

**Committee for the Peer Review of Teaching  
2015 Report to the Faculty Senate**

**2015 Members**

Members of the committee for the 2014-2015 academic year were:  
At Large: Eric Furuseth (15), Draza Markovic (16), Joan Houston (17)  
CAS: Bill Harbort (15), Ken Bowles for Margaret Sherve on sabbatical (16), Scott Sigel (17)  
COB: Patti Fedje (15), Kristi Berg (16), Carla Cabarle (17)  
CEHS: Deb Jensen, acting chair (15), Tom Froelich (16), Kathy Hintz (17)

**Duties**

The CPRT was undergoing a revision of its purpose by the Faculty Senate during this time period, from conducting peer reviews of teaching to be reported to individual faculty and chairs; to providing a more proactive and systematic professional development system.

**Duties Accomplished**

Recommendations for a revised charge for the CPRT had been presented to the Faculty Senate November 6, 2014 (attached). At that meeting, the Faculty Senate moved to “ask the committee to examine a process for formative, non-evaluative feedback be given to faculty for growth” (Faculty Senate Minutes, November 5, 2014). Work was begun on a working draft during the 2014-2015 term. That work is, at this reporting point still ongoing.

**New Membership for 2015-2016**

Faculty Elected At-Large (3)

Draza Markovic (16)  
Joan Houston (17)  
Lisa Borden-King (18)

Faculty Elected by College (9)

College of Arts and Sciences (3)

Margaret Sherve (16)  
Scott Sigel (17)  
Wojciech Cebulak (18)

College of Business (3)

Kristi Berg (16)  
Carla Cabarle (17)  
Tom Seymour (18)

College of Education and Health Sciences (3)

Tom Froelich (16)  
Kathy Hintz (17)  
Holly Pederson (18)

Respectfully submitted,  
Deb Jensen, Recorder and Acting Chair, CPRT

## Recommendations on CPRT Charge 11-06-14

### 1. Current Policy Clarification: Recommend Clarification

Investigate whether current requirements for Peer Reviews are actually understood and clarify. No requests for reviews were received by the CPRT in 2013 or 2014.

### 2. Role of the CPRT: Recommend Professional Growth Role, Not Evaluation Role

Reconsider whether the role of the CPRT should be evaluative or supportive (proactive professional growth orientation). The minutes from the October 2013 and October 2014 CPRT brainstorming meetings indicate a CPRT preference for proactive, professional growth orientation.

- a. There is considerable evidence in professional development literature that evaluation and mentoring must be separate processes.
- b. Evaluation is, in current policy, the purview of supervisors and the promotion/tenure process.
- c. Improvement in teaching must be proactive, not reactive, since reactive approaches do not benefit students who would have already experienced less effective teaching.

### 3. Student Feedback Data: Recommend Use of General Ed., New Course Evaluations and Collaboration

Since some instruments formerly used to monitor student feedback at an institutional level are no longer being used, we need real data (not just opinions) on how teaching is associated with student success on our campus. Some suggestions were made by the CPRT members.

- a. Use data from required General Education evaluations to determine areas of professional development need.
- b. Use data from the newly revised course evaluations to target professional development needs.
- c. Have CPRT work with others on campus involved in professional development (i.e. CETL, PIL, FYE, departments) to develop a more cohesive and systematic approach.

### 4. Growth Opportunities: Address Varied Needs of Faculty, with Student Success Focus

- a. New faculty may need mentoring, institutional process information, opportunities to show their new ideas *to* existing faculty and to also learn techniques *from* existing faculty.
- b. Faculty who are teaching well (good student and supervisor ratings, students succeeding) still need new ideas, individualized feedback on how their students are responding, time for consultation and conversations on 'the work' of how to teach so students learn. They can also serve as mentors.
- c. Faculty who are not teaching well (lower student and supervisor ratings, students not succeeding), need more concrete examples of how to improve, and specific yet still collegial assistance. This needs to stem from supervisory information, but separate from evaluation if faculty are really to ask for and/or receive help openly and honestly.
- d. All faculty need to understand developmental characteristics of young adult and adult learners, how the mind/brain actually learns at this level, and in what specific ways these things matter to instructional models. Those with P-12 education preparation may not have studied adult learner characteristics. Those with content specific preparation only may not have studied developmental learning characteristics or teaching strategies at all. If faculty 'don't know what they don't know' and sincerely assume they are teaching well-but learning

is not occurring, an unfortunate consequence can be to assume it is student ability or effort, even if students have the intelligence and try hard.

**5. Consistency: Proactively and Systematically Address Professional Growth across MSU**

- a. Professional development efforts at MSU are currently sporadic and need to be made systematic.
- b. Professional development efforts at MSU are seriously constrained by time and funding. The importance of faculty growth requires we find ways to think differently so it can occur, regardless.
- c. Instantiate persistent, varied on-campus models for peer interaction on learning and teaching.