

**Educational Policy Committee**  
**4 September 2019**  
**Minutes**

**Committee Members Attending:** Mary Beth, Deily, Frank R. Gunter, Tong Soon Lee, Edward Lotto, Virginia McSwain, Natasha Vermaaki, and Edmund Webb (Chair)

**Guests:** Linda Bell, Lori McClaind, Susan Szczepanski, Greg Tonkay, Steven Wilson, and Katrina Zalatan

**Minutes:** Minutes of May 1, 2019 were approved

**Nominations:** Chair asked for volunteers for Course and Curriculum Subcommittee. Deily volunteered to represent the College of Business. Gunter was selected as Secretary for the current meeting.

**Teaching Peer Review:** Gunter summarized the new R&P 2.2.2.7 Peer Review of Teaching proposal. Key points were:

Motivation

- Current student evaluations fail to distinguish between excellent and average teaching quality – there is less than one standard deviation between the average teaching evaluation and the highest possible score of 5.00
- Students may be able to do a good job of evaluating “how” a topic is taught but are much less able to evaluate “what” is taught
- Studies have shown that student evaluations are often biased against female faculty, faculty who speak with an accent, teachers of required courses, teachers of courses taught at inconvenient hours, teachers who are perceived as tough graders, etc.

Proposal

- Peer review would complement student evaluations
- There are two purposes for peer review:
  - Provide feedback to improve teaching
  - Aid in making promotion/salary decisions
- Peer evaluations would be conducted in conjunction with 3<sup>rd</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> year reviews of untenured faculty
- Distribution
  - Limited distribution for peer evaluations for feedback
  - Peer evaluations for promotion would be part of promotion portfolio
- Attached to but separate from the R&P Peer Review of Teaching proposal
  - Rating Form for Reviewing Course Design (Adapted from Chism 1999)
  - Rating Form for Reviewing Classroom Instruction (Adapted from Chism 1999 and BYU faculty procedures.)

Discussion

- Peer review would also be valuable for tenured faculty
- Peer review will increase the already large administrative burden on faculty

- Should same procedure/standards be used to evaluate non-tenure track teaching faculty?
- There are experts in teaching evaluation in the College of Education. They should be part of this discussion.
- Smaller Departments may lack enough senior faculty to perform peer teaching evaluations.
- Some departments have such diverse fields of concentration that it might be difficult/impossible for a faculty member in that department to evaluate whether: “the course reflects the current state of the discipline.”
- Should classroom visits be arranged in advance or unannounced? Both options have advantages and disadvantages.
- Should there be a university wide policy or should each college be tasked with developing their own peer review policies.

Gunter agreed to revise this peer review policy and resubmit to the Educational Policy Committee at a later meeting.

Educational Policy Committee meeting ended. Chair reminded members and guests that the next meeting would be held on September 18<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank R. Gunter