

**EVALUATION OF TEACHING COMMITTEE**  
**THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Final Report and Recommendations, Spring 2022**  
**Chair: Colette Dollarhide, Professor**

**Table of Contents**

Executive Summary	2
Full Report	3
Section 1: Assumptions and Recommendations about Teaching and Learning	6
Section 2: Assumptions and Recommendations about Evaluation of Teaching	11
Section 3: Specific Recommendations for Four Evaluation Procedures	14
Recommendations for SEI and Student Voice	15
Recommendations for Peer Review of Teaching	17
Sample Peer Review of Teaching Procedure	19
Sample Peer Review of Teaching Letter Template	23
Recommendations for New Teaching Portfolio	24
Sample Core Dossier for Teaching/Clinical/Practice Faculty	27
Recommendations for Annual Review & Feedback Letter from Chair	31
Additional Resources	33

## **Executive Summary**

Convened by Dr. Helen Malone of OAA, this committee was comprised of persons dedicated to teaching for OSU. They were charged with formulating recommendations for improving the evaluation of teaching.

The committee reviewed documents and materials compiled by the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning to include former reports on teaching evaluation, current documents for APT for each department, peer institutions' documents related to teaching, and empirical literature related to teaching, teaching portfolios, and the evaluation of teaching.

To do this work, the committee articulated assumptions and recommendations about teaching and learning. These include:

- Excellence in Teaching
- The Value of Teaching in the University
- The Activity of Teaching
- The Teaching/Learning Environment
- Teaching Philosophy
- Relationship between Teacher and Learner
- Teaching Assessment and Improvement Efforts

Further, assumptions and recommendations for assessment were articulated. These include:

- Qualities of Evaluations of Teaching that Foster Continuous Improvement Efforts
- Scope of Appropriate Evaluations of Teaching
- Problems with SEI
- Problems with Peer Reviews of Teaching
- Incomplete Feedback Loop

In order to create specific recommendations to address these aggregate recommendations, the committee broke into subcommittees to draft recommendations related to four topics derived from the assumptions and implications about teaching. These recommendations are included in this report:

1. SEIs and Student Input
2. Peer Reviews of Teaching
3. Teaching Portfolio, including a Clinical Faculty Dossier
4. Annual Evaluations of Teaching Conducted by Chair

## Full Report

The university-wide Evaluation of Teaching Committee (EOTC) was convened and charged by Dr. Helen Malone, Vice Provost-Academic Policies & Faculty Resources, Office of Academic Affairs. The charge was to “provide recommendations relative to improving or changing the guidelines and policies related to evaluation of teaching. Changes to any of the following should be considered: SEI, peer evaluation of teaching, core dossier guidelines; and developing new guidelines, policies, and procedures addressing the relationship of mentoring, advising, and teaching, and assessment of mentoring and advising in the evaluation of teaching and curriculum development. The committee may consider any other aspects of teaching and is not limited to specific course instruction.”

Members were invited to serve who represented all aspects of the campus community, including faculty, students, and administrators; on-campus and regional campuses; online and in-person instructors; and tenure and clinical/teaching/practice faculty (see full list below). Overall, each member had demonstrated commitment to teaching, either as a teaching award winner and/or a specialized role relative to teaching. Colette Dollarhide, Professor, Educational Studies, Education and Human Ecology served as chair.

Name & Title	Department/College	Served on Full Committee Spring 2021	Served on Sub Committee Fall 2021
<b>Faculty</b>			
<b>Anika Anthony</b> Associate Dean of Academic Affairs	Graduate School	X	X
<b>Joy Balta</b> Clinical Assistant Professor	Biomedical Education and Anatomy, College of Medicine	X	
<b>Amy Barnes</b> Clinical Associate Professor	Educational Studies, Education & Human Ecology	X	X
<b>Ramona Denby-Brinson</b> Associate Dean of Academic Affairs	Social Work	X	
<b>Rachel Kajfez</b> Assistant Professor	Engineering Education, Engineering	X	
<b>Mazeika Sullivan</b> Associate Professor	School of Environmental & Natural Resources, Food, Agricultural, and Environmental Sciences	X	



<b>Shari Speer</b> Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs	Arts & Sciences	X	X
<b>Jos Raadschelders</b> Associate Dean for Faculty Development	John Glenn College of Public Affairs	X	X
<b>Dionisio Viscarri</b> Associate Professor	Spanish & Portuguese, OSU Newark	X	X
<b>Students</b>			
<b>Felipe Evaristo</b> Graduate Student	Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, Engineering	X	
<b>Sri Uppalapati</b> Undergraduate Student	Engineering Education, Engineering	X	
<b>Ex Officio</b>			
<b>Adrienne Bricker</b> University Registrar	University Registrar	X	
<b>Cindy Davis</b> Program Manager, SEI	University Registrar	X	X
<b>Rob Griffiths</b> Associate Vice President	Online Education/ODEE	X	
<b>Alan Kalish</b> Assistant Vice Provost	Undergraduate Education	X	X

The committee had access to many resources that provided the historical and current context for the committee discussions. Below is a list of the materials provided by the Michael V. Drake Institute for Teaching and Learning (“the Drake Institute”). Additional resources are listed at the end of this report.

1. Peer Review Ad Hoc Committee Report 2000
2. Peer Review & SEI Recommendations 2000
3. Peer Review Selected Practices 2000
4. OAA Policy and Procedures Handbook Section 2.8.1 Student Evaluation of Teaching, and 2.8.2 Peer Evaluation of Teaching
5. Ohio State Peer Institutions and List of Vice Provosts
6. Peer Institution Documents Folder for all institutions (28 files)
7. 2017 UITL RESEARCH ON PEER EVALUATION OF TEACHING FOLDER
  - a. Example Documents, Online Resources, Peer-Reviewed Articles
  - b. Teaching Portfolios including model teaching portfolio, articles, and resources
8. 2020 OSU TIU APT Documents Folder (All APT documents for each TIU at OSU by college)

## Context for this Report

It is important to note that the work of the EOTC is located in the context of efforts to improve teaching at The Ohio State University. The committee's work was facilitated by the support of the Drake Institute and by the work of prior committees addressing similar questions. First, it is important to acknowledge the importance of the Drake Institute, which provides training in instructional redesign, teaching endorsements, new faculty programming, curriculum design, course design, consultation for teaching improvement, and tips for using feedback to improve teaching with or without the time and feedback from an Institute consultant. The Drake Institute and its predecessors (including the University Institute for Teaching and Learning) have provided the university with continuous service to improve teaching for many years.

Second, in 2000 two reports were issued: the Evaluation of Teaching Principles (by A. Kalish) and the report from the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Peer Review of Teaching (by K. Halasek, Chair). The findings and recommendations of both reports parallel many of those contained in this report. The driving principles for their recommendations included (a) the imperative for the university to define and formally appreciate teaching in the university, (b) for effective evaluation of teaching, various data from various sources was required, (c) these data should be collected at appropriate times from students, peers, and the faculty person themselves (reflective practice and self-assessments to include their goals and intentions of teaching), and (d) all these data should be integrated and interpreted in light of the discipline and the department.

The specific recommendations made in each report based on these principles included (a) faculty in each TIU needed to articulate teaching practices they want included in evaluation and develop criteria by which they will be judged; (b) teaching evaluations should include multiple sources of data that should be appropriately interpreted; (c) student feedback instruments that are valid and reliable should be carefully curated and selected; (d) practices for peer reviews of teaching should be clearly articulated in terms of who is a peer, when the evaluations are conducted, what elements of teaching will be evaluated by what criteria, how to document and interpret the data, and what preparation will be offered to reviewers; (e) administrators interpreting the results of faculty teaching evaluations are responsible for providing context; (f) self-evaluations are essential for providing intent and context of their teaching practice; and (g) data from all sources must be contextualized within the discipline and department and used to evaluate faculty work and improve instruction.

It is important to note that these reports from 2000 are parallel to the concerns expressed by committee members in this report, suggesting that limited progress has been made to address these issues and concerns, despite consistent advocacy by dedicated individuals.

After reviewing these documents and others, the Committee articulated general assumptions about **teaching and learning** that would drive general recommendations for the evaluation of



teaching. These are presented in Section One. Further discussion focused on specific elements of the **evaluation process** and focused recommendations are presented in Section Two. From these general and focused recommendations, subcommittees were formed to provide concrete recommendations for **specific practices and policies** in four evaluation processes: Student Evaluation of Instruction, Peer Review of Teaching, Teaching Portfolios, and Chair Feedback on Teaching. These documents are presented in Section Three of this report.

## **SECTION 1: ASSUMPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT** **TEACHING AND LEARNING**

### **1. Excellence in Teaching**

Excellence in teaching is achievable and should be a goal of every teacher in the university. In this context, we are defining a teacher as **anyone who facilitates the learning of another person in the university, including direct instruction in classrooms and online as well as in indirect activities of mentorship, coaching, and providing feedback to improve the performance of another (students, colleagues, and staff in the enterprise efforts of the University)**. We realize that the place or space of the teaching/learning process has implications for evaluation, and we believe that we have been able to incorporate those implications into this document.

### **2. The Value of Teaching in the University**

Teaching is the mission of OSU in direct and indirect ways (see below; emphasis added), therefore high-quality teaching has direct financial implications for the University's enterprise. Unfortunately, teaching is currently not valued or rewarded commensurate with research.

**Mission of OSU** (<https://oaa.osu.edu/mission-vision-values-and-core-goals>)

- *Creating and discovering knowledge* to improve the well-being of our state, regional, national and global communities;
- *Educating students* through a comprehensive array of distinguished academic programs;
- *Preparing a diverse student body to be leaders and engaged citizens*;
- *Fostering a culture of engagement and service*.

When teaching is valued, this will be demonstrated to the academic community through resources that link support services for teachers and students; training in evidence-based practices and instructional design (available through the Drake Institute) and designated time for teachers to develop and refine these new skills; direct incentives; formal official reward



structures at all faculty levels and tracks; equitable treatment of non-tenure track instructors by providing comparable teaching status, committee opportunities, and promotion timelines; efforts to help students understand how to define and recognize good teaching and good learning, including many factors that can impact teaching and learning such as public health, housing, and the economy (Social Determinants of Health) by providing adequate empathy and supports; acknowledgment that non-traditional learners may require different support and strategies from instructors; and emphasizes the value of continuous efforts on the part of the teacher to improve curriculum content, delivery skills, relationships, etc. The consensus of the committee was that teaching is not valued by the University in the Promotion and Tenure or merit processes, which then extends to low value on teaching by individual department chairs, faculty evaluators, and members of promotion and tenure committees.

### **Recommendations:**

The University must value and support teaching in direct and indirect ways that are commensurate with the value and support provided for research. Teaching should be given more gravitas in evaluation of overall faculty performance.

- The value of teaching should be **explicitly reflected** in governance documents and the evaluation process for all merit and tenure and promotion decisions.
- Rewards should be commensurate with instructor efforts to meet the needs of learners. For example, higher needs students [i.e. freshmen, first gen] should be recognized as requiring additional time and specialization of the teacher.
- Training in teaching should be provided in evidence-based practice and incentivized.
- Recognition, both financial and emotional, should be given for continued investment in professional learning for improved instruction.
- Official statements on the value of teaching should be consistent with policy and practice.

### **3. The Activity of Teaching**

Teaching takes place both in formal classroom and field instruction as well in informal and outreach interactions with students, colleagues and the wider community. Teaching necessarily encompasses preparation, interaction between instructor and learner, and evaluation of learning outcomes or changes consistent with learning.

Teaching includes *preparing* the learning environment (behind the scenes):

- Curriculum and class preparation: curating, organizing, and structuring class materials to create learning opportunities
- Learner engagement out of the classroom – office hours, emails, discussion boards
- Evaluation/grading/feedback
- Advising and Mentoring (students, colleagues, graduate associates)
- Study and learning strategies



*In the learning space or learning environment, teaching involves:*

- Formalized delivery of the curriculum in the learning environment, and
- Includes flow of teaching/learning between teachers and students, capturing the dynamic nature of the conversation of instructor as facilitator and coach

**Recommendations:**

Teaching includes various activities to prepare and deliver learning opportunities. These should be evaluated in developmental ways and include awareness of the various environments in which teaching/learning take place.

Teaching includes **indirect activities** that should be reflected in the evaluation process:

- Preparation, updating curriculum
- Thoughtful selection and design of learning activities to maximize learning
- Office hours
- Emails
- Discussions
- Grading
- Advising
- Mentoring
- Coaching
- Organizing and leading teaching team (specific to a class)
- Supporting junior colleagues

Teaching includes **direct activities** in the classroom/learning space that should be reflected in the evaluation process:

- Curriculum delivery
- Teaching students how to learn/study
- Strategizing and providing support for students to learn specific concepts, skills, attitudes, etc.
- Reflecting the fluid nature of concurrent and interdependent learning/teaching that happens between students and teacher

#### **4. The Teaching/Learning Environment**

It is important to consider the environment of teaching/learning; there are different ways to engage learners. Teaching must be appropriate for learning space; include the intellectual community in discipline; take into account the logistics of student needs/realities/experiences; be informed by current and historical research discoveries and practice; should fit into and advance the structure and goals of the overall general education and disciplinary curricula; and include field experiences, service learning, study abroad, and other environments for the learning process.





**Recommendations:**

The learning environment is managed by the teacher and should be evaluated by:

- Learner engagement, interaction, and demonstrated learning in the moment and across the time of the learning experience
- Learners' ability to understand their progress toward their goals
- Appropriateness for learning space
- Located in the intellectual community of general education and/or the discipline
- Addresses scope of students' needs
- Informed by research and practice
- Alignment with programmatic goals and expectations
- Unique contexts such as field experiences, service learning, study abroad, and other non-traditional contexts, environments, and locations.

**5. The Importance of a Teaching Philosophy**

Each teacher needs to articulate a philosophy of teaching/learning, including goals for curriculum (student learning) and for student relationships (see Item 6 below; teacher/student relationships should be student centered, culturally affirming of student diversity, emphasize student experiences, provide/affirm sense of belongingness of all students in the curriculum and learning space). The teaching philosophy for each teacher should connect to the mission and vision of the university; reflect on how students will utilize what they learn (for citizenship, foster inclusion, employment); recognize that both teachers and students are concurrently teaching and learning; and take into account students' walks of life and experiences with teaching, evaluation, etc.

**Recommendations:**

Teaching philosophy should be written by each teacher and edited/affirmed each year and contextualized in terms of current students (non-traditional, distance modality, workforce development). This statement should address each of the following topics:

- Culturally affirming
- Addresses student belonging
- Connects to university mission and vision
- Addresses why students should learn
- Addresses what learning involves: asking what, when, how, but also why, and accepting uncertainty and probability in the search for answers
- Contextualizes mutual and interdependent learning
- Acknowledges student life experiences and ways of knowing



## 6. Relationship between Teacher and Learner

Learners' needs should be at the forefront of the evaluation process. In a healthy contexts, this relationship is based on human motivation (both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation to perform well in a course; learning has value where the program/course fits within the students' broader trajectory of motivation, career/personal goals); create safe and supportive spaces for learning; reflects a deep belief in students and is designed to help them develop a sense of self-efficacy; is grounded in cultural affirmation, where diversity, equity and social justice are the basis of the curriculum and the teaching/learning relationship; is based on trust between teacher and learner; allows students to learn from each other; values all forms of knowledge and learning, including workforce development and non-credit learning; and includes awareness of access issues, including technology, finances, and differential ways to evaluate for fitness for enrollment.

### Recommendations:

Teachers create growth-inspiring environments for learning as they design a healthy relationship with learners. This relationship should be:

- Based on intrinsic motivation and career/personal goals
- Create safety and support balanced with intellectual challenge
- Support mutual trust that supports students' self-efficacy
- Intentionally designed to be culturally affirming and just
- Creates mutual and interdependent learning
- Values student epistemologies (ways of knowing and cultural influence suggested by King & Kitchener, Perry, Moll)
- Utilizes accessible universal design

## 7. Teaching Assessment and Improvement Efforts

Teachers need to see teaching as a continuous improvement process. They need to set goals for improvement of teaching, collect data, and commit to improvement. This means that assessment needs to be done through non-threatening methods; encourage a growth mindset; needs to be individualized to person's career development; needs to focus on the learning process and its connection to results to leverage reflection on future goals/process. Each instructor's trajectory for student improvement should be based on annual goals and plans, and there should be communication with students about ongoing improvement efforts.

### Recommendations:

Teaching can be improved through focused effort and growth mindset toward evidence-based practice.

- Set yearly goals and collect evidence



- Improvement efforts that do not work out should not be penalized
- Each person will individualize this process
- Consistent interpretation of materials by administration, e.g. a rubric.
- Sharing with students that you, too, are improving your craft through their feedback
- Provide way for teacher to present resources needed, checklist of existing resources they consulted/used, professional learning activities and learning communities participated/engaged in

## **SECTION 2: ASSUMPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ABOUT EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING**

### **1. Qualities Of Evaluations of Teaching that Foster Continuous Improvement Efforts**

Evaluation processes that foster continuous improvement efforts are transparent; reflect accurate description and measurement of what we want to know about the teaching effort and outcome; are multi-faceted in terms of data coming from self, peer (broadly defined), student, and department specific to the context of the teaching assignment; are multi-modal, reflecting student feedback, efforts to improve, and reflection writings; protect diverse faculty from potentially biased evaluations of students (historically lower evaluations of Black and Brown faculty at PWIs); are holistic and contextual, such as a portfolio; are both formative and summative such that formative assessments emphasize continuous improvement and not perfection; and requires a holistic view of efforts to improve teaching that may or may not work. We recognize that this will require extensive training of our colleagues since most persons in higher education do not have training in andragogy/pedagogy and would rely on the Drake Institute to provide the foundation for these recommendations.

#### **Recommendations:**

Teaching evaluation efforts should:

- Provide for ongoing feedback as opposed to only semester-end evaluations
- Provide a longitudinal view for the teacher's reflection and improvement through analysis of trajectory and patterns
- Be reflective of informed evaluators. Students need to know what/how their feedback is used, how to give good feedback, and how their feedback fits in the larger picture of teacher evaluation; faculty peer evaluators and administrators must be trained in how to provide contextually relevant feedback.
- Be a fair and clear process of discussion between teacher and evaluator (chair)
- Be interpreted and analyzed fairly and accurately, not just presented as raw data



## 2. SCOPE OF APPROPRIATE EVALUATIONS OF TEACHING

It is important to define the scope of evaluations of all efforts that contribute to quality teaching. The scope should include the advising and mentoring work faculty do, including research faculty who mentor students in research; teaching goals in terms of appropriate design, curriculum, and content; how the course, content, or instruction has transformed students; overall learning that happened during the course and how student contributed to their own learning, emphasizing their shared responsibility for their learning; focused on what happens in the learning space/environment; and continuous or annual improvement process / plans / actions.

### Recommendations:

To address the scope of the evaluation of teaching, what should be evaluated includes:

- Advising
- Mentoring
- Teaching goals
- Curriculum preparation, including design of appropriate, effective learning opportunities and evaluation structures
- Curriculum delivery in all formats
- Grading
- Student efforts at learning
- Results/transformation for student

Red font: May require new evaluation instruments.

## 3. PROBLEMS WITH SEI

Committee members identified multiple ways that the current SEI does not foster the improvement of teaching. Problems include: too high stakes with all-or-nothing view of the scores; the fact that quantification of teaching leads to over-simplification of a complex qualitative process that can be weaponized; is too linear when what is needed are multiple measures; is not well understood by students; **focuses only on student feedback when other data is also important**; de-emphasizes student comments which can be very valuable; does not allow faculty to contextualize outliers, improvement efforts, and outcomes over time; measures popularity not necessarily skill in curriculum delivery; needs to recognize that not everyone can be “above average” by definition; and that we need a instrument that measures what we want it to measure with valid and reliable questions/items.

### Recommendations:

Student evaluations of their learning should include:



- Multiple measures
- Multiple samples
- Include both quantified and qualitative information and comments
- Opportunity for context by instructor
- Equally focused on their responsibility for learning
- Assesses teacher availability for additional assistance as needed
- Assesses what we want to measure in our understanding of teaching

#### **4. PROBLEMS WITH PEER REVIEWS OF TEACHING (PRT)**

Peer reviews of teaching (PRT) need to be revised also. These practices should provide a consistent set of expectations across units such as a template that can be modified or expanded by units if needed that are based on a set of Expected Teaching Outcomes (ETO); these practices should be clearly defined but encourage use with flexibility. Problems can easily arise when peer reviewers have a personal relationship with the teacher being reviewed, or when peer reviewers are not trained in providing relevant constructive feedback or in the appropriate scope of the activities being reviewed. It is critical that peer reviewers are persons who are familiar with course mode strategies or other contexts of the particular course or cohort of students. Finally, it is important to note that a PRT reflects a discrete moment in time, often single class period, and is not reflective of the entirety of the course experience.

#### **Recommendations:**

Peer reviews of teaching should be

- Defined in terms of multiple elements of teaching, to include design of learning experiences, prior teaching efforts, Expected Teaching Outcomes, and contextual elements of the teaching/learning space and environment, and must include information about course, students, design and teaching strategies, curriculum, and improvement efforts.
- Consistent process across units
- Include broad range of persons as “peers”, i.e., professionals in the discipline
- Conducted by persons who have been trained in process and who are objective with the goal of providing constructive feedback.
- Involves multiple conversations between peer evaluator and teacher, and multiple classroom visits by reviewer.

#### **5. INCOMPLETE FEEDBACK LOOP**

Members of the committee had important questions about who provides meaningful, constructive, developmental feedback to teacher? Who has access to results? How are results



integrated back into improvement plans and contextualized about effort and progress made by instructor?

**Recommendations:**

- Meaningful, constructive and developmental feedback to teacher needs to be provided to encourage continuous improvement.
- All forms of feedback (SEIs, peer reviews) need to be contextualized and integrated with continuous improvement efforts.

**SECTION THREE: SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR**  
**FOUR EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

From these discussions, the committee determined that four discrete “products” were needed to provide greater focus to these assumptions and recommendations. These recommendations and specific documents follow.

1. Revise the SEI
2. Revise the Peer Evaluation of Teaching
3. Create a teaching portfolio template, and create a new dossier for Clinical/Teaching/Practice faculty
4. Create a structure for feedback on teaching performance that increases continuous improvement

## **Recommendations for SEI and Student Voice**

At the beginning of the work of this committee, we hoped to recommend a specific set of questions for a revised SEI instrument or another structure for gathering student input about the teaching/learning environment, design, and implementation. However, it quickly became apparent that this would NOT be possible as an outcome of the current timeline. Instead, we offer the following recommendations of a PROCESS to revise or replace the current SEI survey instrument.

Our main recommendation is that a small team be charged to research possible systems in detail. This group should include no more than 5 or 6 members, and some of these should have expertise in student feedback, educational measurement, or psychometrics. It would be very useful if, in addition to faculty and staff members, that graduate and undergraduate students be represented on this group.

This group should seek to provide a specific recommendation for replacement of the current instrument within 12 to 18 months of its initial charge.

The following should inform the group's efforts:

1. Student voice must be included in all evaluation of teaching, but it must be included fairly and appropriately.
2. The committee should be directed by the principles elucidated by the Dollarhide Committee.
3. The first step in the process should be to surface and make explicit answers to the big picture questions for including student voice in evaluation of teaching:

What topics do instructors want student input on?

What do students want to tell us?

What purposes is this data to support?

formative vs summative, together vs separate [others?]

4. Answers to these questions will require asking ALL stakeholders - surveys and/or focus groups of students, lecturers, tenure-track faculty, departmental leaders, etc.



5. The team will need to review of a wide range commercially available instruments, (Blue, IDEA, etc.) to determine if any of these might meet our needs or if we need to develop an instrument locally.
6. In addition to addressing the specific issues identified by our stakeholders, any survey instrument will need to demonstrate
  1. validity
  2. reliability
  3. bias reduction measures
  4. flexibility (one size likely won't fit all, but some comparability is needed)
  5. and control for contextual issues such as
    - run dates
    - added questions (department, course, and/or instructor)
    - removal of outliers
    - open response questions (should we use auto-analyze feature?)
    - selection of questions [recommend creation of library of validated questions]

Further development will also be needed for these elements of the process:

Guidance for students on how to provide useful feedback

Guidance for analysis, interpretation, and use

Process for training chairs and ATP committees

Training and support instructors to use for improvement

Training and support for instructors to describe contextual issues to reviewers





## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING**

OSU is an R1 university but that does not mean that teaching takes a backseat in relation to research, for at least the following reasons: 1) Faculty, whether in tenure track, clinical, teaching or practice roles, are educators; 2) Our units across the university are dedicated to excellence in teaching, and this is instantiated in our governance documents at all levels; and 3) without our students we literally would not have the revenue to sustain this university.

Elements of teaching evaluations include:

1. **Mentoring** styles/systems: formal mentoring systems (e.g. medical colleges), formal or informal by choice of junior faculty (e.g. Glenn College), informal (e.g., through research mentoring and/or collaborating teaching work)
2. **Faculty peer evaluations of teaching**: Typically defined as done by someone in higher rank (e.g. associate of an assistant) except for Full Professors (who are sometimes not evaluated). Could it be also by someone in the same rank? Someone outside the university? Could departments specify that some required reviews are strictly formative?
3. The teaching portion of **annual evaluations** by department chairs and deans; the teaching portions of mandatory 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> year reviews, and non-mandatory reviews for promotion (Note, this is part of faculty peer review).
4. AND expanded to include design of learning experiences and Expected Learning Outcomes

**Issue to be determined:** Should the method for conducting an evaluation be linked to type and rank of position, i.e., should a faculty member mainly appointed for research prowess but with some teaching responsibility be evaluated differently than a clinical professor, teaching professor or professor of practice with a heavier (3-3 or 4-4) teaching load?

Contextual considerations:

1. Evaluation of teaching is context-dependent: some departments/colleges have larger expectations/requirements re. generation of grants (e.g., engineering, ASC NMS and SBS divisions) than others (e.g., English); also, the substantive content of teaching can/should be evaluated in a manner relevant to that substance
2. To what extent can we learn from teaching evaluation practices in other units?
3. Do departments/colleges have sufficient personnel resources to meet the expectations in the APT regarding peer evaluations? (nota bene: this points to the problem of staffing peer

evals, the frequency of these evals and the number of faculty involved in the process as specified in APT documents)

**Recommendations:**

OAA should conduct a comparative investigation into the types and styles of teaching evaluations at its departments/colleges with an eye on learning from one another, but guarding against standardization of teaching evaluation practices. It is important to recognize and respect the diversity in teaching expectations that vary due to disciplinary content and practice, as laid out in the APTs.

The following documents are offered as an example of a peer review of teaching process and a peer review of teaching letter from a department in the University. **NOTE: This example should be broadened to include design and outcomes elements noted on page 13 of this report.**



## SAMPLE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PROCEDURE

**The Ohio State University**  
College of xxxxx  
Department of xxxxx  
Peer Review of Teaching Document  
Approved by the faculty March 14, 2018

The goal of the peer review of instruction process is to generate sustained reflection on one's own teaching and to promote dialogue among faculty concerning insights about teaching. A system for peer review of teaching supports and embraces the College of xxxxxx mission to be a leader in instructional expertise across the University.

According to the University Faculty Rule 3335-6-02, "Teaching is broadly defined to include didactic classroom and distance instruction, extension and continuing education, advising, and supervising or mentoring students or postdoctoral scholars." For the purposes of this document, teaching is defined as teaching university courses—both credit and non-credit—in lecture halls, laboratories, physical performance venues, and internship supervision venues, both on and off campus, and instruction offered through the use of electronic technology.

The Department of xxxxx Pattern of Administration (POA) document provides for the creation of this peer review of teaching document:

Evaluation of teaching depends on reports of student evaluations, indicators of academic quality of the teaching, and generation of credit hours. The Department will have a separate "Peer Review of Teaching" document that will serve as a basis for providing additional information about the evaluation of teaching. (p. 17)

### PRINCIPLES

1. The peer review of teaching [PRT] must be consistent with the rules of the University and framed by the canons of academic freedom and responsibility.
2. There is no single model or criteria for good teaching, either within or across disciplines. Good teaching has many faces and expressions and is informed by research. Both teaching and its review are a professional exercise.
3. Just as there is no single model for good teaching, there are no universal criteria for the review of teaching. The criteria for any review depend on several factors, including the discipline, size and type of class (including distance learning formats), characteristics of the instructor, and characteristics of the learners. Thus, every review needs to be observant of its context. Advance discussion and agreement are useful for informing the reviewer about the teaching philosophy and instructional goals of the instructor.
4. A peer review of teaching presumes a professional community of peers. Our community of peers is a community of faculty across the disciplines and programs within the Department of Educational Studies. A peer review of teaching does not require content expertise; it is rather an exercise in the professional judgment of a common task. Faculty are strongly encouraged to seek a variety of reviewers from outside their home program.



5. All reviews must include the basic procedures outlined the “Peer Review of Teaching Procedure” section. Additionally, the reviewer and faculty member may agree in advance about a focus of the review.
6. The practice of peer review of teaching is a mutually beneficial exercise.
7. The department recognizes that serving as a peer reviewer is a significant service contribution.
8. There are other exercises beyond the peer review of teaching that have a valued place in the department. They can be part of one’s annual review portfolio, or part of one’s promotion and tenure portfolio. Though a different exercise than the peer review of teaching, they are valuable and instructive and have their place in the larger context of our commitment to excellence and the professional development of instruction. For guidance on professional development activities related to the improvement of teaching, see the Teaching Activities Related to Annual Review document.

### PROCESS OF PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING

The process of peer review is defined in the OSU OAA Handbook and the Department’s Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document.

#### **From the OSU OAA Handbook**

##### **2.6.3.1.1 Peer Evaluation of Teaching Revised (8/01/14)**

Periodic peer evaluation is required for all tenure-track and clinical faculty who deliver formal course instruction and recommended for any associated faculty with multiple-year appointments. In case of full professors, such evaluation can take the form of peer review without a formal written evaluation. In addition, peer evaluation for promotion should include at least two different evaluations, with the exact number to be determined by the TIU according to college guidelines.

#### **Section 9.2 of the Department of xxxxx APT Document: Peer Evaluation of Teaching**

It is an expectation that all tenured faculty will serve as peer reviewers. Reasonable efforts are made to distribute service among the tenured faculty from year to year in order to support and encourage attention to the quality of teaching in the department. Although there is no presumption that a peer reviewer must be of equal or higher rank than the faculty member being reviewed, such a model will be followed to the extent possible. Each year, the Associate Chair will contact probationary faculty to coordinate the assignment of a peer reviewer. Non-probationary faculty who would like to have a peer review conducted should contact the Associate Chair.

The responsibilities of the tenured departmental faculty are as follows:

- To review the teaching of probationary tenure-track and clinical faculty at least once per year during the probationary period.
- To review the teaching of associate professors at least twice by the time they seek promotion to full professor.
- To review the teaching of full professors as requested by the department chair.



- To review the teaching of any faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon the department chair's request. Such reviews are normally triggered by low or declining student evaluations or other evidence of the need for providing assistance in improving teaching.
- To review the teaching of a faculty member not currently scheduled for review, upon that individual's request, to the extent that time permits. Reviews conducted at the request of the faculty member are considered formative only. The department chair is informed that the review took place, but the report is given only to the faculty member who requested the review. Assistant professors may conduct these reviews. Faculty seeking formative reviews should also seek the services of the Drake Institute.

Reviews conducted upon the request of the department chair or the faculty member focus on the specific aspects of instruction requested by the chair or faculty member.

Regularly scheduled peer teaching evaluations are comprehensive and should include, in addition to class visitation, review of course syllabi and related instruction materials. In the case of peer review for the purposes of promotion and tenure reviews, the class visitation is conducted by one or more senior peers whom the Associate Chair has identified in consultation with the candidate. The peer reviewer should meet with the candidate to establish a time for the visit and to understand the goals of the course and the candidate's teaching philosophy. If possible, the peer reviewer should attend two different class sessions over the course of the semester.

In observing the course and reviewing the syllabus and other materials, the peer reviewer should focus on such issues as the appropriateness of the course design given the goals and level of the course, the quality and effectiveness of the instructional materials and assessment tools, and the appropriateness of the approach relative to current disciplinary knowledge. At the conclusion of the class visits, the reviewer meets with the candidate to give feedback and also submits a written report to the department chair, copied to the candidate. The candidate may provide written comments on this report and the reviewer may respond if he/she wishes. The reports are included in the candidate's promotion and tenure dossier.

## **THE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING PROCEDURE**

A peer review of teaching includes class observation and the review of course materials. Peer reviews should aim for clear and productive feedback on the course that has been reviewed, its design and organization, student assignments, and feedback to and engagement with students. The faculty member may select courses for review and recommend the schedule for review. They may nominate reviewers and may request assistance and input from the Department Chair or Associate Chair to help select appropriate peer reviewers from within the Educational Studies faculty.

In general, peer reviews are conducted by tenured faculty within the department (i.e., clinical and assistant professors should not be expected to conduct reviews). Faculty are strongly encouraged to seek a variety of reviewers from outside their home program. Exceptions will be considered on an individual basis (see petition form).



### **Initial Meeting**

At the first meeting between the faculty member and the peer reviewer, the focus of peer review that is the most relevant and appropriate to the course and instructional goals of the faculty member are determined. The faculty member should be prepared to:

- give the reviewer a copy of the syllabus;
- describe the aims of the course and its place within the degree program or the program(s) it serves;
- describe the goals, purposes, and organization of the class session to be observed;
- describe the areas on which the faculty member would like to review to focus; and
- give any other relevant course materials to the reviewer (e.g., the faculty member may grant guest access to the course's Carmen site). If the course is an online course, the reviewer should be given the same level of access to Carmen as the students.

### **Reviewer Preparation**

Prior to the class session, the reviewer should read the syllabus and review any other materials provided by the faculty member. The reviewer should also begin the review letter by filling in pertinent class information and summarizing the pre-observation meeting.

### **Class Observation(s)**

The peer review of teaching includes at least one class observation (two observations are preferred). Class observations, however, can occur in the classroom, be an observation of an electronic class, or be an observation of a course that has been recorded. Wherever possible, student feedback (outside of the faculty member's presence) should be sought (e.g., classroom discussion, Qualtrics survey).

### **Post-Observation Letter Preparation**

Following the class observation, the reviewer should complete the review letter. In addition to the observational information (e.g., what happened in the class), the reviewer should provide an evaluation of the faculty member's instruction including recommendations for changes. The evaluation should include highlights of the faculty members' strengths and suggestions for improvement.

### **Post-observation meeting**

After the class, the faculty member and the reviewer should meet to discuss the experience, to review the written review, and to address any questions that either party may have. Following this meeting, the reviewer will submit their review to the Department Chair. The faculty member is entitled to respond to the review in writing to the Department Chair within 10 business days. The faculty member should include the review (and the response, if applicable) as part of the annual review and with any promotion materials.



## SAMPLE PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING LETTER TEMPLATE

Date

**Faculty Observed:**

**Peer Observer:**

**Date/Time of Observation and Meetings:**

**Class Title & Number:**

**Credits:**

**Number of Students:**

**Level of Instruction:**

**Mode of Instruction (in person, distance, hybrid):**

**Observation (in person or from a recorded presentation):**

### **Description of Pre-Meeting**

Include a description of the materials presented and what was discussed.

### **Observation**

During the observation, look for and be prepared to comment on the following:

- Instruction strategies used
- Content knowledge
- Presentation skills
- Instructor–student rapport
- Clarity
- Instructor organization
- Other class or teaching elements worthy of note

### **Meeting with Students (Outside of Faculty Presence)**

Include a summary of the questions asked to the students and their comments.

### **Evaluation of Instruction**

Provide an evaluation of the faculty member's instruction including highlights of the faculty member's strengths and suggestions for improvement of teaching. Be as specific as possible.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW TEACHING PORTFOLIO**

This document would be optional for tenure track faculty but **required/recommended** for clinical/teaching/practice faculty but does not include clinical faculty in patient service roles in the health sciences. *(For Clinical/teaching/practice faculty, this document would replace the research component of the dossier.)* This portfolio is adaptable to fit a variety of teaching formats and delivery platforms.

### **SECTION 1: Introduce purpose and rationale for document**

Teaching can be improved through focused effort and growth mindset toward evidence-based practice. Here are some hallmarks of focused effort and growth mindset:

- Set yearly goals and collect evidence
- Share with students that you, too, are improving your craft through their feedback
- Let your chair know what resources you have accessed to improve your teaching through professional learning activities and learning communities
- Reflect on your teaching philosophy and practices

In this section, include a clear Teaching Philosophy. This should be a personal statement that is edited/affirmed each year and contextualized in terms of current students (non-traditional, distance modality, workforce development) that includes reflections on the following topics:

- Culturally affirming for learners
- Addresses student belonging
- Connects to university mission and vision
- Addresses why students should learn
- Addresses what learning involves: asking what, when, how, but also why, and accepting uncertainty and probability in the search for answers
- Contextualizes mutual and interdependent learning
- Acknowledges student life experiences and ways of knowing

### **Section 2: What were your teaching goals last year?**

Identify teaching goals you pursued in the past year based on your philosophy, last year's SEIs, peer review of teaching, changing or increasing student needs, student feedback, and feedback from the chair.





### Section 3: How did you try to meet your teaching goals? (methods)

Describe the following **preparation activities** to frame your reflection.

- Thoughtful selection and design of learning activities to maximize learning
  - Examples: Office hours, emails, discussions, grading process/feedback to students, lesson planning, preparing Carmen spaces
- Participation in teaching development workshops through the Drake Institute, ODEE, WAC, Libraries, disciplinary teaching conferences etc.
- Curricular improvements
  - Examples: redesign of a syllabus, new course design, transition to online/hybrid/in-person, etc.)
- Implement inclusive teaching strategies (Expanding representative content, decolonize syllabus, include transparent assignments, increase access and accessibility, address unique student characteristics such as first generation students, etc.)

Share how you create a **learning environment**. Teachers create growth-inspiring environments for learning through:

- Addressing students' intrinsic motivation and career/personal goals
- Providing safety and support balanced with intellectual challenge
- Providing mutual trust that supports students' self-efficacy
- Creating a class context that is culturally affirming and just
- Fostering mutual and interdependent learning
- Fostering learner engagement, interaction, and demonstrated learning in the moment and across the time of the learning experience
- Supporting learners' ability to understand their progress toward their goals
- Using appropriate evaluation for learning space
- Creating content located in the intellectual community of the discipline
- Addressing scope of students' needs
- Informed by research and practice
- Aligning content with programmatic goals and expectations
- Can includes field experiences, service learning, study abroad

Reflect on any direct activities in the classroom/learning space, understanding the fluid nature of concurrent and interdependent learning/teaching that happens between students and teacher. Address the following topics:

- Curriculum delivery
- Teaching students how to learn/study
- Strategizing support for students to learn specific concepts, skills, attitudes, etc.



- Advising, mentoring, coaching
- Organizing and leading teaching team (specific to a class)
- Supporting junior colleagues
- Infusing inclusive teaching strategies

#### **Section 4: How do you know it's working? (evidence)**

As you reflect on this past year in teaching, what are the ways that you are evaluating your progress? (Note: The Drake Institute offers great individualized services for this.) Evidence can include any or all of the following:

- SEIs
- Student comments
- Midterm feedback
- End-of-semester feedback
- Student work
- Peer Review of Teaching
- Other evidence (lab group publishing, publishing with students)

If the university wants to create this document, we would recommend a web platform with notes, e.g., "For notes to help with writing a teaching philosophy, see ..."

In addition, a revision to the Core Dossier for Clinical Faculty would reduce confusion. A possible format for such a dossier is presented in the following pages.



## ANNUAL ASSESSMENT OF ACTIVITY CORE DOSSIER

### Teaching/Clinical/Practice Faculty

(would not include health sciences faculty involved with patient care)

#### Annual Review for 2021

Name:

Rank and Program:

#### Teaching and Advising (SEE TEACHING PORTFOLIO ALSO)

List courses taught in 2020 (spring, summer, autumn) including semester, course number and title, credit hours, the number of students enrolled, the percentage of the course you taught, whether formal evaluation data were collected, and the SEI mean score for item 10.

Sem/Year	Course No. Course Title	Credit Hours	No. Enrolled	% Taught	Formal Eval	SEI Mean Score (item 10)	SEI Response Rate

List names of PhD or professional doctoral advisees for January through December 2020 (i.e., *you are the major advisor*). Please include notable student accomplishments for the year. For completed cases, list exam date.

- Completed
- Candidacy completed
- Candidacy not completed

List names of PhD or professional doctoral Committees on which you currently are serving (i.e., *you serve on the committee but are not the major advisor*).

- Completed
- Candidacy completed
- Candidacy not completed



List names of active (i.e., currently registered) Masters students for whom you are the major advisor. For completed cases, list exam date.

List names of Masters committees on which you currently are serving (i.e., *you serve on committee but are not major advisor*). For completed cases, list exam date.

List any undergraduate students you mentor in research or other discipline-relevant efforts.

### Evaluation of Teaching

- Provide a brief description of how you use SEIs and other evaluative information on your teaching to improve your instruction.
- Provide a summary of any additional course evaluations that you created on your own (mid-semester feedback, end of semester evaluations, observations of teaching by peers or supervisors, etc.)

### Other Instructional Contributions.

- Please describe any other instructional contributions not listed above.

### Curricular and Course Development

- Please describe any curricular work or course development you've engaged in this past year (2020). This could include any teaching improvements, new course development, online curriculum development, or additional pedagogical improvements during this past year.

### Teaching Innovation

- Please describe any teaching innovations that you have engaged in this year (these might include receiving teaching grants, taking a course or workshop to improve your teaching, applying for GE status for a course, designing a service learning component to your course, decolonizing your syllabus, cross-listing a course with another department to enhance interdisciplinary learning, etc.)

### Description of Program of Research

In each of the following categories, please indicate with an '\*' any works completed with graduate students.

#### Peer-Reviewed Journal Articles

- List in reverse chronological order articles published, in press, or under review in peer-reviewed journal during the past three years (2018–2020).



### Practice-based Book Chapter and Articles

- List in reverse chronological order articles or chapters published, in press, or under review during the past three years (2018–2020).

### Books (separate author and editor entries)

- List in reverse chronological order books published, in press, or under review during the past three years (2018–2020).

### Non-Peer-Reviewed Book Chapters and Articles

- List in reverse chronological order non-peer-reviewed chapters and articles published, in press, or under review during the past three years (2018–2020).

### Technical Reports

- List in reverse-chronological order any technical reports published during the past three years (2018–2020).

### Conference Presentations

- List in reverse-chronological order any conference presentations that you have given during the past three years (2018–2020).

### Works in Progress

- List in reverse chronological order books, articles or chapters that are in progress but have not yet been submitted.
- Include a brief statement for each piece indicating the status of the project and the work accomplished in the past three years.

### Prizes and Awards for Research, Scholarly, Teaching, or Creative Work received during the past three years (2018–2020).

- List any prizes or awards for research, scholarly, teaching, or creative work, including who the award/prize granting agency was as well as what the award/prize was for.

### Grant proposals

- Describe any internal or extramural grant proposals that have been submitted for funding during the past three years (2018–2020) and their status (pending, funded, unfunded). Please include the name of the agency/foundation, your specific



role on the grant (e.g., PI, Co-PI, Co-I, or consultant), and the dollar amount requested. If you are not the PI, please list the name of the PI. For clinical faculty, you can list any teaching grants here or in the innovation section above.

## Service

### Editorial Service

- Describe any editing duties that you have performed during the past year (2020).
- List editorial boards that you have been officially appointed to and served on during the past year (2020). Include the approximate number of reviews completed in this capacity for each editorial board listed.
- List any journal that you have reviewed manuscripts for as an ad-hoc reviewer in the past year (2020). Please only included journals for which you completed a review in 2019. Include the approximate number of reviews completed in this capacity for each journal listed.

### Service to Profession

- List organization or association, offices held, or other role or service for the past year (2020). Describe the responsibilities of the position and the approximate time commitment.

### Administrative Service within the University (2020) and Role:

1. Departmental committees
2. College or University committees
3. Affirmative action and mentoring activities
4. Other administrative positions or service within the University

### Other Professional or Public Service

- List any other professional or public service for the past year (2020). Describe the responsibilities of the position and the approximate time commitment.



## Recommendations for the Annual Review and Feedback Letter from Chair

In the full developmental teaching evaluation process, the Department Chair understands and values the efforts that are a part of **comprehensive intentional teaching**, which includes teaching activities of mentoring and advising for students and colleagues. In order to evaluate the full range of teaching activities, it is important for the Chair to consider the totality of the teaching experience and evidence of continuous improvement in the items below and in all forms of feedback (SEIs, peer reviews) that need to be contextualized and integrated with continuous improvement efforts. These efforts reflect the fluid nature of concurrent and interdependent learning/teaching that happens between students and teacher. Also, consider providing separate feedback letters for each activity: one for research, teaching, and service.

1. **Indirect activities**, such as updating curriculum, thoughtful selection and design of learning activities to maximize learning, communicating with students through office hours, emails, discussions; grading; advising, mentoring, and coaching.
2. **Direct activities** in the classroom/learning space, such as curriculum delivery; teaching students how to learn/study; supervising independent learning situations such as dissertations, independent study, etc.; and strategizing support for students to learn specific concepts, skills, attitudes, etc.
3. **Creation of an inspired learning environment**, based on intrinsic motivation and career/personal goals, provides safety and support balanced with intellectual challenge, creates mutual trust that supports students' self-efficacy, is culturally affirming and just, provides mutual and interdependent learning, values student epistemologies (ways of knowing and cultural influence; King & Kitchener, Perry, Moll), and utilizes accessible universal design.
4. **Management of the learning environment**, evaluated by learner engagement, interaction, and demonstrated learning in the moment and across the time of the learning experience; learners' ability to understand their progress toward their goals; appropriateness of activities for learning space which is contextualized and located in the intellectual community of the discipline; addresses the scope of students' needs; informed by research and practice; aligned with programmatic goals and expectations; and includes field experiences, service learning, and study abroad.
5. **Teaching philosophy** written and edited/affirmed each year and contextualized in terms of current students (non-traditional, distance modality, workforce development). In best practice, these statements would be culturally affirming, address student belonging, connect to university mission and vision, address why students should learn, address what learning involves (asking what, when, how, and why, and accepting uncertainty in the search for answers), contextualize mutual and interdependent learning, and acknowledge students' life experiences and ways of knowing.



In order to improve teaching, the Chair will foster focused effort and growth mindset toward evidence-based practice. Please frame your comments in meaningful, constructive feedback to encourage continuous improvement.

In providing feedback in your annual letter, please address the following:

#### RATING OF TEACHING PERFORMANCE

- What documents did you consult/consider in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of the facultyperson? Consider design of the course, Expected Teaching Outcomes, SEIs, student comments, peer reviews of teaching, and communications with instructor as evidence of direct and indirect activities of teaching, student engagement, and management of the learning environment.
- Does the facultyperson's teaching philosophy reflect the qualities of best practices in teaching? How might this be improved?
- Did the teacher set yearly goals and collect evidence about meeting those goals? With a growth mindset, improvement efforts that do not work out should not be penalized.
- What resources did the facultyperson consult as they worked to improve their teaching in the past year (training, consulting, learning communities and/or institutes)?
- Did the facultyperson engage in mentoring of students and/or colleagues? How effective were those efforts?

#### CONTEXT OF RATING

- How did the teaching performance of the facultyperson demonstrate intentionality and reflection for growth?
- How did the teaching performance of this year relate to the overall pedagogical trajectory and long-term instructional objectives of the facultyperson? Were any innovative approaches or alternate methodologies attempted? Were there any internal or external circumstances that affected instructional practice?

#### RESOURCES FOR CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

- What specific actions would you suggest that could directly improve the quality of teaching, mentoring, advising, and coaching?
- What resources would you recommend that the facultyperson consult to improve their teaching (training, consulting, learning communities and/or institutes)?



**Additional Resources Consulted:**

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Harvard University Press.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2013). *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Temple University Press.

Filene, P. (2005). *The joy of teaching: A practical guide for new college instructors*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Press.

Ginsberg, M. B. & Wlodkowski, R. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Diversity & motivation: Culturally responsive teaching in college*. Jossey-Bass.

Svinicki, M. D. (2004). *Learning and motivation in the postsecondary classroom*. Anker Publishing.

Taylor, E. W. & Cranton, P. & Associates (2012). *The handbook of transformative learning: Theory, research, and practice*. Jossey-Bass.

Weimer, M. (2015). *Learner centered teaching: Five key changes to practice* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Jossey-Bass.