

**A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching:
Using OSCQR with Genuine Peers**

Sarah McCorkle, Ph.D.

OAKTrust Digital Repository
Texas A&M University

Documents in this collection

Grant Proposal: 2021-2022 POD Network Grant Program..... 1 – 12
A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

Final Report: 2021-2022 POD Network Grant Program 13 – 14
A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

Conference Presentation: 47th Annual POD Conference 15 – 22
The Development-Focused Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

References 23 – 24

Appendix: Peer Review Worksheets..... 25 – 29

This project and document collection may be cited as:

McCorkle, S. (2022). *A development-focused approach to the peer review of online teaching: Using OSCQR with genuine peers*. OAKTrust Digital Repository, Texas A&M University.

A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

Sarah McCorkle, Ph.D.
College of Education and Human Development
Texas A&M University
<http://education.tamu.edu/oscqr>

2021-2022 POD Network Grant Program
POD Network Early Researcher Grant

Project Proposal
May 9, 2021

Abstract

The peer review of teaching has primarily focused on departmental classroom observations for promotion and tenure decisions. The observation of one's teaching can also serve as a valuable opportunity for self-reflection, acquiring feedback from peers, and introducing research-based intervention strategies and new teaching techniques. While these observation and review activities are common in the brick-and-mortar classroom, there appears to be a peer review gap between the physical campus classrooms and the learning management system housing online courses. Rubrics for the evaluation of online course design have attempted to fill this need, as an administrator may choose to use the results of online course quality rubrics, like Quality Matters (QM), as a substitution for classroom observation or peer review of teaching. The QM process is evaluative, producing a score to indicate whether or not the course design as presented in the learning management system has met the outlined standards. However, QM does not address course delivery, teaching, or student outcomes. An approach to online course quality review that addresses both the design of the course and one's teaching (synchronously and asynchronously) would be most beneficial to our college's faculty. Existing research on development-focused peer review of teaching will be used to inform our approach. Much of this research has been conducted in the traditional brick-and-mortar classroom, though the lessons within are transferable to any teaching modality.

Importance of the Project

The peer review of online teaching is often conducted with a course quality rubric for the purpose of providing formative feedback to the instructor. This feedback is then applied to the course to meet the benchmarks outlined in the rubric. Online course quality rubrics, Quality Matters (QM) being just one example, assess only the design of the course as it appears in the learning management system (Kreie et al., 2017; McKenzie & Parker, 2011; Youger & Ahern, 2015). The peer review of teaching in the traditional brick-and-mortar classroom takes a completely different format: a pre-observation meeting (what are your goals, why are you interested in a peer review, what should I be looking for); takes artifacts of teaching into consideration beyond course materials (examples of student work, samples of the type of feedback the instructor provides to students); observation of classroom interaction (listening to student-student and student-instructor conversations); and a post-observation meeting (Chism, 2007). These areas are absent from the peer review process when using an online course quality rubric.

I was inspired to begin this project after reading the work of David Gosling on the development-focused peer review of teaching with genuine peers (Gosling, 2002). In my work as an instructional designer and educational developer, I observed a gap in the peer review of online teaching and the peer review and classroom observation of the traditional classroom. The peer review of online teaching, despite providing a semester-long snapshot and archive of asynchronous activities, does not encourage the exploration of voluntarily submitted evidence and artifacts such as course delivery, teaching, student submissions, faculty feedback, or student evaluations of teaching. As many QM reviews are conducted by cross-institutional peers, and access to teaching artifacts must be provided carefully due to FERPA, the decision to limit

evaluation to course design was likely intentional to keep QM's initiative scalable. However, I believe it would be beneficial to use genuine peers, here in our college, for a development-focused peer review of online teaching.

This project will set up a development-focused peer review of online teaching initiative for faculty teaching in the college of education using genuine peers. In alignment with POD's ethical guidelines, care will be taken to pair faculty with those who are not serving on committees or in positions that could create a conflict of interest (Robertson, 2010). By documenting this process, exploring faculty experiences, and measuring impact of this initiative, I hope to introduce a model that can be adopted by other schools while bringing attention to the gap in how we conduct peer reviews of teaching in the online classroom compared to the traditional brick-and-mortar classroom. By providing time and space for faculty to discuss their teaching and share ideas, we can begin to eliminate teaching silos among our online faculty and support those who teach online, especially adjunct faculty, at a distance from our main campus.

Project Design

Problem Statement

For several years the college of education has used the Quality Matters (QM) Rubric to assess the quality of our online courses. Up until her recent retirement, there was only one faculty member within the college of education with the appropriate QM certification. This presented two problems: 1) QM certification must be periodically renewed, and our reviewer expressed how time consuming the recertification process had become; and 2) a course review bottleneck was created within the college. Attempts to transfer course review requests to others within the university were unsuccessful due to the workload of those departments. The QM process and associated rubric are positioned as a peer review (Roehrs et al., 2013). However, the

college of education's single, certified QM reviewer may not have been a genuine peer (Gosling, 2002) to every faculty member participating in the QM process. This introduces a third problem: potential for a conflict of interest. As discussed in the POD Network's Ethical Guidelines (<https://podnetwork.org/about/ethical-guidelines>), conflicts of interest can arise when faculty members find themselves in both formative and summative evaluation roles (Robertson, 2010).

The central problem this project aims to address in the college of education is the QM course quality review process has inadvertently created: 1) an unscalable model resulting in course review bottleneck; and 2) a teaching silo effect by limiting direct faculty-to-faculty interaction and idea sharing through development-focused peer reviews of teaching. The proposed activities would have the potential to improve teaching practices across the college's fully online and hybrid programs. By moving away from a QM certified reviewer (or reviewers), we aim to improve the course quality peer review process for faculty within the college.

Project Objectives

The objectives for this project are to:

- Develop a peer review initiative that is scalable and does not rely on a specific reviewer (or reviewers).
- Lessen the training time commitment we are currently experiencing with QM by designing self-paced training modules for college of education faculty on applying an open-source course quality rubric called OSCQR.
- Increase the pool of peer reviewers so we can move towards the use of genuine peers (remaining cognizant of the potential for conflicts of interest) and eliminate the bottle neck of course review requests.

- Improve upon our current practices in online, hybrid, and technology-enhanced course delivery by facilitating reciprocal peer reviews of teaching and opportunities for idea sharing.
- Move beyond the current QM model which only addresses the course design as it appears in the learning management system and begin addressing topics such as: synchronous and asynchronous teaching techniques, course delivery, technology options, and improving student learning outcomes.

Literature Review

The peer review of teaching has primarily focused on departmental classroom observations for promotion and tenure decisions. The observation of one's teaching can also serve as a valuable opportunity for self-reflection, acquiring feedback from peers, and introducing research-based intervention strategies and new teaching techniques. While these observation and review activities are common in the brick-and-mortar classroom, there appears to be a peer review gap between the physical campus classrooms and the learning management system housing online courses. Rubrics for the evaluation of online course design have attempted to fill this need, as an administrator may choose to use the results of online course quality rubrics, like Quality Matters (QM), as a substitution for observation or peer review of fully online teaching. This brief literature review will examine issues relevant to this project's objectives.

Limitations of QM. The QM process is evaluative, producing a score to indicate whether or not the course design as presented in the learning management system has met the outlined standards. However, QM does not address course delivery, teaching, or student outcomes (Kreie et al., 2017; McKenzie & Parker, 2011; Youger & Ahern, 2015). An approach to online course

quality review that addresses both the design of the course and one's teaching (synchronously and asynchronously) would be most beneficial to our college's faculty.

Genuine peers in peer review. The peer in a Peer Review of Teaching (PRT) or Peer Observation of Teaching (POT) is not necessarily an equal partner, and thus contributes to the power imbalance of the PRT and POT process. A genuine peer (Gosling, 2002) is one who has equal status within the PRT/POT activities, and the power and relationship between the two colleagues is equal. Genuine peers participate in a reciprocal PRT/POT for purposes of improving the teaching practices of both parties. By distinguishing between development-focused peer review of teaching and the summative evaluation of teaching at the college or department level, faculty members can establish separate and distinct roles whereby relationships can be safely formed through the exploration of and reflection on one's teaching (Harris et al., 2008). Chism recommended the adoption of separate procedures for formative and summative evaluation of teaching, where the "two approaches should dovetail... creating a comprehensive approach" (Chism, 2007, p. 70).

Development-focused peer review of teaching. Existing research on development-focused peer review of teaching will be used to inform our approach. Much of this research has been conducted in the traditional brick-and-mortar classroom, though the lessons within are transferable to any teaching modality. Harris et al. (2008) includes a guide on "Designing a program for the purpose of enhancing the teaching environment" (p. 32) with key decision points and considerations to guide the development of such initiatives. Byrne et al. (2010) built upon the work within *Models of Peer Observation of Teaching* (Gosling, 2002), specifically the use of genuine peers and the power structure imbalance of traditional PRT/POT activities.

Impact of the Project

This project aims to provide our online and hybrid course faculty with time and space for reflective practice with genuine peers through formative evaluation of teaching. Many of our college's fully online faculty members are not within commuting distance to main campus and may not have the same opportunities to participate in faculty development as their on-campus colleagues. We also hope to introduce a unique use case on transitioning to OSCQR, an open-source course quality rubric, as we move away from the proprietary aspect of QM, their copyrighted materials, required training and certification, and course review processes. OSCQR has been adopted by the Online Learning Consortium as an official scorecard and is gaining popularity in higher education. Like QM, the OSCQR rubric leaves some gaps in a holistic formative assessment of one's teaching. Therefore, OSCQR is one tool within this larger initiative of a development-focused peer review of teaching: course design, synchronous and asynchronous teaching techniques, and improving student learning outcomes. OSCQR's open source and non-propriety nature makes this an ideal tool for faculty to utilize without the additional constraints, requirements, and costs associated with QM.

The introduction of a more holistic development-focused peer review of teaching, specifically for online and hybrid courses, is a worthwhile research project. This project builds upon existing literature on peer review in the traditional classroom and course quality rubrics for online courses. By disseminating our project's outcomes, these initiatives may be replicated by other institutions.

Product to Be Generated

The college-wide initiative on the development-focused peer review of online teaching will produce the following products as part of this proposal:

- **Public-facing website** with information on the college’s initiative.
- **A custom OSCQR rubric** tailored to the college of education.
- **Two eLearning modules** built in Articulate Storyline:
 - Applying the OSCQR Rubric for a self-review
 - Participating in a development-focused peer review of teaching
- **Process for tracking** peer reviews and pairing peer reviewers with genuine peers.
- **Worksheets and handouts** for facilitating pre-observation conference, review of artifacts, and post-observation.

Additional opportunities as this initiative grows may include:

- **Pathway to recognition** for exemplary online teaching.
 - Faculty members have expressed that, by giving up QM, they would not have an opportunity to demonstrate their effectiveness.
 - A portfolio of evidence, which may or may not include documentation from their development-focused peer review, could be used for this purpose.
 - A committee will be established in year two to explore this option.
 - A separate rubric for assessing the portfolio should be developed (Chism, 2007).
- **Open-source materials** such as eLearning content, worksheets, and curriculum.

Project Timeline

Summer Semester 2021

- Finish the development of modules in Articulate Storyline
- Finish handouts and worksheets
- Setup spreadsheets for tracking peer reviews
- Deploy website and promotional materials
- Complete IRB process

Fall Semester 2021

- Enroll interested faculty
- Begin peer reviews

Spring Semester 2022

- Continue peer reviews
- Begin qualitative data collection
- Respond to call for 47th annual POD Conference in April

Summer Semester 2022

- Analyze data
- Prepare reports
- Prepare to disseminate project outcomes

Ongoing

- Establish a sub-committee on a pathway to recognition for exemplary online teaching
- Implement changes and improvements to initiative practices
- Revise materials in Articulate Storyline as needed
- Identify additional module topics as needed in Articulate Storyline
- Continue to enroll interested faculty
- Continue data collection
- Continue to disseminate project outcomes in a manner that can be adopted by others

Project Staff and Responsibilities

This section contains a description of who will work on the project and their responsibilities.

Early researcher / P.I.

The author of this project proposal is a director of distance education, a new faculty in learning design and technology, and member of the college of education's distance education committee. They explored faculty development topics through mentorship opportunities during their graduate coursework. As an early researcher, the POD Network has been instrumental in their professional development.

Responsibilities include the development of the rubric, accompanying handouts and worksheets, eLearning modules, and curriculum for the development-focused peer review approach. Data collection and tracking for peer reviews, as well as qualitative data collection for research and reporting, also fall under the responsibility of the author.

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

The Associate Dean for Academic Affairs oversees initiatives within the college of education, such as the one proposed here. Permission and direction for a development-focused peer review of online teaching has been established and communication with this dean will be on-going. She also serves as the head of the college's distance education committee.

Distance Education Committee

The distance education committee consists of 10 faculty and staff within the college of education. The committee has decided to move forward with OSCQR as an online course quality rubric. Policy decisions surrounding OSCQR and the development-focused peer review of online teaching must be approved by this committee. Sub-committees dedicated to issues specific to this initiative are likely to be established over time. Co-authors for manuscripts and presentations

resulting from this proposal are likely to come from this committee due to their investment and interest in this project.

Evaluation Plan

This section will describe the evaluation plan to determine if the initiative's objectives have been met. The evaluation plan will also be used to improve and grow the initiative over time.

Quantitative Data Collection

Tracking data directly related to the project will include:

eLearning Module Completion

- *Facilitated by content management system hosted by university human resources*
 - Faculty name
 - Completion date

Reciprocal Peer Reviews

- *Faculty members complete a questionnaire to express interest*
 - Faculty name
 - Appointment
 - Department
 - Course to be reviewed
 - Timeframe available for a review
 - Questions regarding online/hybrid teaching experience
 - State conflicts of interest, committees served on, etc. that may impact peer to peer pairing with another faculty member
- *Faculty members are paired with a peer and tracked in a spreadsheet*
 - Date the faculty pair were emailed by administrator.
 - Date of "check-in" follow-up support email. Note any questions/concerns.
 - Date when faculty pair indicates the post-observation has been completed.
 - Date when a link to the survey on their experience was emailed.

(Note: Faculty retain their own records, worksheets, and rubrics. These are not submitted to any office. Faculty may choose to include these artifacts in their promotion and tenure materials if they wish. Worksheets will be designed to document revisions and improvements over time.)

Survey on the Experience

- *Online survey to be created and approved by IRB*
 - Determine which activities were completed (pre-observation, review, post-observation)
 - Faculty member self-reports if they implemented any changes to their teaching
 - Satisfaction / Dissatisfaction with the process and eLearning modules
 - Opportunities for improvement of the initiative

Qualitative Data Collection

Faculty members who have participated in the peer review process will be invited to participate in an interview. Composition of the interview questions will be informed by the quantitative data collected through a survey on their experience.

Data Analysis

Analysis of quantitative data will initially consist of descriptive statistics due to the small population anticipated in years one and two of this initiative. However, this quantitative data would be used to inform the interview questions in the qualitative portion of this study.

Quantitative data will be used to determine if we have met Objectives 1, 2 and 3:

- Objective 1: Develop a peer review initiative that is scalable and does not rely on a specific reviewer (or reviewers).
- Objective 2: Lessen the training time commitment we are currently experiencing with QM by designing self-paced training modules for college of education faculty on applying an open-source course quality rubric called OSCQR.
- Objective 3: Increase the pool of peer reviewers so we can move towards the use of genuine peers (remaining cognizant of the potential for conflicts of interest) and eliminate the bottle neck of course review requests.

Audio transcriptions will be produced using artificial intelligence software. Transcripts will be corrected for errors by listening to the audio while re-reading the AI produced transcript. At this time, any biases which may emerge will be noted by the PI. Qualitative data will be analyzed in MAXQDA. An inductive coding approach is likely to be used at this time, noted by Yin (2014) as an effective approach to coding for early researchers. A more structured, iterative approach to coding will be taken in the later analysis stages (Saldaña, 2013).

Qualitative data will be used to explore whether or not Objectives 4 and 5 have been met.

- Objective 4: Improve upon current practices in online, hybrid, and technology-enhanced course delivery and teaching by facilitating both the peer observation and peer review of teaching through reciprocal course quality reviews and idea sharing.
- Objective 5: Move beyond the current QM model, which only addresses the course design as it appears in the learning management system, and begin addressing topics such as: synchronous and asynchronous teaching techniques, course delivery, technology options, and improving student learning outcomes.

Dissemination Plan

I plan to submit this project to the 47th Annual POD Conference call for proposals in April of 2022. If accepted, the presentation will be delivered in November of 2022. I also plan to work with my colleagues in POD Connects to identify appropriate journals for manuscripts resulting from this initiative.

A Development-Focused Approach to the Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

Sarah McCorkle, Ph.D.
College of Education and Human Development
Texas A&M University
<http://education.tamu.edu/oscqr>

2021-2022 POD Network Grant Program
POD Network Early Researcher Grant

Final Report
September 1, 2022

Project activities

This project produced a scalable, development-focused peer review of online teaching initiative. Our college no longer relies on a single, certified Quality Matters peer reviewer, but rather a pool of genuine peer reviewers (most of whom are interested in reciprocal peer reviews), which has eliminated the peer review “bottleneck” we were experiencing in the college.

Two on-demand eLearning modules were developed: Part 1) applying the open-source OSCQR rubric for a self-review; and Part 2) preparing to participate in a development-focused peer review of online teaching. These sessions were also delivered in an in-person workshop format to encourage participation. The session on preparing to participate in a development-focused peer review was also delivered in-person during a meeting of my department’s pre-tenure group and modified just slightly to appeal to those who teach in-person and online.

Impact on recipients’ professional development

Unfortunately, my participation numbers were much lower than I had hoped. At a university the size of Texas A&M, faculty in our college have many places they can go for resources. I am interested in exploring how an under-resourced college or university could benefit from an initiative of this kind by combining an open-source rubric with a scalable peer

review model utilizing the community-building aspects of genuine peers. When I am ready to launch this study, I plan to reach out to the POD Small Centers listserv to find a research site.

Usefulness to the educational, instructional, and organizational development community

I submitted a proposal on this project to the POD Conference and hope to have an opportunity to share my work with a larger audience. A public-facing website is available with information on the initiative: education.tamu.edu/oscqr

I also reached out to our Center for Teaching Excellence prior to launching the project and asked them to peer review the “peer review” initiative. I offered the OSCQR rubric, which was modified slightly for the Texas A&M community, to the CTE for addition to their website which is currently undergoing a redesign.

Results

Faculty participation in: *Applying the OSCQR Rubric for a Self-Review*
(self-paced or in-person)

- 10 College of Education
- 2 Veterinary Medicine School (*Unexpected! Presumably they found us online!*)
- 1 Staff member from an instructional design office on campus

Faculty participation in: *Preparing for a Development-Focused Peer Review*
(self-paced or in-person)

- 16 College of Education (*includes pre-tenure group attendees who teach in a classroom*)
- 2 Veterinary Medicine School
- 1 Staff member from an instructional design office on campus

Peer reviews completed to date and level of satisfaction with the process
(anonymous survey)

- 4 Very Satisfied
- 1 Satisfied

The Development-Focused Peer Review of Online Teaching Using OSCQR

Sarah McCorkle, Ph.D.
College of Education and Human Development
Texas A&M University
<http://education.tamu.edu/oscqr>

The POD Network
47th Annual Conference

Concurrent Conference Session
November 16, 2022

Session Abstract

While peer observation and review of teaching are common in the traditional classroom, there are gaps in the peer review practices of in-person and online teaching. Rubrics like Quality Matters address only the design of online courses, and administrators often use these rubrics as a substitute for classroom observation or peer review of online teaching. Our college investigated approaches to online course quality peer review to include both the design of the online course and one's teaching (synchronously and asynchronously). We coupled the OSCQR rubric with existing research on development-focused peer review of teaching. This session shares our approach.

Session Description

This project resulted in a development-focused peer review of online teaching initiative for faculty teaching in the college of education using genuine peers. In alignment with POD's ethical guidelines, care is taken to pair faculty with those who are not serving on committees or in positions that could create a conflict of interest (Robertson, 2010). By documenting this process, exploring faculty experiences, and measuring impact of this initiative, I hope to introduce a model that can be adopted by other schools while bringing attention to the gap in how we conduct peer reviews of teaching in the online classroom compared to the traditional brick and mortar classroom.

By providing time and space for faculty to discuss their teaching and share ideas, we can begin to eliminate teaching silos among our online faculty and support those who teach online, especially adjunct faculty, at a distance from our main campus. This project aims to provide our online faculty with time and space for reflective practice with genuine peers (Gosling, 2002) through formative evaluation of teaching. Many of our college's fully online faculty members are not within commuting distance to main campus and may not have the same opportunities to participate in faculty development as their on-campus colleagues.

We also hope to introduce a unique use case on transitioning to OSCQR, an open-source course quality rubric, as we move away from the proprietary aspect of QM, their copyrighted materials, required training and certification, and course review processes. OSCQR has been adopted by

the Online Learning Consortium as an official scorecard and is gaining popularity in higher education. Like QM, the OSCQR rubric leaves some gaps in a holistic formative assessment of one's teaching. Therefore, OSCQR is one tool within this larger initiative of a development-focused peer review of teaching: course design, synchronous and asynchronous teaching techniques, and improving student learning outcomes.

The introduction of a more holistic development-focused peer review of teaching, specifically for online courses, is a worthwhile research project. This project builds upon existing literature on peer review in the traditional classroom and course quality rubrics for online courses. By disseminating our project's processes and outcomes, these initiatives may be replicated by other institutions.

Learning Outcomes

Attendees of this session:

- are introduced to OSCQR, an open-source rubric.
- will discuss the benefits of pairing faculty with genuine peers.
- may replicate these processes on their own campus.

Primary Session Topic

Online and/or Hybrid Teaching & Learning

Impact of Your Work

This session may be of interest to centers and faculty who are supporting online programs. The initiative described took place within a single college at a large university, though it is easily scalable and can be replicated within any institutional context serving online faculty.

Inclusive Strategies

In this research session I will present the initiative and available resources in an accessible manner. Materials will be accessible and I will make use of closed captioning if available. I can make myself available after the session to consult with under-resourced institutions.

Development-Focused Peer Review of Online Teaching



Using OSCQR with Genuine Peers

Sarah McCorkle (she/her)
Clinical Assistant Professor
College of Education & Human Development
Texas A&M University

EPSY.TAMU.edu/Distance-Education



Goals of the Research Project



Explore faculty members' experiences with this PRT initiative and its impact on teaching and learning.

Share the initiative and resources so they can be adopted by other schools.

Bringing attention to the gaps in how we conduct PRT in the online classroom compared to the traditional classroom.



History of the project

Envisioned this project in grad school

Moved to Texas A&M and joined the College of Education

Our college needed a new PRT process for online courses

POD Early Researcher Grant

Deployed the initiative and collected initial data



How do you do peer review?

What school do you work for?

Where is your office/center situated?

What rubric or process are you using for Online PRT?

[TX.AG/pod22](https://www.tx.gov/ag/pod22)



Differences in Classroom & Online PRT



Classroom Teaching

Observation of classroom interactions
(Environmental scan of classroom activity)

Learning Artifacts
(Examples of student work, feedback given)

Encourages reflection and improvement

Frequency: When putting together P&T dossier

Reviewer is a departmental peer

*Often feels...
Collegial, Growth Orientated*

Online Teaching

Observation of the layout in the LMS
(Rubric or checklist of "design standards")

Empty course with no students
(Review often occurs before course begins)

Encourages remediation and error correction

Frequency: Every course as developed

Reviewer is not a departmental peer

*Often feels...
Punitive, Gate Keeping*



Challenges Identified by DE Committee



One **Certified QM Reviewer** in the college of education

- Course review bottleneck
- Certification expires, must be renewed, and became time consuming
- Tried outsourcing course reviews to other colleges/departments

Fully online faculty must submit **something** in their P&T dossier

- QM Course Certification
- Could we do this ourselves within the college?

Felt like something was missing – **teaching!**

- Asynchronous teaching strategies
- Synchronous teaching observation and feedback
- Artifacts of student learning

Support our fully online faculty, especially off-campus and adjunct

- Break down "teaching silos" and foster a sense of community and collegiality
- Engage in peer-to-peer conversations on teaching



Our Approach to Formative Online PRT



Nancy Van Note Chism's *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*

Pre-Conference

Observe and compose the review

Post-Conference

*Formative and Summative
evaluation are separate processes*

"two approaches should dovetail... creating a comprehensive approach" (Chism, 2007, p. 70)

David Gosling's *Use of Genuine Peers*

Development-Focused
and Collaborative

Non-Hierarchical peers

Often reciprocal

*Focus on GROWTH
and improvement*

OSCQR Rubric

Open SUNY / Online Learning Consortium

Non-evaluative rubric

No "training" needed to use it!

Every criteria links to more information

Open source

Any rubric will do!



Power Structure



Genuine Peers Can Restore Balance in Review and Evaluation

Self Review	Peer	Mentor	CTL*	Department	Institution
Faculty Power Structure				Bureaucratic Power Structure	
<i>formative</i>				<i>summative</i>	
←				→	

**The power structure of a center for teaching and learning is dependent upon institutional context and how the center is situated within the campus community. It is speculated that the EPSY Distance Education office is considered a neutral space for faculty where the balance of power is in the faculty's favor.*



Any Rubric Will Do!

We chose the OSCQR rubric

- Open Source
- Can be modified for your campus
- Criteria is linked to a long description plus resource

Info:

OSCQR.SUNY.edu

OnlineLearningConsortium.org



pod
NETWORK

Online Peer Review of Teaching should look more like Classroom PRT

Faculty include two teaching peer reviews in their dossier

Our initiative provides

- Structure: Pre-conference, Review, Post-conference
- Support: On demand videos on how to give/receive PRT
Also available as an in-person workshop to facilitate pairs
- Worksheets that encourage the documentation of continuous improvement through reflection and revision



pod
NETWORK

Our Worksheets

Education.TAMU.edu/OSCQR

Pre-Review

- What's working well? What would you like to improve?
- What artifacts did you bring today? Can you walk me through your major project?
- Do I need access to course activities outside of the LMS? Do you have an upcoming Zoom?
- Identify 2-3 areas of focus.

Post-Review

- Action plan for items requiring the least amount of time and effort to implement.
- Action plan for items that can have the biggest impact on student learning.

Post-Semester Reflection

- Document evidence of impact based on these changes.
- Retain these forms and worksheets for their records. Consider using these for P&T dossier.



Let's Collaborate

Are you a Small College or Small Center?

Do you have an online program?

Let's replicate this initiative on your campus!

McCorkle@tamu.edu

This initiative is supported by a contribution from the POD Network. Thank you!



References

- Chism, N. (2007). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Byrne, J., Brown, H., & Challen, D. (2010). Peer development as an alternative to peer observation: A tool to enhance professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 15(3), 215-228.
- Gosling, D. (2002). *Models of peer observation of teaching*. Generic Centre: Learning and Teaching Support Network.
- Gosling, D. (2014). Collaborative Peer-Supported Review of Teaching. In J. Sachs & M. Parsell (eds.) *Peer Review of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Professional Learning and Development in Schools and Higher Education* (pp. 13-31). Springer.
- Harper, F. & Nicolson, M. (2013). Online peer observation: Its value in teacher professional development, support and well-being. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 18(3), 264-275.
- Harris, K. L., Farrell, K., Bell, M., Devlin, M., & James, R. (2008). *Peer review of teaching in Australian higher education: A handbook to support institutions in developing and embedding effective policies and practices*. Australian Learning & Teaching Council.
- Kreie, J., Johnson, S., & Lebsack, M. (2017). Course design and technology for synchronous interaction in an online course. *Information Systems Education Journal*, 15(5), 60-67.
- McKenzie J, Parker N. (2011). *Peer review in online and blended learning environments. Final Report*. Australian Learning & Teaching Council.
- Monk, C., & Purnell, L. (2014). What constitutes 'peer support' within peer supported development? *Journal of Pedagogic Development*, 4(1), 38-47.

- Robertson, D. (2010). Establishing an educational development program. In K. J. Gillespie & D. L. Robertson (Eds.) *A guide to faculty development* (2nd ed., pp. 35-52). Wiley.
- Roehrs, C., Wang, L., & Kendrick, D. (2013). Preparing faculty to use the quality matters model for course improvement. *Journal of Online Learning & Teaching*, 9(1), 52-67.
- Tobin, T. J., Mandernach, B. J., & Taylor, A. H. (2015). *Evaluating online teaching: Implementing best practices*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Younger, R. E., & Ahern, T. C. (2015). Is a quality course a worthy course? Designing for value and worth in online courses. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 18(1), 1-9.

Appendix: Peer Review Worksheets

Pre-Review Conference

Course to be reviewed

Faculty's Name

Peer Reviewer's Name

Today's Date

*Schedule the day/time
for a post-conference*

What is your motivation for receiving a review? What do you hope to get out of the process?

What is currently working well?

What would you like to try?

What would you like to improve?

Walk me through the major project/activity in your course.

What artifacts did you bring to share with me? Do I need any passwords or special access?

Focus of the peer review

Identify 2 or 3 specific areas to focus on during the review.

Area of focus #1

Area of focus #2

Area of focus #3

Course Review

Syllabus

Identify strengths and recommendations:

--

Synchronous Teaching

Identify strengths and recommendations: (If recorded synchronous teaching artifacts are not available, indicate n/a.)

--

Other Artifacts

Indicate the type of artifact (course evaluations, examples of student work, feedback to students) and identify strengths and recommendations.

--

Canvas Course

What were your initial impressions upon entering the Canvas course?

--

OSCQR

Which standards were identified for improvement? List the standard numbers below:

	Standard Numbers
Course Overview and Information	
Course Technology and Tools	
Course Design and Layout	
Course Content and Activities	
Course Interaction	
Assessment and Feedback	

Post-Review Conference

Reminder: Please do not forward the completed rubric or this worksheet to the recipient before your meeting. Thank you.

What is working well in this course? Did you discover something new you plan to try yourself?

During the Pre-Conference you worked together to identify 2-3 specific areas to focus on during the review. List below and include some notes to help guide your post-conference discussion.

Area of focus #1

Area of focus #2

Area of focus #3

Do you have a tool, resource, or technique to suggest? Is there someone you might suggest reaching out to for support or idea sharing?

Faculty Member's Reflection

1. Is this a self-review or a peer review?

Today's date

2. Of the areas identified for improvement, which will require a minimum amount of effort to implement? Provide an action plan for those items.

3. Which area(s) identified for improvement would have the greatest impact on student learning? Provide an action plan for implementation:

Planning

4. In what semester will these action items be implemented?

5. List the remaining areas for improvement, to be addressed in the future as time allows:

Outcomes After Implementation

To be revisited at the end of the semester identified in Question 4.

Describe the outcome of changes implemented in Question 2. If evidence is available to support your claim, retain this evidence as an artifact to accompany your materials.

Describe the outcome of changes implemented in Question 3. Evidence of student learning will support your claim.