in her annual reports on SIPET submitted to Academic Affairs. The full set of data for each objective appear in subsequent pages, but some highlights include the following:

- Objective 1. SIPET aligns with the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), but the MoA as it is currently written has outdated terminology and could be expanded to reflect a central role of faculty in SIPET and broaden its scope to include teaching evaluations for experienced (post-tenure) faculty seeking to modify their teaching and complement promotion files. Based on the responses from junior faculty, SIPET could also be expanded to include a workshop that helps junior faculty be their best teaching advocates in the peer review process. Such a workshop would include several elements already part of SIPET and reframe several others so that junior faculty focus on goal development in their courses and peer evaluations.

- Objectives 2 (SIPET participants), 3 (non-SIPET participants), 4 (Junior Faculty: tenure track and NTTP). A survey was sent to faculty members across the university twice, in March 2023 and November 2023. The questions were tailored to each of the three groups, but there was some overlap to enable comparison.
    - The current SIPET model has several goals and objectives to provide specific opportunities that align with excellence in peer evaluations as indicated by scholarly literature. To that end, the survey asked SIPET participants the extent to which they experienced those opportunities. 80 -100% of participants indicated that SIPET provided "a good amount" of opportunity for every item listed, and none of the participants in the current model (2020 -2023) indicated that they did not or did not remember experiencing any of the opportunities listed. It is clear from the responses that the current SIPET model has strong success in providing opportunities to learn about and practice effective peer evaluation practices in accordance with scholarly literature.
    - SIPET participants indicated that the current model was a highly valuable experience. 80 -90% of participants indicated that SIPET improved the quality of their peer evaluations and increased their confidence as peer evaluators "most certainly" or by "a high amount". SIPET participants perceived their experience to be highly valuable, one that strongly impacted the quality of their peer evaluations.
    - SIPET participants indicated that the activities (seven listed) in the current model had a high (50 – 70%) or moderate (20 -40%) impact on their peer observations. None indicated low or no impact for any of the activities. It appears as though the current SIPET model incorporates activities that impact subsequent peer evaluations. SIPET could look more closely at these items from the survey to determine where activities could be modified or increased.
    - SIPET and non-SIPET participants were asked the same questions regarding their self-perceived peer evaluation skills and the impact of peer evaluation on their professional development.
        - Generally, SIPET participants showed less variability in their responses to the list of peer evaluation skills, largely restricting their responses to strongly agree or agree

to questions about their confidence in understanding Stockton's policies, alignment with the scholarly literature, peer evaluations in a variety of contexts (face-to-face, online, lab/studio), and recognizing effective teaching.

- o By contrast, the non-SIPET respondents had many fewer skills with which they strongly agreed, were more spread out across the five response options (from strongly agree to strongly disagree), with the highest percentages at agree and neither agree/disagree.
- o Generally, SIPET participants reported more confidence in their skills as peer evaluators, had stronger understanding of Stockton policies, and felt more comfortable across different course types than did participants who had not participated in SIPET.
- o Both SIPET and non-SIPET respondents felt the least confident in their skills to evaluate online and lab or studio courses, but they were not equal.
  - ▪ In response (strongly agree to strongly disagree) to the statement, "I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for online (synchronous and asynchronous) courses", 90% of SIPET participants selected "agree" or "strongly agree", 10% disagreed with the statement, none strongly disagreed. By contrast, 30% of non-SIPET respondents selected "agree" or "strongly agree", but 44% disagreed and 7% strongly disagreed.
  - ▪ In response to the statement, "I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for lab or studio courses", 60% of SIPET participants selected "agree" or "strongly agree", 10% selected disagree and 0 strongly disagree. By contrast, 46% of non-SIPET respondents selected "agree" or "strongly agree", and 37% selected "disagree" or "strongly disagree".
  - ▪ As a conclusion, SIPET could increase focus on online and lab/studio courses, but SIPET participants are much more comfortable with and confident about their skills in online and lab/studio courses than non-SIPET participants.
- Peer evaluations also seem to have more of an impact on professional development for SIPET participants compared to non-SIPET respondents.
  - o For example, SIPET participants report a moderate or major impact of peer evaluation on behaviors such as having added new teaching strategies, critically evaluating their existing teaching strategies, having taken action toward improvement of their own teaching, increased teaching conversations with peers, their confidence in and knowledge about teaching, benefits to interactions with students, increased interest in other professional development opportunities, and greater appreciation for different teaching strategies and skills of colleagues.
  - o SIPET participants also indicated that they feel they have had moderate to major impact on helping instructors improve their teaching and that they have made important contributions to the personnel review process.
  - o By contrast, non-SIPET respondents, again, had more variability and notably high percentages of these respondents indicated "no or minor impact" for those same items for which SIPET participants reported moderate and major impact.

- o Both SIPET and non-SIPET respondents indicated with high percentages that peer evaluations had no or minor impact on their interest or output in scholarship of teaching, and both plans to use peer evaluations as indicators of college service in their next personnel files. Indeed, the current SIPET model incorporates no components that explore scholarship of teaching because we have believed it beyond the scope of the SIPET mission. However, it is also critical that we recognize that scholarship of teaching contributes to an individual's teaching excellence and becomes important evidence of teaching excellence for senior faculty members. One issue that has repeatedly come up during SIPET is how to document peer evaluations in personnel files in a manner that protects the observes privacy and control over the report, while also enabling the evaluator to claim authorship and demonstrate the quality and quantity of their service.
  - o To summarize, SIPET participants appear to simply get more out of the peer evaluation process (or recognize that they do) than non-SIPET participants, for reasons that could be attributed to the experience of SIPET or the self-selective nature of SIPET participation. Interestingly, the impact of peer evaluations on professional development seems limited to the practice of teaching, having limited or no impact on scholarship of teaching. While promoting scholarship of teaching is not relevant to SIPET goals/objectives, it would be beneficial to the learning environment for Stockton to provide resources that promote and emphasize scholarship of teaching.
- Non-SIPET and junior faculty respondents were asked about their interactions before and after their observation sessions. This question was asked because SIPET pays considerable attention to the value, process, and best practices in pre-observation and post-observation meetings. These questions were not asked of SIPET participants because it was assumed that they engage in most or all, given their training.
  - o Generally, non-SIPET respondents indicated that they do many or most of the pre- and post-observation practices emphasized in SIPET (a few indicated that they had been trained, elsewhere)
  - o Despite the self-report of non-SIPET trained participants and our assumption that SIPET trained respondents engage in pre- and post-observation best practices, this strongly contrasts with the experiences reported by junior faculty respondents. It is possible that peer evaluators who do not engage in these best practices did not complete this survey.
  - o For pre-observations experiences, 52% of junior faculty reported their observations rarely or never included a pre-observation meeting (by Zoom or in person). 40% indicate that discussion of their course goals takes place half the time or less. 64% reported that half or less of their observations included discussion of relationship between the class events and learning objectives, and 80% half or less of their observations included discussion of previous personnel letters.
  - o For junior faculty, pre-observation activities were around 50% between always and usually, and 50% half the time or less.
  - o When asked about post-observation activities, a high percentage of junior faculty indicated that they rarely or never have a follow-up meeting, discuss strengths or

weaknesses of the session, discuss teaching strategies or ways to improve teaching, student engagement or classroom management. They also indicated with high percentages that they rarely or never discuss program/school/University standards, available resources, or the elements in the peer evaluation report.

- A high proportion of junior faculty agreed (48%) that pre-observation meetings are/would be useful (36% indicated neither agree nor disagree, 8% indicated disagree); 52% agreed that post-observations are/would be useful (40% indicated neither agree nor disagree, 12% indicated disagree). It is possible that the respondents who indicated value in pre and post observations are also the same approximate half that have experienced them.
- To summarize, according to the experiences of junior faculty members, many peer evaluators are not doing the pre- and post-activities for which SIPET advocates and trains, and which are benchmarks of excellence in peer evaluation of teaching. As indicated by some of the qualitative comments in the survey, more faculty should be participating in SIPET and in a separate question, the junior faculty overwhelmingly indicated that they would prefer peer evaluators to be trained.

- Junior faculty respondents provided several insights into the value of the peer evaluation process and also several shortcomings.
  - 48% of the junior faculty respondents believed the peer observation process to have improved their teaching. Also, 76% claimed to have applied the suggestions by the peer observers to improve their teaching. 40% of the respondents also agreed that peer observation reports are important for tenure and promotion decisions. 56% felt that peer observation was a good way of providing evidence for teaching excellence. Interestingly, 40% of the respondents felt that having classes observed is a stressful process but agreed (76%) that the final reports were valuable for teaching development as they contained valuable suggestions for improvements.
  - 40% felt that the quality of peer observations has been consistent.
  - 80% of the respondents believed that peer observers should be trained. 64% felt that peer observers have had adequate training.
  - Most (88%) agreed that peer observation reports accurately described the observed class sessions. However, faculty (52%) were ambivalent about the quality of observations made by peers outside of their field.
  - 52% felt that it was difficult to find an observer for evaluation purposes.
  - Many (52%) also felt that two peer evaluations per year were not realistic. It appears when asked to evaluate, a large number of faculty decline to peer observe. Most of the rejections were due to scheduling conflicts or lack of time, while some did not respond back to requests.
  - When asked about the process of finding peer observers, 19% of respondents mentioned that they asked other faculty for recommendations when choosing peer observer, and 18% ask faculty members they know or have heard of. 18% indicated that they chose previous SIPET participants, 6% indicated that their Chair recommends and only 5% contacted the CTLD for recommendations. On the other hand, 9% indicated that they bring the names of potential observers to their Dean for approval and 4% indicated that peer evaluators are chosen for them by their Dean, Chair, or other senior members.

While the majority of junior faculty exhibit autonomy in their choice and selection of evaluators, it is problematic that any must seek administrative approval or have peer evaluators selected for them. Junior faculty members must build their own personnel files in the manner that they feel best expresses their teaching excellence. It is a reasonable assertion that requiring approvals from/selection by Deans and Chairs is intended to help junior faculty navigate in an unfamiliar culture and that Deans and Chairs recommend peer evaluators based on their experiences of having read so many reports. Nonetheless, we suggest that Deans and Chairs reduce their influence by merely making suggestions as supportive gestures and cease requirements of their approvals.

- o To summarize, junior faculty in general appreciate peer observation to be an important part of teaching development and demonstrations of teaching excellence for tenure. However, some issues were identified for which we recommend changes to the peer evaluation process. First, junior faculty indicated that 10 peer observations may be too stressful and cumbersome, due to the fact that it is difficult to find faculty to do evaluations, and many reject when asked due to scheduling or time conflicts. As an alternative, some junior faculty suggested conducting one evaluation per year. Second, the respondents indicated that many observers did not meet (zoom or in-person) prior to the observation date. Based on the responses, it seems that faculty observers should do a pre- and post-observation meeting, and discuss ways of improvement, and the strengths and weaknesses of the session. Also, there were concerns regarding the clarity of the process – some faculty were suggested to select only trained observers, others were told to choose only members within the program, and others were told to choose outside the program. Finally, there were concerns regarding the time it takes to receive the final observation report.

- Many respondents at all ranks indicated that the current peer evaluation process is overly burdensome. From the evaluator's perspectives, there are too many, they take too long to write, and there is not enough incentive to write them (although many people indicated that they liked helping junior faculty and appreciated being part of a teaching conversation). From the junior faculty member perspective, they also generally felt that there are too many, they take too long to receive, and it is too difficult to find so many evaluators. Based on our findings, we recommend:
  - o Reduce the number of required peer evaluators to one per year.
  - o SIPET modify its training to encourage shorter and more streamlined reports that capture the teaching excellence aligned with the standards of just the observed session, to the exclusion of other assessments that are included in the personnel file which Programs and the FRC can evaluate.
  - o Increase the number of SIPET participants through email or other marketing-type means.

Objective 5. Timing of and participation in SIPET.
- Of the respondents who completed SIPET, and are therefore familiar with its content and rigor, the overwhelming majority (87%) believe summer (74% before June 30, 13% after June 30) to be the best time to offer SIPET to maximize the benefits.
- Respondents who had not previously participated in SIPET had more varied response, 34% also felt summer to be the best time for SIPET, while 26% indicated that they have no interest in ever

participating in SIPET and most indicated that they have no time to do SIPET or have conflicting schedules with SIPET.

- Interestingly, both the SIPET (10%) and non-SIPET (30%) respondents indicated that sessions throughout the academic year would be beneficial, and participants during SIPET and in personal communications with the current SIPET leaders (Kathy Klein, Meg White, Liz Shobe) have indicated that they would like refreshers throughout the year. Sessions throughout the year would require additional funding commitments from the administration, but benefit both previous SIPET participants and non-SIPET participants who are unwilling or unable to do three SIPET days in the summer.

- Based on the survey findings, SIPET participants benefit tremendously from their training, which in turn benefits junior faculty and elevates the teaching craft across the university. Further, junior faculty members indicate a strong preference for trained peer observers, and SIPET contains many elements of the peer evaluation process that reflect best practices in peer evaluation and that are desirable to junior faculty members. As such, the current 3-day SIPET model appears to work well and be a useful resource for senior and junior faculty members, but refreshers and short workshops throughout the year could be added.

- The main issue that we are finding with SIPET is that we are not getting very many applicants. Our findings indicate that there should be a higher quantity of SIPET-trained faculty members to decrease the burden on the few who are SIPET-trained, increase consistency in reports, and to best advocate for and support junior faculty. It is recommended that the Provost, Deans, and Chairs more strongly encourage senior faculty members to participate in SIPET through earlier and more frequent email reminders to the faculty assembly about purpose and deadlines, highlighting SIPET as separate and distinct from other summer institutes, and encouraging Chairs to add it to their Program meeting agendas. It would be ideal if every program had several SIPET trained faculty-members.

Objective 6. There is no published literature on peer evaluation training programs that are broadly applicable to undergraduate liberal arts teaching. The published literature on training programs is limited to K-12, nursing programs, and graduate programs with exceptionally low sample sizes, external funding, and/or missions and goals that differ from undergraduate liberal arts. As such, we have begun to disseminate our SIPET model through workshops at the Southeastern Psychological Association (Liz Shobe and Meg White, March 2023) and at the Eastern Psychological Association teaching session (Liz Shobe, March 2, 2024). The workshops were well received, and the one at the Eastern Psychological Association was completely full with standing participants (about 30 people in attendance). This indicates an interest across the field in the peer evaluation process and models for training peer evaluators. The data herein will be submitted for publication(s) in scholarship of teaching journal(s).

The following sections indicate our observations for each objective.

Objective 1. Determine if the current SIPET model aligns with the University and negotiated expectations (MOA).

Method:
Review MOA and current SIPET model syllabus and materials on the SIPET Blackboard.

Findings:
The Memorandum of Agreement (MoA) for the Summer Institute for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET) was approved in 2013 and has not been updated since that time. Currently, the SIPET objectives reflect those outlined in the MoA. The learning objectives delineated in the SIPET syllabus are distinct and measurable and the materials and activities provided to SIPET participants, reflect the SIPET purpose to teach participants how to prepare, conduct and write up professional peer-classroom evaluations. The names of faculty members who have completed the SIPET training is openly available on the CTLD website at: https://stockton.edu/ctld/peer-observation-teaching.html. Included in the current SIPET model is homework to be completed before the first SIPET day and homework for each day, and participant responsibilities are discussed at length at the end of the third day. The CTLD Director periodically requests updates from SIPET trained participants on their progress in meeting their responsibility to complete four peer evaluations.

The MoA should be reviewed and updated to reflect current terminology, director and responsibilities, fellows, and to clarify or update the selection processes. Suggestions are as follows:

- SIPET currently falls under the umbrella of the CTLD. The wording in the MoA should reflect this by removing reference to the Institute for Faculty Development (IFD) and the Director of the IFD, neither of which exist.
- The term "Teaching Fellow" applied to SIPET participants is confusing, as the CTLD and the IFD before it, both used the Teaching Fellow terminology to refer to a specific and unique position, and SIPET participants have not been referred to as "Teaching Fellows" for years.
- Inclusion of recently approved tenured faculty in SIPET during the summer <u>before</u> their tenure begins.
- Consideration should also be made about expanding the MoA to include additional training to address evaluating post-tenured faculty, where the teaching focus and expectations can be quite different from junior faculty.
- The MoA should include wording that ensures faculty contribution to planning, organizing, and running SIPET. The CTLD directorship is an administrative position, whereas the IFD directorship was a faculty position, and it was under the IFD leadership that SIPET was created. It is important that SIPET include faculty leaders who have demonstrated appropriate experiences in the classroom, understand the Stockton culture, students, and faculty through many years of experience, experience with a variety of personnel committee levels, and have a record of scholarly achievements that pertain to learning and teaching. In the current model, the combination of faculty leadership with administrative leadership (Kathy Klein) has made the current SIPET extremely strong.

Objective 2. Identify strengths and weaknesses of the current model including benefits to SIPET participants, improvements that could be made, and general experiences as peer observers.

Method:

A survey was conducted to address several factors, some specific to their SIPET experience and others more relevant to the peer evaluation experience. Factors specific to SIPET were opportunities provided by SIPET, the value of SIPET, impact of specific SIPET activities on the quality of peer evaluations. Factors relevant to the peer evaluation experience were self-perceived peer evaluation skills, impact of peer evaluation of professional development, and reasons for accepting/refusing peer evaluation requests. In addition, the SIPET model has changed several times since its inception in 2012, and so we were particularly interested in responses to the current model, which has been in place since 2020.

Results:

32 SIPET participants responded. One was excluded from analyses due to not having completed a peer evaluation and indicated that they were at a stage between the observation and the written report. The following is a summary of the remaining 31 SIPET participants.

Demographics

Years at Stockton	f
6 - 10 years	7
11 - 15 years	8
16 - 20 years	7
21 - 25 years	8
31 + years	1

Year Participated in SIPET	f	% of SIPET participants who responded to the survey (retired and left excluded)
No response	1	
2012 -2013	7	7/15 = 47%
2014- 2016	7	7/19 =37%
2017 - 2019	6	6/25 = 24%
2020 - 2023	10	10/19 = 53%

Hispanic or Latino descent	
No response	3
No	27
Yes	1

Group Membership	
No response	4
Black or African American	3
White	24

Schools Represented	f
ARHU	3
BSNS	2
EDUC	5
GENS	3
HLTH	5
SOBL	13

Preferred Pronoun	f
No response	3
He/him	6
She/her	22

SIPET Relevant Factors (Factors 1 – 3)

Factor 1. Opportunities Provided by SIPET. Importantly, the current SIPET syllabus and course design (discussions, activities, homework, schedule) is intended to include all of the following, so reported here are the overall frequencies and percentages and percentage of 2020-2023 SIPET participants.

Responses to the question, "To the best of your recollection, to what extent were the following opportunities provided by SIPET?"	A good amount F (%) 2020-23 %	Some F (%) 2020-23 %	None F (%)	I do not remember F (%)
Identify best practices of peer observation	30 (97) 100	1 (3)	0	0
Aligning peer evaluation practices with Stockton's expectations for faculty evaluation	22 (71) 90	9 (29) 10	0	0
Critical reflection on your experiences with the peer evaluation process	19 (61) 100	6 (19)	3(10)	3(10)
Critical reflection on biases in the peer evaluation process	18 (58) 80	6 (19) 20	6 (19)	1 (3)
Discussion of evidence-based teaching practices	14 (45) 90	15 (48) 10	2 (6)	0
Inspection of peer evaluation models (e.g., collaborative)	21 (68) 90	6 (19) 10	2 (6)	2 (6)
Simulation of a pre-observation meeting, directly or by example	17 (55) 80	7 (23) 20	5 (16)	2 (6)
Inspection of pre-observation meetings	16 (52) 80	5 (16) 20	7 (23)	3 (10)
Examination of peer evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)	17 (55) 90	11 (35) 10	2 (6)	1 (3)
Experience a virtual or in-person teaching session	16 (52) 90	5 (16) 10	10 (32)	0
Analyze a virtual or in-person teaching session	16 (52) 80	6 (19) 20	8 (26)	1 (3)
Inspection of best practices in peer observation through sample peer observation reports	20 (65) 100	9 (29)	0	2 (6)
Identify the role of peer evaluation reports in assessment of teaching	21 (68) 80	9 (29) 20	0	1 (3)
Write and reflect upon your own peer evaluation report using best practices and Stockton standards	18 (58) 80	8 (26) 20	4 (13)	1 (3)
Simulate a post-observation meeting, directly or by example.	13 (42) 80	10 (32) 20	5 (16)	3 (10)
Discuss effective methods for providing post-observation feedback	16 (52) 80	13 (42) 20	0	2 (6)
Understand expectations of SIPET-trained faculty peer observers	25 (81) 90	5 (16) 10	0	1 (3)
Engage in meaningful conversation with peers about ways to improve peer evaluation skills	24 (77) 100	6 (19)	1 (3)	0

Factor 2. SIPET Value

Responses to the question, "Please indicate your agreement with the following general statements about the value of SIPET for you"	Most Certainly F (%) 2020-23 %	High Amount F (%) 2020-23 %	Moderate Amount F (%) 2020-23 %	Small Amount F (%) 2020-23 %	Not at All F (%)
SIPET improved the quality of my peer observations.	10 (32) 40	12 (39) 50	6(19) 10	2(6)	1(3)
SIPET was a valuable experience for me.	10 (32) 40	10 (32) 40	8 (26) 20	2(6)	1(3)
I recommend that others participate in SIPET	13 (42) 40	11 (35) 40	6 (19) 20	0	1(3)
SIPET helped me become a more confident peer evaluator.	11 (35) 50	12 (39) 30	5 (16) 10	1 (3) 10	2 (6)

Factor 3. Impact of SIPET Activities

Responses to the question, "Please indicate the impact of the following SIPET activities on the quality of your peer observations."	High F (%) 2020-23 %	Moderate F (%) 2020-23 %	Low F (%) 2020-23 %	None F (%) 2020-23 %	Did Not Experience F (%)
Reviewing sample peer observation reports	19 (61) 70	8 (26) 30	2 (6)	1 (3)	1 (3)
Writing sample peer observation reports	17 (55) 50	10 (32) 40	2 (6) 10	1 (3)	1 (3)
Discussion of pre-observation meetings	15 (48) 70	12 (39) 30	4 (13)	0	0
Discussion of post-observation meetings	15 (48) 70	12 (39) 20	3 (10) 10	1 (3)	0
Discussion of teaching effectiveness	15 (48) 80	10 (32) 20	4 (13)	1 (3)	1 (3)
Observation of teaching session(s)	13 (42) 60	12 (39) 40	2 (6)	2 (6)	2 (6)
Inspection of Stockton standards for teaching excellence	17 (55) 70	11 (35) 30	1 (3)	0	2 (6)

General Peer Evaluation Factors (Factors 4 -6)

Factor 4. Self-Perceived Peer Evaluation Skills

Responses to the question, "How do you feel about your skill as a peer observer of teaching?"	Strongly Agree F (%) 2020-23 %	Agree F (%) 2020-23 %	Neither Agree nor Disagree F (%) 2020-23 %	Disagree F (%) 2020-23 %	Strongly Disagree F (%) 2020-23 %
I rate my skills as a peer observer as high.	12(39) 50	18 (58) 50	1 (3)	0	0

I am confident that I can evaluate and select tools that are useful for peer observation (e.g., rubrics).	13 (42) 70	16 (52) 30	1 (3)	1 (3)	0
I am confident in my ability to evaluate teaching effectiveness that aligns with the scholarly literature.	7 (23) 40	19 (61) 60	5 (16)	0	0
I am confident in my understanding of Stockton's Policies on teaching excellence.	13 (42) 50	16 (52) 40	2 (6) 10	0	0
I am comfortable making critical comments in the reports I write, even if they are negative.	8 (26) 30	20 (65) 60	1 (3)	2 (6) 10	0
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for face-to face courses.	17 (55) 60	13 (42) 40	1 (3)	0	0
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for online (synchronous and asynchronous) courses.	10 (32) 50	10 (32) 40	5 (16)	4 (13) 10	2 (6)
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for lab or studio courses.	2 (6) 10	10 (32) 50	11 (35) 30	6 (19) 10	2 (6)
I have engaged in meaningful, informal conversations with my peers for ways to improve my peer observation skill.	6(19) 20	13 (42) 40	10(32) 40	2 (6)	0
I have a thorough working knowledge of the expectations and uses of peer observation at Stockton university.	10 (32) 30	16 (52) 50	4 (13) 20	1 (3)	0
I am confident in my ability to recognize effective teaching in a variety of teaching settings and styles.	12 (39) 60	18 (58) 40	1 (3)	0	0
It is difficult for me to evaluate effective teaching when the teaching style is different from my own.	0	4 (13) 10	2 (6)	16 (52) 70	9 (29) 20
I am comfortable completing peer observations for courses outside of my area of expertise.	10 (32) 30	18 (58) 60	3 (10) 10	0	0
Conducting peer observations is stressful for me.	3 (10) 20	6 (19) 10	8 (26) 10	10 (32) 50	4 (13) 10

Factor 5. Impact of peer evaluation of professional development

Responses to the question, "Has conducting peer observations had an influence on the following aspects of your professional development?"	Major Impact F (%)	Moderate Impact F (%)	Minor Impact F (%)
I have changed my learning objectives in at least one course.	0	18 (58)	13(42)
I have added new teaching strategies in at least one course.	7 (23)	22 (71)	2 (6)
I have critically evaluated my existing teaching strategies in at least one course.	7 (23)	23 (74)	1 (3)
I have taken actions toward improvement in teaching in at least one course.	9 (29)	22 (71)	0
I have revised my teaching philosophy.	0	15 (48)	16 (52)
My teaching conversations with peers have increased.	9 (29)	15 (48)	7 (23)
I have more confidence in my teaching.	7 (23)	17 (55)	7 (23)
My knowledge about teaching has improved.	8 (26)	21 (68)	2 (6)
My interactions with students have benefited from being a peer observer.	4 (13)	16 (52)	11 (35)
I have a greater interest in the scholarship of teaching.	6 (19)	9 (29)	16 (52)
I read more scholarly articles or books about teaching.	3 (10)	7 (23)	21 (68)
I have increased my scholarly presentations or publications on teaching.	0	8 (26)	23 (74)
I am more interested in additional professional development activities about teaching, such as summer institutes, committees, fellowships, professional organizations.	5 (16)	15 (48)	11 (35)
I have used or plan to use peer evaluations as indicators of service in my promotion file.	14(45)	9 (29)	8 (26)
I have a greater appreciation for different teaching perspectives or strategies.	13 (42)	16 (52)	2 (6)
I have a greater respect for teaching abilities of my colleagues.	20 (65)	9 (29)	2 (6)
I do more self-monitoring of my teaching practices.	12 (39)	15 (48)	4 (13)
I have gained a broader understanding of cross-disciplinary teaching methods and goals.	12 (39)	13 (42)	6 (19)
My peer observations have helped instructors improve their teaching.	8 (26)	21 (68)	2 (6)
My peer observations are an important contribution to the personnel review process.	17 (55)	12 (39)	2 (6)

Factor 6. Reasons for Accepting or Refusing Peer Evaluation Requests

Responses to the question, "When a peer asks you to do an evaluation of their teaching, what are your reasons for agreeing? Select all that apply. "	F (%)
It's hard for me to say no	17 (55)
I feel a sense of obligation to junior faculty	26 (84)
I am doing my part to strengthen teaching practices, collegewide	19 (61)
I like learning about teaching and different pedagogies	18 (58)
I may learn how to improve my teaching	16 (52)
I feel sorry for junior faculty who need peer evaluations	12 (39)
I use it as evidence of service	14 (45)

I enjoy doing them	12 (39)
I want to be part of a teaching conversation	11 (35)
I get a closer inspection of teaching practices of junior faculty in my program	10 (32)
I am doing my part to weed out underperformers	2 (6)
I am required to do it by my program	1 (3)

Responses to the question, "When a peer asks you to do an evaluation of their teaching, what are your reasons for NOT agreeing? Select all that apply"	F (%)
I could not /cannot fit it into my schedule	22 (71)
This does not describe me. I have never refused when asked	9 (29)
I have already done my fair share (and then some!)	4 (13)
They are too time consuming	2 (6)
They are too much effort	2 (6)
There is too little reward	2 (6)
I have already done the four required of me from my SIPET contract	2 (6)
I am not expert in the field for the course requested	1 (3)

Other reasons added by text:
I don't have time to do more than one observation per semester; I limit myself to one per semester. First come, first served; Lack of compensation;

Qualitative Comments.
Responses to the Question, "Is there anything else you think is important for us to know about peer evaluations of teaching at Stockton?" The six affirmative responses shared the following:

- these are overly time consuming but very important. SIPET really helped me focus on important things to include in peer reviews.
- I really think that Peer Reviews have lost their meaning - on one hand, they become a "here's how you can teach more like me (meaning, better)." I am SO tired of being bullied by Stockton faculty about what is the "best" way to teach - this is what makes me scared about survey items about "data-informed strategies," etc. We seem to forget that faculty (WHO ARE NOT K-12 TEACHERS) also have their own approaches, and that those are OK. If I want to be a lecturer, then help me be my best lecturer, not bully me into being a different type of instructor. As a peer reviewer, I don't want to make them into something else - I want to engage them as instructors and improve their experience in the classroom (the idea is that if THEIR experience in the classroom is more engaging and enjoyable, then students will have a more enjoyable, engaging experience. When students feel like you hate being in the classroom, so will they). On the other hand, this is TOO MUCH - why do a peer observation EVERY SEMESTER? Now with more NTTPs, this is getting more and more overwhelming - it's to the point where I don't want to do them anymore. They are SO time consuming (to write them effectively), and what are they really? Just a check-box on the personnel process and maybe a source of one or two sentences that you can use in your file narrative? We have too few tenured faculty members (and those numbers are getting fewer and fewer) to review more and more junior, adjunct, and NTTP faculty members. This is UNSUSTAINABLE. In the end, what is the purpose of SIPET and how is it not going to be yet another way of beating down faculty (either through the bully/shaming process and/or the "thanks for volunteering to do this, now give up hours and hours each semester)?

- SIPET is very important to faculty, and to Stockton, in general. There is a lot of research that supports the use of peer evaluations to strengthen teaching. This makes us better.
- I have found that some faculty will ask 2 distinct SIPET trained faculty to observe the SAME course during the SAME semester. I turned others away without knowing that was the case. I would consider a way to suggest faculty not ask for multiple observations the same semester from SIPET. I also would consider having a way for us to report how many observations we have done. This way, faculty aren't steered to the same SIPET observers. I worry that some of us get more requests than others. I hate to say no but I can't fit any more in.
- I have heard there may be a stipend or there have been discussions about it. These are very time consuming if done correctly. so I think getting paid is fair. I also think there are far too few trained observers and too many people who say no to all requests.
- Random thoughts:
  1) people need to request observations EARLY
  2) We need many more SIPET trained faculty
  3) We should get a stipend for each evaluation because it's a lot of freaking work.

Objective 3. Understand the perspective of faculty members who have not participated in SIPET including areas where SIPET training is advantageous or can de-emphasize, reasons for non-participation in SIPET for the purpose of increasing SIPET participation.

Method:

A survey was conducted to address several factors. Two factors were identical to SIPET participants: Self-Perceived Peer Evaluation Skills and Impact of Evaluation on Professional Development. Also included in this survey were factors related to practices as a peer evaluator. These are practices covered in the current SIPET training model. The purpose of including these was to determine the extent to which these elements are practiced by those who have not participated in SIPET, which would inform any changes that could or should be made to the current model. These factors were: elements included the written report, preparation practices before the observation, and post-observation practices.

Results:

27 faculty members with experience writing peer evaluations who have not participated in SIPET completed the survey.

Demographics

Years at Stockton	f
11 - 15 years	3
16 - 20 years	9
21 - 25 years	4
26 - 30 years	1
31 + years	1
6 - 10 years	9

Race and Ethnicity	f
No response	2
White	25
Hispanic or Latin	26 No, 1 no response

School	f
ARHU	2
BSNS	3
GENS	5
HLTH	1
NAMS	10
SOBL	6

Pronoun	f
He/him	12
She/her	14
They/them	1

Number of peer evaluations completed for colleagues	f
1 - 4	11
5 - 9	3
10 -14	5
15 or more	8

Number of peer evaluations received from other colleagues	f
0	4
1 - 2	1
3 - 4	7
5 or more	15

Factor 1. Self-Perceived Peer Evaluation Skills

Responses to the question, "How do you feel about your skill as a peer observer of teaching?"	Strongly Agree F (%)	Agree F (%)	Neither Agree nor Disagree F (%)	Disagree F (%)	Strongly Disagree F (%)
I rate my skills as a peer observer as high.	3 (11)	14 (52)	7 (26)	2 (7)	1 (4)
I am confident that I can evaluate and select tools that are useful for peer observation (e.g., rubrics).	3 (11)	18 (67)	5 (19)	0 (0)	1 (4)
I am confident in my ability to evaluate teaching effectiveness that aligns with the scholarly literature.	3 (11)	8 (30)	10 (37)	5 (19)	1 (4)
I am confident in my understanding of Stockton's Policies on teaching excellence.	8 (30)	14 (52)	0 (0)	4 (15)	1 (4)
I am comfortable making critical comments in the reports I write, even if they are negative.	5 (19)	6 (22)	5 (19)	8 (30)	3 (11)
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for face-to face courses.	14 (52)	10 (37)	1 (4)	1 (4)	1 (4)
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for online (synchronous and asynchronous) courses.	3 (11)	5 (19)	5 (19)	12 (44)	2 (7)
I am confident in my ability to complete peer observations for lab or studio courses.	6 (22)	7 (26)	4 (15)	7 (26)	3 (11)
I have engaged in meaningful, informal conversations with my peers for ways to improve my peer observation skill.	2 (7)	15 (56)	5 (19)	3 (11)	2 (7)
I have a thorough working knowledge of the expectations and uses of peer observation at Stockton university.	4 (15)	17 (63)	4 (15)	2 (7)	0 (0)
I am confident in my ability to recognize effective teaching in a variety of teaching settings and styles.	9 (33)	16 (59)	1 (4)	0 (0)	1 (4)
It is difficult for me to evaluate effective teaching when the teaching style is different from my own.	0 (0)	2 (7)	6 (22)	3 (11)	6 (22)
I am comfortable completing peer observations for courses outside of my area of expertise.	5 (19)	13 (48)	4 (15)	4 (15)	1 (4)
Conducting peer observations is stressful for me.	2 (7)	9 (33)	4 (15)	8 (30)	4 (15)

Factor 2. Impact on Professional development

Responses to the question, "Has conducting peer observations had an influence on the following aspects of your professional development?"	Major Impact F (%)	Moderate Impact F (%)	Minor Impact F (%)
I have changed my learning objectives in at least one course.	0 (0)	7 (26)	20 (74)
I have added new teaching strategies in at least one course.	4 (15)	15 (56)	8 (30)
I have critically evaluated my existing teaching strategies in at least one course.	7 (26)	8 (30)	12 (44)
I have taken actions toward improvement in teaching in at least one course.	9 (33)	9 (33)	9 (33)
I have revised my teaching philosophy.	0 (0)	4 (15)	23 (85)
My teaching conversations with peers have increased.	5 (19)	10 (37)	12 (44)
I have more confidence in my teaching.	5 (19)	13 (48)	9 (33)
My knowledge about teaching has improved.	4 (15)	13 (48)	10 (37)
My interactions with students have benefited from being a peer observer.	1 (4)	11 (41)	15 (56)
I have a greater interest in the scholarship of teaching.	0 (0)	7 (26)	20 (74)
I read more scholarly articles or books about teaching.	0 (0)	5 (19)	22 (81)
I have increased my scholarly presentations or publications on teaching.	0 (0)	3 (11)	24 (89)
I am more interested in additional professional development activities about teaching, such as summer institutes, committees, fellowships, professional organizations.	0 (0)	14 (52)	13 (48)
I have used or plan to use peer evaluations as indicators of service in my promotion file.	9 (33)	5 (19)	13 (48)
I have a greater appreciation for different teaching perspectives or strategies.	10 (37)	12 (44)	5 (19)
I have a greater respect for teaching abilities of my colleagues.	8 (30)	16 (59)	3 (11)
I do more self-monitoring of my teaching practices.	2 (7)	14 (52)	11 (41)
I have gained a broader understanding of cross-disciplinary teaching methods and goals.	0 (0)	18 (67)	9 (33)
My peer observations have helped instructors improve their teaching.	5 (19)	15 (56)	7 (26)
My peer observations are an important contribution to the personnel review process.	4 (15)	14 (52)	9 (33)

Factor 3. Practices of Evaluators Before the Observation.

Responses to the question, "Before you attend a class for observation, which of the following are included in your typical preparation practices? Select all that apply."	F (%)
We agree on course, time and date of observation.	27 (100)
Other than agreeing on time/date to observe, we meet at least one additional time by zoom or in person.	18 (67)
Other than agreeing on time/date to observe, we communicate additional questions/responses by email.	17 (63)
Other than agreeing on time/date to observe, we communicate additional questions/responses by telephone.	3 (11)
I communicate my observation philosophy, intentions, or goals.	13 (48)
Discuss instructor's course goals.	15 (56)
Discuss instructor's class goals and objectives.	19 (70)
Discuss how class events meet learning objective.	13 (48)
Discuss instructor's pedagogical skills and style of teaching.	10 (37)
Discuss instructor's concerns or desired affirmations.	15 (56)
Discuss areas for development based on previous PRC, Dean, FRC letters.	2 (7)
Discuss areas for development based on student feedback.	5 (19)
Discuss program standards.	5 (19)
Discuss school standards.	2 (7)
Review instructor's syllabus for course design, content, and rigor.	27 (100)
Review instructor's course on Blackboard.	9 (33)

Factor 4. Practices of Evaluators After the Observation.

Responses to the question, "After you attend a class for observation, which of the following reflect your most typical practices? Select all that apply."	F (%)
Other than exchanging pleasantries, our next communication is my final report that I send to the instructor. Barring errors or typos, that is the final report.	4 (15)
I send a draft of my report to the instructor, where I ask for feedback about the content before finalizing.	22 (81)
The instructor writes their own report, I add narrative or make modifications, and return the finalized report to them.	0 (0)
My final report includes a checklist.	1 (4)
We meet by Zoom or in person.	20 (74)
We communicate by email.	19 (70)
We communicate by telephone.	2 (7)
Discussion of strengths of the session.	23 (85)
Discussion of teaching effectiveness.	20 (74)
Discussion of weaknesses of the session.	22 (81)
Discuss student engagement.	22 (81)
Discuss classroom management.	17 (63)
Discuss alternate ways to meet learning objectives for the session or course.	8 (30)

Discuss general teaching strategies for this or other courses.	19 (70)
Discuss instructor's organization or planning.	17 (63)
Discuss instructor's clarity.	15 (56)
Discuss the elements I will include in my report.	20 (74)
Discuss resources available to support teaching practices.	14 (52)
Discuss obstacles or barriers to teaching effectiveness.	11 (41)
Discuss Program Standards.	6 (22)
Discuss School and/or University Standards.	3 (11)

Factor 5. Elements of the Peer Evaluation Written Report

Response to the Question, "Reflecting on the written report portion of the peer observation, please indicate the relative importance of including the following:"	Essential F (%)	Moderate F (%)	Minimal F (%)	Not Important F (%)
Assessment of teaching effectiveness with specific mention of Standards for Teaching Faculty in Faculty Evaluation Policy, Section 6.1	13 (48)	7 (26)	4 (15)	3 (11)
Reference to specific Program Standards	12 (44)	4 (15)	7 (26)	4 (15)
Reference to specific School Standards	9 (33)	5 (19)	8 (30)	5 (19)
Specific examples of teaching behaviors that reflect Standards for Teaching Faculty in Faculty Evaluation Policy, Section 6.1	16 (59)	5 (19)	3 (11)	3 (11)
Your credentials and relevant experience.	3 (11)	12 (44)	6 (22)	6 (22)
Examples of effective teaching that are not captured by the Standards	12 (44)	8 (30)	4 (15)	3 (11)
Examples of effective teaching based on your experience teaching the same or similar course	2 (7)	12 (44)	6 (22)	7 (26)
References to the scholarly literature on teaching excellence	2 (7)	4 (15)	13 (48)	8 (30)
Evaluation of the syllabus	9 (33)	10 (37)	7 (26)	1 (4)
The goals for the course	8 (30)	11 (41)	5 (19)	3 (11)
The goals for the session you observed	16 (59)	5 (19)	4 (15)	2 (7)
Positive or constructive assessment of teaching behaviors	17 (63)	8 (30)	0 (0)	2 (7)
Impediments or barriers to good teaching due to physical environment or personal circumstance of the instructor	7 (26)	10 (37)	8 (30)	2 (7)
Changes since previous observations (yours or others)	0 (0)	10 (37)	8 (30)	9 (33)
Comments overheard or made to you by students during the observation session	3 (11)	7 (26)	12 (44)	5 (19)
Instructor's use of inclusive language	5 (19)	14 (52)	5 (19)	3 (11)
Instructor rapport with students	15 (56)	9 (33)	2 (7)	1 (4)

Instructor use of comprehension checks (questioning, activities, self-assessments) or other formative assessments	11 (41)	11 (41)	1 (4)	4 (15)
Suggestions for improvement or alternate teaching methods	10 (37)	12 (44)	2 (7)	3 (11)
General assessment of whether you would enjoy being a student in this class	1 (4)	5 (19)	9 (33)	12 (44)
Recommendation to retain or promote the instructor	1 (4)	4 (15)	5 (19)	17 (63)
General comparison of the instructor to an ideal (e.g., top, average, poor)	1 (4)	3 (11)	4 (15)	19 (70)

Qualitative Comments.
Responses to the Question, "Is there anything else you think is important for us to know about peer evaluations of teaching at Stockton?" The five affirmative responses shared the following:

- I wish there was an abbreviated version of SIPET as an intro, and then when I had time, I would go to the longer one. That the options weren't multi-day training versus no training. I do take advantage of the resources on CTLD website to learn how to do POT's, and also had a more experienced colleague read and give input on the first one that I completed. Thank you for doing this survey.
- I am hesitant to be completely honest in my report regarding the instructor's lack of engagement with students. Instead, I plan to have a conversation about potential improvements and make a vague suggestion in the report. I am concerned that negative comments could negatively impact the instructor's tenure assessment by PRC and FRC. As an observer, this puts me in a delicate position.
- I do enjoy doing peer evals for junior colleagues, because I enjoy mentoring junior colleagues. The official process and expectation is too onerous. I would be more likely to take the official training if I could do maybe 2 observations per year. The actual observation and discussion with the professor is not the issue. It is the crafting of the report that takes a lot of time for me. This is why I can't responsibly commit to too many in a given semester.
- Peer evaluations are clearly important, but are only one piece of the evaluation process. I think some people place too much weight on these evaluations, in general. Ultimately, the candidate can choose to submit or withhold an evaluation. The notion that someone would need to obtain training in order to evaluate another faculty member is ridiculous. The fact that I obtained tenure and have years of experience should be enough qualification to evaluate my colleagues.
- This work disproportionately falls on female colleagues and the "usual suspects," those of us are willing to support our colleagues.

Objective 4. Gain the perspective of junior faculty on the teaching evaluation process including benefits and concerns to emphasize aspects of the SIPET model that can enhance teaching through the evaluative process.

Method:
A survey was conducted to address several factors, including perceptions of the peer evaluation process, interactions with peer observers, and selecting peer observers. Factors specific to the peer evaluation process were value, reliability and validity of peer evaluators and process. Factors relevant interactions with peer observers were before observation, after observation. Factors specific to selecting peer observers were who and how, refusals and reasons provided.

Results.
25 junior faculty completed the survey.

Demographics:

Years at Stockton	F
1 - 5 years	20
16 - 20 years	1
6 - 10 years	3
No response	1

Current Status	F
Full- time NTTP	6
Full-time tenure track	18
No response	1

School	F
BSNS	3
EDUC	1
GENS	3
HLTH	6
NAMS	5
SOBL	6
No response	1

Preferred Pronouns	F
He/him	10
She/her	14
No response	1

Hispanic or Latino descent	F
No	21

Yes	3

Race	F
American Indian or Alaska Native, White	1
Black or African American	2
White	21
No response	1

Factors 1 – 3: Perceptions of Peer Evaluation process

Factor 1. Value of Peer Observations

Responses to the question, "Please indicate your level of agreement with following statements about your experience with peer observers."	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree
The peer observation process has improved my teaching.	12 (48)	7 (28)	6 (24)
I have applied suggestions by observers for improvements or alternate teaching methods	19 (76)	3 (12)	3 (12)
Peer observations have adequately identified my teaching strengths and weaknesses	17 (68)	5 (20)	3 (12)
The peer observation reports in my file are major influences in retention, tenure and promotion decisions for me (e.g., referenced in letters from PRC, FRC, or Dean)	10 (40)	13 (52)	2 (8)
Peer observations feel like an audit/inspection of my competence as an instructor.	13 (52)	7 (28)	5 (20)
The main goal of peer observers is to determine an instructor's strengths and weaknesses for personnel review.	11 (44)	10 (40)	4 (16)
I believe that if I do not incorporate a program peer observer's suggestion, then they will hurt my chances for tenure or contract renewal.	8 (32)	6 (24)	11 (44)

Factor 2. Reliability and Validity of Peer Evaluations

Responses to the question, "Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about the consistency and accuracy of peer evaluations."	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree
The quality of peer observations has been consistent.	10 (40)	8 (32)	7 (28)
Peer observers should be trained	20 (80)	4 (16)	1 (4)
The observed classes were representative of my teaching.	20 (80)	3 (12)	2 (8)
Peer observers tend to include only positive comments in their reports.	6 (24)	10 (40)	9 (36)
Peer observation is a good way of providing evidence for teaching excellence, in general.	14 (56)	8 (32)	3 (12)
Peer Observation reports have accurately described the observed class sessions.	22 (88)	3 (12)	0 (0)

I am uncertain about the ability of observers who are not in my field to effectively evaluate my teaching methods	7 (28)	4 (16)	14 (56)
I am uncertain about the ability of observers who are not in my field to effectively evaluate quality of content in my classes	10 (40)	7 (28)	8 (32)
It is best when peer evaluators use the same teaching methods as I do.	2 (8)	11 (44)	12 (48)
The teaching mastery expectations of my peer observers have been too high	2 (8)	10 (40)	13 (52)
Observers outside of my field provide a lower quality or less useful peer observations	1 (4)	13 (52)	11 (44)

Factor 3. Experience

Responses to the question, "Please indicate your level of agreement with following statements about your experience with peer observers"	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree
My peer observers seem to have adequate training	16 (64)	8 (32)	1 (4)
Pre-observation meetings are or would be a useful part of the peer observation process for me.	12 (48)	9 (36)	2 (8)
Post-observation meetings are or would be a useful part of the peer observation process for me.	13 (52)	10 (40)	3 (12)
Having my classes observed is stressful.	10 (40)	5 (20)	4 (40)
Peer observation reports are valuable/useful for my teaching development	18 (72)	6 (24)	5 (4)
I look forward to reading the observer's reports.	17 (68)	6 (24)	6 (8)
I appreciate when the final report includes suggestions by observers for improvements or alternate teaching methods.	19 (76)	6 (24)	7 (0)
My observers have typically understood the goals of the session they observed	22 (88)	2 (8)	8 (4)
I have felt intimidated by observers	5 (20)	5 (20)	9 (60)
Peer observers have attempted to inappropriately influence my teaching	2 (8)	2 (8)	10 (84)
Peer observers should not interrupt or contribute to the class session without invitation or prior approval from me.	19 (76)	3 (12)	11 (12)
It is easy to find an observer(s) to agree to evaluate my courses	7 (28)	5 (20)	12 (52)
It has been difficult to arrange a date for observation that works for both me and my observer(s).	11 (44)	5 (20)	13 (36)
Two peer evaluations per year is a realistic goal	8 (32)	4 (16)	14 (52)

Responses to the question, "Of the observations you have had, how many have you chosen NOT	F (%)	Reason

to include in your personnel file?"		
0, I have included all of them	24 (96)	
1	0	
2	0	
3	1 (4)	It was inaccurate (included information that was untrue about the observed session). I was having an 'off' day during the observation. It did not represent my teaching.
4	0	
5 or more	0	

Factors 4 -5: Interactions with Peer Evaluators
Factor 4. Interactions with Peer Evaluator Before Observation Session.

Responses to the question, "Before the class observation how frequently have you and your observer(s) engaged in the following?"	Always F (%)	Usually F (%)	About half F (%)	Rarely F (%)	Never F (%)
Other than agreeing on time/date to observe, we have met at least one additional time by zoom or in person	5 (20)	7 (28)	0 (0)	8 (32)	5 (20)
Other than agreeing on time/date to observe, we communicate additional questions/responses by email	11 (44)	5 (20)	0 (0)	6 (24)	3 (12)
They shared their observation philosophy	2 (8)	6 (24)	4 (16)	6 (24)	7 (8)
Discussion of course goals before the class observation	7 (28)	8 (32)	3 (12)	3 (12)	4 (16)
Discussion of how the events in the observed class session meet learning objectives	7 (28)	4 (16)	4 (16)	5 (20)	5 (28)
Discussion of my pedagogical skills and style of teaching	5 (20)	10 (40)	3 (12)	3 (12)	4 (16)
Discussion of my concerns or desired affirmations	6 (24)	8 (32)	2 (8)	5 (20)	4 (16)
Discussion of areas for development based on previous PRC, Dean, FRC letters	3 (12)	2 (8)	2 (8)	5 (20)	13 (52)
Discussion of areas for development based on student feedback	2 (8)	3 (12)	2 (8)	6 (24)	12 (8)
Discussion of university standards	3 (12)	4 (16)	2 (8)	7 (28)	9 (12)
Discussion of program standards	3 (12)	4 (16)	1 (4)	9 (36)	8 (12)
Discussion of school standards	2 (8)	3 (12)	1 (4)	8 (32)	11 (8)
Given an observer my syllabus for review	23 (92)	2 (8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (92)
Given an observer access to my Blackboard for face-to-face classes	8 (32)	2 (8)	2 (8)	2 (8)	11 (32)

Factor 5. Interactions with Peer Evaluator After Observation Session.

Responses to the question, "After the class observation how frequently have you and your observer(s) engaged in the following?"	Always F (%)	Usually F (%)	About half	Rarely F (%)	Never F (%)
Other than exchanging pleasantries, our next communication is the final report that I receive from the observer. Barring errors or typos, that is the final report.	8 (32)	8 (32)	2 (8)	5 (20)	2 (8)
My observer sends me a draft and asks for feedback before finalizing	10 (40)	4 (16)	5 (20)	1 (4)	5 (20)
I write my own report and send to my observer to add narrative or make modifications	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4)	24 (96)
Follow-up Zoom or in person meeting	4 (16)	3 (12)	3 (12)	5 (20)	10 (40)
Follow-up communications by email	8 (32)	4 (16)	2 (8)	6 (24)	5 (20)
Discussion of strengths of the session	5 (20)	7 (28)	2 (8)	4 (16)	7 (28)
Discussion of teaching effectiveness	4 (16)	8 (32)	3 (12)	4 (16)	6 (24)
Discussion of weaknesses of the session	4 (16)	7 (28)	2 (8)	6 (24)	6 (24)
Discussion of ways to improve learning objectives	3 (12)	6 (24)	2 (8)	6 (24)	8 (32)
Discuss ways to improve student engagement	4 (16)	5 (20)	4 (16)	5 (20)	7 (28)
Discuss ways to improve classroom management (where relevant)	3 (12)	6 (24)	2 (8)	7 (28)	7 (28)
Discuss ways to meet learning objectives for the session or course	3 (12)	5 (20)	2 (8)	7 (28)	8 (32)
Discuss general teaching strategies for the observed or other courses	3 (12)	7 (28)	3 (12)	5 (20)	7 (28)
Discuss ways to improve instructor's organization or planning (where relevant)	3 (12)	6 (24)	1 (4)	5 (20)	10 (40)
Discuss ways to improve instructor's clarity (where relevant)	4 (16)	5 (20)	2 (8)	5 (20)	9 (36)
Discuss the elements included in the final report	8 (32)	4 (16)	1 (4)	5 (20)	7 (28)
Discuss the Program, School, and/or University Standards	1 (4)	7 (28)	0 (0)	6 (24)	11 (44)
Discuss resources available to improve or alter teaching practices	2 (8)	2 (8)	5 (20)	7 (28)	9 (36)
Discuss obstacles to improving or altering my teaching	3 (12)	3 (12)	5 (20)	5 (20)	9 (36)

Factors 6 – 7: Finding peer observers
Factor 6. Choosing Peer Evaluators

Responses to the question, "How do you choose a peer observer (or choose people to ask to be a peer observer)? Select all that apply"	F (%)
I ask other faculty to recommend	15(19)
I choose previous SIPET participants	14(18)
I bring names of potential observers to my Dean, and then the Dean approves	7(9)
I ask people who have reputations as great teachers	8(10)
I email or call the CTLD/Kathy Klein with a request for recommendations	4(5)
My Chair recommends	5(6)
I ask faculty I know or have heard of	14(18)
I'll take anyone who agrees to do it!	9(11)
They are chosen for me by my Dean, Chair, or senior members of my Program	3(4)

Factor 7. Obstacles to finding peer evaluators

Responses to the question, "Has anyone ever denied your request for a peer observation?"	F (%)
Yes	12 (48)
No	13 (52)

Responses to the question, "Estimate how many people have not agreed to be a peer observer for you when asked (exclude requests you have withdrawn)."	F (%) n = 12
1-2	0 (0)
3-4	8 (69)
5-6	1 (8)
7-8	2 (15)
9-10	1 (8)
11-15	0 (0)
16 - 20	0 (0)
21 or more	0 (0)

Responses to the question, "What reasons have you been given when someone denied your request for peer observation? Select all that apply"	F (%) n = 12
They ignored or did not respond to my request	7 (58)
Just flat out, "no", no reason given	1 (8)
Scheduling conflicts	10 (83)
Lack of time	9 (75)
Other (type your response)	2 (17)
Lack of skill or content knowledge	0 (0)

Other Qualitative comments:
- *commitment to other peer evaluations*
- *People are too busy to accommodate the number of observations that are currently required*!

<u>Qualitative Comments</u> Responses to the question, "Is there anything else you think is important for us to know about peer evaluations of teaching at Stockton?" the 10 affirmative responses added the following:

- The expectation of TEN peer observations for the tenure file is excessive and not helpful. I came here from another institution that required 1 before the 3rd year review and 1 before the five-year P&T package was submitted. Perhaps that's not enough for an institution that emphasizes teaching but there has to be a middle ground. Maybe 2 by year three, 2 by year five? I also think the eval process itself could be tightened up a bit. Perhaps start with a self-reflection that elucidates aspects of teaching that the individual wants to work on, so the observer knows what to look for and can give specific, actionable feedback?? The process is too much to be useful, its too time consuming for the observer, and really stressful to coordinate for the person being observed. I feel like I'm begging people for help! Its yucky.
- EVERY peer review performed has taken several months for me to receive a report on. NEVER have any of the reviewers expressed an inclination or request to "discuss" their observations and make a learning opportunity of the event.
- I appreciate this survey. This is a stressful piece to complete for the file review as a relatively new employee at Stockton. I have followed all the advice provided to secure 2 peer observations per year, but have been met with over 10 individuals declining my request. I understand their reasoning, but if each of the NTTP files require 2 peer observations per year, then the list of approved observers needs to multiply exponentially.
- For two reasons, I suggest one peer evaluation per year. 1) applying the recommendations in the peer evaluation needs more than one semester. 2) finding two observers per year is so stressful because usually, the observers do not respond with an answer.
- The PRC should value and consider peer evaluations more. Peer evaluations are a much more appropriate method for discussing teaching effectiveness (as opposed to student evaluations or course materials). I think peer evaluations should be considered and weighted equally to the other measures used to determine teaching effectiveness for T & P.
- If I have specific lectures that I would like observes, I have primarily identified faculty both in and out of my program who have a higher level of expertise concerning the content that is being delivered during those specific lectures. I find their experience invaluable.
- A poor observation could be used against me even if it's not submitted in my file.
- Peer observations are a vital aspect of tenure. They help to compliment student evaluations so that there is a less biased view of the instructor. Sometimes there are negative student comments that can be explained through a peer observation because sometimes students do not appreciate teaching methods or something that is actually beneficial for their learning. It would be intimidating to me if the observer was not a peer. Like if the observer was a dean for example that would intimidate me. So it is important to me that they were tenured professors. And not staff or deans.
- Thank you for doing this survey. Although I think peer observations can be helpful, there are many barriers to note: 1) Very stressful for the faculty member, who in addition to IDEA evaluations each semester, precepting evaluations, PRC letters, also has to have 10 peer observations before tenure. This is a considerable amount of evaluation. 2) It is very difficult to find someone to do an evaluation - faculty report being too busy. I have to ask numerous people before I get someone. In addition, my school (SOBL) requires I get approval from the my file clerk and dean so if the observer declines, I have to start the process all over again. Seems like there may be a more efficient way. For example, have a list of faculty observers and the dean/chair is responsible for asking for the observation and overseeing the process (there is a

power differential to take into consideration when a untenured person has to ask) 3) Faculty members are unclear or have different opinions regarding a peer observation which causes confusion. For example, some faculty say only use those who are trained, some say only use a faculty member in your program, some say only use those outside your program, etc. There is no consistency and the lack of clarity adds to the stressfulness (and the concern is doing something different than what is recommended can hurt your promotion (example, one faculty says use only trained observers and another says it doesn't matter and going against one of the recommendations will be used against you) 4) I have never received a peer observation back within the 2 week deadline. Most of the time it is months late which means if it was a concerning report, I do not have time to get another one. It is uncomfortable to ask for it since the person who did the observation 'has the power.' It is my recommendation someone is responsible for making sure it is received within the time frame (Dean, chair, etc.)

- The largest reason I had for so many peer review requests being denied for lack of time was that I asked from the lists published on the CTLD page of the University website. It seems that everyone contacts people from the top of the list first. When I finally realized that and worked from low on the list, I received multiple offers. This should be considered in how that list is published on the web page."

Objective 5. Determine impediments to SIPET participation. Determine if the current timing and modality of SIPET (Summer, on campus) is desirable and sufficient.

Factor 1. Reasons for not participating in SIPET.

Responses to the question, "Please help us understand your reasons for not having participated in Stockton Institute for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET). Select all that apply"	F (%)
I do not have time to do the training	12 (44)
I cannot come to campus for the training	4 (15)
I plan to participate in SIPET sometime in the next few years	8 (30)
I do not want to do a Stockton summer institute	6 (22)
I feel training is not necessary for me	6 (22)
The application timing is inconvenient	3 (11)
I need more reminders about the application deadline	2 (7)
The application process is cumbersome	4 (15)
The pay is not reasonable	4 (15)
I have been trained to do peer evaluations, elsewhere	3 (11)
I did not know SIPET existed	2 (7)
I am unfamiliar with its purpose	1 (4)

Qualitative comments:

- I already get asked to do many peer observations, that I feel that if I complete the SIPET training and my name goes on a website, I will get asked to do more. For example, I have heard that the SOBL Dean prefers that all peer observations come from SIPET trained individuals. This is the conundrum at Stockton, if you are good at something you get asked to do it over and over and over again.
- Either the timing hasn't been convenient, or there were other institutes I preferred.
- Stockton's seeming movement to only encourage peer observers who've done SIPET sessions to serve as said peer observers is a mistake and slippery slope. In reading letters, content has become 'pro forma' and NOT REAL OR GENUINE. Instead, untenured faculty choose reviewers who they perceive will be nice and write glowing comments, and then even choose those same people a second time. In my humble opinion, senior faculty who teach similar courses should be evaluating / observing classes and faculty.
- I applied to SIPET many years ago after I got tenure and was not accepted. My Dean asked me to apply because they specifically wanted professors from our school. I felt turned off to ever applying again.
- Since receiving tenure, the timing of SIPET has conflicted with my summer research and travel schedules.
- I teach in load in the summer, and it conflicts with the timing of the training.
- I use other SIPET certified folks' peer observation reports as a kind of template. I want to do SIPET, but I have not yet had the time. I am also intimidated by the required number of observations expected. Right now I can do them when someone asks, and I can do them thoroughly without being overwhelmed by the expectation.

Factor 2. Timing of SIPET

	SIPET Participants In response to the question, Given your experience with SIPET in the summer, when do you feel is the ideal time SIPET should be offered for maximal engagement AND benefit to participants?" F (%)	Non- SIPET In response to the question, "If given a choice, when would it be convenient and most beneficial for you to participate in Stockton Institute for Peer Evaluation of Teaching (SIPET)?" F (%)
Fall Semester	1 (3)	2 (7)
Spring Semester	0	1 (4)
Throughout the academic year	3 (10)	8 (30)
Summer, before June 30	23 (74)	8 (30)
Summer, after June 30	4 (13)	1 (4)
None, I am not interested in SIPET training.	N/A	7 (26)

Objective 6. Training practices of other schools.

The following were the directives given to a sub-group of the task force:

Focus:

How do other schools train peer evaluators?

Strengths of other models

Weaknesses of other models

Method:

Review models of 3 - 5 other schools (include comparable institutions), compare to SIPET model.

Recommendations:

Components of other models that should be incorporated into SIPET

Feasibility and sustainability of incorporating those components

Results:

This subgroup was unsuccessful in finding published literature on training peer evaluators in higher education. Instead, many institutions opt to offer tips and rubrics for faculty evaluators on their websites, without any direct training. They also do not track (or publish their findings) the success of their approach with respect to quality of peer evaluations or skill of peer evaluators. We reached out to the few institutions that appeared to offer some kind of training, but never received responses.

There is some published literature on training peer evaluators in health sciences and medicine (mostly at the graduate level), where their faculty must meet teaching criteria specific to the discipline. Stockton's is much more general, but it may be interesting to determine if indeed different programs would appreciate more tailored teaching observations, in addition to the overarching standards of teaching excellence. If that is the case, then perhaps SIPET workshops throughout the year could address this by being discipline specific.