

**Minutes**  
**PHHP Curriculum Committee**  
**Wednesday, February 10, 2016**  
**11:00 am to 12:00 pm, Room 4101**

**Present: Lori Altman, Diana Rojas Alvarez (non-voting member), Jason Beneciuk, Daniel Estrada, Michelle Heeg (non-voting member), Xiaomin Lu, Michael Marsiske, Cindy Prins, Mary Ellen Young**

**Absent: Joseph Bisesi, Lauren Hearn, Amy Blue (non-voting member)**

**1. Discussion Item - Peer Teaching Evaluations in PHHP**

The PHHP Curriculum Committee discussed the peer teaching observation form and evaluation process. The committee sees two separate functions for peer teaching evaluations that need to be separated:

1. We need an evaluative component of teaching for Promotion & Tenure
2. We need a process to improve instruction (which we recognize has a mentoring component with it)
  - a. A new and inexperienced instructor needs peer feedback
  - b. Any instructor who is not getting good course evaluations needs peer feedback

Comments about the Peer Evaluation Form

Regarding the questions on the peer evaluation form, the committee felt that the current questions were adequate but that questions about the syllabus should be added.

The current document is tailored to an in-class experience and does not take into account alternative learning formats like online learning and blended learning. We recommend that different evaluation forms be developed (or the current form be modified) to include questions about online course components. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences includes instructions for in-person and online classes in their observation form; it is attached here as an example.

Comments about the Peer Evaluation Process

Committee members noted that peer feedback processes are managed differently among departments in the college. Some departments do not collect peer feedback, some do not do it regularly, and some do it regularly.

The committee felt that it would be valuable to set minimum frequencies for peer evaluation, recognizing that peer evaluation is most critical for early career faculty but can have a benefit for more experienced faculty as well. We recommend that evaluations are conducted annually for the "Assistant" level up through the promotion and/or tenure process, at least every two years for an "Associate", and every three years for "Full" across all tracks. Graduate students who are instructors of record or who have the primary responsibility for teaching a course should be evaluated each time they teach. Adjunct instructors should be evaluated once per course.

Most committee members felt that the peer evaluation process would benefit from having external reviewers from other departments in the college, as opposed to reviewers in the same department. One committee member was concerned that external reviewers could not adequately give feedback on courses outside their knowledge base, but most committee members felt that an in-depth knowledge of the subject materials was not necessary to provide the feedback requested on the form. A suggestion for the external reviews was to establish a standing/rotating committee of evaluators that could be used.