ACIE Assessment Plan

FOSTERING A CULTURE OF EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING

The Katz Graduate School of Business and Pitt Business

April 30, 2021

Arjang Assad

Henry E. Haller Jr. Dean of the Katz Graduate School of Business and College of Business Administration

Contents

Overview:

This report outlines a number of steps we have taken at the Joseph M. Katz Graduate School of Business (Katz) and the College of Business Administration (CBA) in response to the concerns and opportunities presented in the report by the Provost's Advisory Council in Instructional Excellence.

In engaging with the recommendations of the report, our primary goal at Katz/CBA has focused on **enhancing student learning outcomes**, and **enriching the student experience**. This goal drives our experienced-based learning efforts at the masters level, and our extensive efforts to enrich both the curricular and co-curricular experiences of our undergraduate students. In the process, we reflect on how we can best support our faculty, as well as our graduate student instructors. Accordingly, many of our existing and new efforts regarding faculty assessments are **formative** in nature rather than summative. However, we have also taken concrete steps to broaden the summative dimensions of evaluating faculty teaching to ensure that teaching contributions are appropriately recognized.

The organization of this report follows the "Specific Recommendations" in the document entitled "***Assessment of Teaching Recommendations to the Provost***", presented to the Council of Deans in November 2020 (pages 6 and 7).

1. ACIE Specific Recommendations:

Units should foster a culture of teaching excellence and improvement by providing resources, tools and support to faculty. There should be a dialogue about the allocation of resources for teaching improvement to support this culture.

1. Each academic unit will develop its own processes, criteria and an action plan to be used in the evaluation of the teaching performance of its faculty.

a. Units should examine their current practices, take note of ways to improve these practices in light of their goals, and develop an action plan to implement revised processes.

b. Teaching Center staff should be consulted for input and support and will provide the following assistance upon request: support in selecting the assessment methods best suited to the unit's needs and teaching goals, guidance on implementing assessment methods (e.g. training instructors how to perform peer observations and deliver effective feedback), and assistance interpreting results and developing plans to improve teaching.

c. Each Dean or Campus President should submit the plan for approval to the Office of the Provost by the end of Spring Term 2020, with an implementation target of Fall 2020. The Dean or President should determine the level of the plan to be submitted (i.e., plans for individual departments or divisions may be "rolled up" into a larger plan).

Below, we outline four key initiatives we have undertaken to support and assess faculty instruction.

Key Initiative 1: Teaching Support for New Faculty

We have been very keen to support our new faculty in both the tenure and appointment streams. Our efforts comprise a number of initiatives, including the development of a comprehensive guide for new faculty, as well as a number of on-site seminars focused specifically on teaching effectiveness.

Our most significant initiative for supporting our new faculty is our ***teaching mentorship program***. Thirteen highly accomplished teachers stepped up as faculty volunteers to serve as mentors for new faculty. Newly hired faculty have the option to participate, and all but a few have embraced the opportunity (the exceptions had extensive prior experience). There are currently 16 faculty mentees. We designed the mentorship program in collaboration with Dr. Audrey Murrell, former Interim Dean of the Honors College and in our initial program roll out, she worked separately with both the mentors and the mentees. Mentors work with the new faculty on course development, review course materials, and do peer reviews.

This is a developmental effort. We felt that to ensure its success, it had to be explicitly characterized as formative, and not evaluative. To reinforce this message, junior faculty are typically assigned a faculty mentor from outside their area. This assures mentees that they can can be open and honest about the challenges they are facing, without concerns about possible effects on their contract renewal or promotion chances. However, junior faculty receive copies of the teaching portfolio template they will be required to deliver. This allows the classroom assessment to follow the same rubric that is used for classroom observations by the Promotion and Tenure Committee.

Key Initiative 2: Systematize Core Course Instruction and build-out Peer visits, content review, and feedback.

A faculty committee gathered syllabi data for all core courses in the Business School to determine if each section of a core course required the same readings, the same learning goals, and the same grading schemes. It found significant variability in required materials, course descriptions, and assessments within most core courses. Specifically, the committee found that in the **CBA core courses, 54% of all sections for a course require substantially the same materials** and the same learning goals, while only 23% of those sections of core courses have the same grading schemes. In the **MBA core courses, 64% of course sections require the same materials**, 73% have some of the same learning goals and 27% have the same grading schemes.

Standardizing materials would ensure that students are not facing different textbook and material choices and prices, and we have a clear understanding of what was used for instruction each year. Standard content would ensure that we know exactly what baseline knowledge all students have, provide opportunities for collective improvement, and enable us to assure learning systematically. Systematizing the instruction for our core courses would open up two important new opportunities: an expansion of **inter-disciplinary teaching** and the introduction of more **personalized education** options for our students. With respect to the former, a clear understanding of what is taught in each core course creates opportunities to connect the learning across core courses, say by covering different aspects of the same case from the vantage points of different business disciplines (such as finance and accounting).

The committee undertaking the syllabi review made several recommendations that are now under further consideration by two committees tasked with examining our undergraduate and masters level curricula. From a faculty assessment standpoint, our goal in this process is to create significant opportunities for formative assessments and collective innovation.

Key Initiative 3: Structured Teaching Development for Graduate Students.

In any given year, as many as 30 graduate students teach courses at Katz/CBA. We are therefore intent on instilling the craft of teaching in Katz graduate students. The craft of teaching involves a broad array of activities including the theory and techniques of pedagogy, syllabus development, student evaluation and assessment techniques, delivery of instructional material, effective student interactions, and the development of teaching materials. Our newly developed program, designed in collaboration with the *University Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL)*, and reviewed and approved by our Doctoral Faculty committee, is being rolled out now with our first-year doctoral students. The program incorporates formal teaching instruction, including required engagement with CTL. It also involves a series of developmental activities, including sitting in on the course that a graduate student is slated to teach with appropriate reflective steps as well as practice in developing course materials. During their first semester as an independent instructor, all students are formally observed by CTL experts, and insights and feedback are discussed with an advising faculty member. At the end of the term, student feedback is similarly discussed with the advising faculty member to explore further development and improvement opportunities. A full outline of the new doctoral student development process is provided in the Appendix A.

Key Initiative 4: Enriched Assessment of Teaching

Teaching Portfolios and Classroom Observations for all Contract Renewals and Promotions.

In collaboration with CTL, we have developed a customized teaching portfolio template, as well as a classroom observation tool. These appear in Appendices B and C of this document. The teaching portfolio template was rolled out this year for all promotion cases. It will be used alongside the classroom observation tool by the Promotion and Tenure Committee of the school for all contract renewal and promotion cases in AY 2021/2022 forward. This impactful decision was vetted and approved by the Business School Promotion and Tenure Committee, and then presented to the faculty which voted in favor of implementation.

Annual Faculty Reviews:

In our automated faculty annual reporting system, faculty are now asked to report:

Pedagogical contributions: *Scholarship on teaching (e.g. publications or presentations delivered on teaching); Development of new courses; Contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects; Service on teaching-related efforts (e.g. Curriculum revision or development); New teaching materials (e.g. development of a text book, new cases etc.).*

List of pedagogical training and development: *Courses, classes, workshops that they have attended or participated in. These may include classes and training offered in the business school, workshops offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, professional development activities at conferences, etc. Faculty are also asked to report any formal roles they have taken on to train, develop, or mentor others in the school.*

2. Data Sources: *Each unit's plan should recognize that data used to assess teaching effectiveness should come from at least three sources: input from students (both undergraduate and graduate) such as that from student opinion of teaching surveys, feedback from faculty colleagues, and representative teaching materials, such as those that would be contained in a teaching portfolio, or teaching inventories. In addition, a self-assessment should be submitted by each instructor.*

Our teaching assessment and improvement model relies on input from the following sources:

Students:

- We have placed consistent reliance on OMET scores in both annual evaluations and Promotion and Tenure and/or contract renewal decisions.
- As described in section 6 we have launched a systematic effort to increase student responsiveness to the surveys so that the results better reflect all students taking the class.
- As described in section 7, the Dean's team now also has access to student written comments which contextualize some of the numerical data.

Faculty colleagues:

Formative:

- All junior faculty who request it, have a faculty mentor who works closely to help improve both in-class instruction, as well as course materials, assessments, rubrics, etc. Currently we have 13 faculty mentors who are working with 16 mentees.
- Starting in AY 21/22, area directors will develop a plan with the heads of core courses to arrange peer visits.
- All faculty are now asked to report annually participation in teaching development. This includes courses taken through the Center for Teaching and Learning, Professional Associations, etc.

Summative:

- All faculty going up for renewal and promotion are observed by a faculty colleague. In the past this was relatively ad-hoc. Going forward, we are using a standardized observation tool to streamline this peer observation process (see section 5). This decision was vetted and approved by the faculty.

Representative Teaching Materials:

Formative:

- Junior faculty. All junior faculty who request it, have a faculty mentor that provides guidance on developing and refining teaching materials, rubrics, and the like.
- Doctoral Students: All doctoral students work closely with a faculty member to observe teaching in the class they will eventually teach independently, and to develop their teaching materials. They also take a prescribed set of classes with the Center for Teaching and Learning on this front. Appendix A provides a comprehensive overview of the development process for our doctoral students that we approved this year, and which is being phased in with the latest doctoral student class.

Summative:

- All faculty going up for renewal and promotion are required to include a teaching portfolio that comprises an established set of materials.
- Starting with AY20/21, our faculty annual reporting system will give faculty the option of uploading examples of new materials and courses that they have developed for instructional purposes.

3. Faculty Engagement: *Each unit's plan should describe how faculty were engaged in the development of the assessment plan, and how faculty will continue to be engaged going forward.*

Peer visits for core courses:

Two faculty committees are undertaking the process described in section 1 regarding the curriculum content in the core courses. This is the outcome of a recommendation from a faculty committee charged with helping the school's strategic planning process. In AY 21/22, once the core courses are standardized, the formative assessments will be developed in collaboration with the area directors. The process will rely on faculty leaders of each of the core courses.

PTC Process input:

The summative assessment and teaching portfolio used by the Promotion and Tenure Committee were developed in collaboration with CTL, and are aligned with expectations that were already agreed upon in the Promotion and Tenure fact-finding process. The systematic use of these tools for all promotions and renewals was voted on and approved by the faculty this spring.

Mentoring Program:

Our peer mentoring was introduced by Dr. Frits Pil, with guidance and input from Dr. Audrey Murrell, a current member of the Katz faculty and former Interim Dean of the Honors College.

The program, which plays a critical formative role for our junior faculty, **is completely voluntary** and all mentors are outstanding teachers who volunteered to help their colleagues.

Doctoral Program teaching development pathway:

A subset of the School's doctoral committee, chaired by Dr. Frits Pil, developed the full assessment and development model for doctoral students, with input from Joel Brady in the Center for Teaching and Learning. The doctoral student development model was approved by the full doctoral committee and is being phased in this academic year.

OMET student comments:
Section 7 describes faculty input in the agreement on OMET student feedback.

4. The Teaching Center *will make available to all schools and campuses:*
a. an inventory of research-based effective practices for assessment of teaching. (See ***Appendix 5*** *for a list of effective practices)*
b. sample assessment of teaching effectiveness plans and resources for units to consider as they develop or refine their processes to assure they include additional assessment strategies beyond student opinion surveys

We have worked with the CTL to co-develop our teaching portfolios and classroom observation tool (see section 6 and Appendix C).

5. OMET *Academic Units, with support from the Office of the Provost and the Center for Teaching and Learning, should enhance the value of student opinion surveys by raising faculty awareness of the effective use of student input, and the potential biases in these types of surveys; they also should help faculty learn how to appropriately increase student response rates to surveys and how to raise student awareness of the impact of their opinions.*

Response rates: In consultation with the Area Directors and Associate Deans, Katz/CBA has established a common time to administer the OMET evaluations in class, two weeks before Final Exams. We trialed this in Fall 2019 before Covid hit. If faculty were unable to meet the time line, they had the option of taking a different approach as long as they informed the school of the alternative they were implementing. This common, in-class evaluation period is intended to improve the consistency and level of response rates. During the common survey window, we advertised this period via our lobby monitors and other forms of student communication so that students would expect the surveys in class. These communications also highlighted some of the benefits of participating. In the session before the survey class, we request that faculty briefly note the importance of the feedback, and to ask students to bring a phone or computer to their next class to complete the surveys. We ask faculty to plan ten minutes for the survey in class and give the students privacy while they complete it.
But for a few exceptions, we found that the faculty teaching traditional courses were able to meet the common survey time. The primary challenges rested with unique class formats and classes held outside of the formal semester structure. We found that the common survey time was well received but we were unable to do a full-scale evaluation of its efficacy due to Covid.

We are working on implementing the elements we can under Covid, and plan to resume all aspects of that approach when in-person classes are once again feasible.

Biases:

With the help of the Center for Teaching and Learning, we have developed a document explaining how student bias may manifest in the Omet evaluations, with concrete suggestions on how to approach and interpret OMET scores and documents. This document is included in Appendix D. It will be shared annually in a tracked way with all those using OMET for evaluative purposes.

6. Expectations on Assessment: *Academic units should develop specific guidance for all faculty regarding expectations for teaching and the use of formative and summative assessment data to be included in annual reviews and promotion/tenure dossiers.*
a. This guidance should be tailored for faculty at different stages in their careers, with consideration given to needs and expectations of full-time faculty who are in the tenure stream, tenured, or outside the tenure stream.
b. Guidance that is specific to the needs and responsibilities of part-time faculty should also be developed. This guidance may differ from guidance for full-time faculty. For guidance on annual review and samples for promotion and tenure dossiers, see **Appendix**

As input to its process and deliberations, the Promotion and Tenure Committee (PTC) has long required teaching materials and classroom observations to be submitted of by faculty in both tenure and appointment streams. However, there was no standard observation tool, and materials were not always present. Dr. Frits Pil worked with Joel Bradey of CTL to refine a portfolio template that meets our needs. That portfolio model was used for all faculty promotions this year, and served as the basis for PTC discussions related to teaching. Lindsay Onufer from CTL worked with Dr. Pil to develop a classroom observation tool that will help us assess our teaching for promotions and renewals, and that will also help us as we move towards more peer exchange and learning. This observation tool was trialed in our mentorship program described above. While the PTC process indicates that an observation tool is available for promotions, the use of that tool has not been enforced in the past.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee of the School has discussed the question of how to systematize peer observations in the faculty renewal and promotion process. The observation tool will be used going forward and refined as we continue to learn from our internal mentorship program as well as feedback from the PTC. All junior faculty (appointment stream and tenure stream) meet with the Associate Dean for Research when they start, and they receive a copy of the Teaching Portfolio Template when they start so that they can develop the requisite portfolio during their time as assistant professor. They also receive a copy of the classroom observation tool. As noted above in section 1, new faculty are matched with a mentor who can do a sample classroom observation using the classroom observation tool.

7. OMET Access *All deans and campus presidents should be given access to their school or campus Student Opinion of Teaching Survey results for all instructors of all ranks. Further, deans*

and campus presidents, in conjunction with their faculty and in accordance with each unit's governance practices, will determine how the data are shared within their unit. These determinations should be conveyed to the Teaching Center on a regular basis (annually or upon personnel changes) so that system access can be granted to the appropriate individuals. This applies to the schools and campuses that use the services of OMET to administer their student surveys.

While the Katz Dean's office has long had access to the numeric OMET scores, we worked through the faculty governance process to approve Dean's office access to student comments on OMET scores. The statement below was developed by Dr. Frits Pil as Director of teaching innovation and faculty development, and Dr. Jeff Inman, Associate Dean for Faculty and Research. It was then vetted by the Executive Committee, and finally put for a vote to all the Tenure and Appointment Stream faculty, who approved it.

> *Statement:* ***"In order to better serve our students, the Dean's Office would like to receive a copy of the written student comments from OMET for all evaluated courses. The Dean's Office in other units at the University are already receiving this information for their faculty, which puts Katz/CBA at a disadvantage in Provost Office discussions of teaching. The comments will only be viewed by the Dean and Associate Deans. They will use the comments to assess trends and patterns and other diagnostic analyses and will not focus on one-off comments. The written comments will be retained for a period of three years, after which they will be destroyed."***

Appendix A: Katz Doctoral Program Teaching Policy and Teaching Development Plan

The Policy

An integral aspect of the Katz Ph.D. program is to develop doctoral students' teaching competency. This document outlines the core principles underlying the Katz Ph.D. program's efforts with respect to developing doctoral students' teaching skills, and outlines key program requirements to achieve these objectives. The document outlines students' contractual obligations to the program, and provides a teaching program roadmap for students, their advisors, and the faculty within each area.

All doctoral students whose programs are funded by the business school are required to engage in 15 credits of teaching-related development and effort. This requirement must be completed by the end of the student's fourth year in the program. The Doctoral Office will provide each doctoral committee member and area coordinator a table of their students' teaching-credit progress annually. The faculty areas will decide within the group which faculty will guide the progress and teaching development of which students. Progress will be reviewed annually at the Doctoral Performance Committee Meetings. Also, by the end of the fourth year, the student must have taught at least six credits (two 3-credit courses) as the primary instructor. By the end of their fourth year, the student must have also contributed at least 4 credits of teaching-related duty. Teaching-related duties are defined in Appendix A. The remaining five credits are granted collectively to the student following successful completion of ALL activities listed in the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan. See the roadmap on page 3 for a detailed explanation, and also see the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan Check-off list in Appendix B.

Teaching as Primary Instructor:	6 credits*
Students Complete Teaching Developmental Plan	5 credits
Teaching-related Duties:	4 credits*

The roadmap on page 3 outlines and explains the activities in the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan in a suggested order of completion, as well as explanations and suggested timelines for completing the six credits of teaching and four credits of teaching-related duty.

Special Notes

ALL students, regardless of funding, must teach six credits as the primary instructor as a graduation requirement and must satisfactorily complete all activities in the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan.

*If a funded student chooses to serve as the primary instructor for more than six credits <u>in their first four years</u>, they may increase their primary instructor teaching to nine credits and reduce their teaching-related duty to 1credit instead of 4 credits. However, they may <u>not</u> opt out of the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan (five credits).

Students entering the program without Katz funding with extensive teaching experience may petition their advisor, area coordinator, and the Doctoral Program Director to develop a teaching plan better suited to their skill level.

Areas may still request that their doctoral students do additional teaching-related duties as needed beyond the four-credit contract requirement. Four credits is the minimum.

All elements in this guide and road-map may be updated at any time by the Doctoral Office – please see the Doctoral Program Director for the latest guidance. When there is a discrepancy or disagreement, the Doctoral Program Director's decision is final.

Core Teaching Principles for Katz Doctoral Student

Teaching Development and Practice are important components of our doctoral student education. We expect all students who graduate from our PhD program to have developed basic competencies with respect to teaching, and to deepen their skills and understanding of instruction in a systematic and guided way as they proceed through the program.

Developmental emphasis on learning the craft of teaching. Learning the craft of teaching involves a broad array of activities including but not limited to the theory and techniques of pedagogy, syllabus development, student evaluation and assessment techniques, delivery of instructional material, effective student interactions, and the development of teaching materials. A student's "Program of Study" will include a plan for developing teaching skills and experience beginning in the first year and continuing across the first four years of the program.

A Ph.D. student's area will have primary responsibility for ensuring the milestones included in this document are met, fostering the ongoing development of teaching skills, and evaluating student performance in relation to program targets and expectations. This document includes required engagement with the University of Pittsburgh's Center for Teaching and Learning, but we encourage students to go beyond these basic requirements. Students can continue to draw on the teaching center throughout their program. We also encourage them to confer with faculty in their area to obtain additional support to ensure their success as educators. The Doctoral Program office will play a supporting role to each of the areas.

Ph.D. teaching should contribute to the school's mission. Excellent instruction of undergraduate and master's students and the development of doctoral students are all central to the mission of the business school. Therefore, areas should ensure that doctoral student development proceeds as expected, and assistance is available where needed, to ensure the school's mission is supported.

The following roadmap is a guide for students, faculty, and administrators to facilitate the development of teaching skills over the first four years of a doctoral student's GSA/TA/TF (Graduate Student Assistant/Teaching Assistant/Teaching Fellow) assignment. It should also serve as a guide for teaching development for Katz doctoral students who are not receiving Katz financial support.

Year 1 and Year 2

In the first semester on campus, all non-native English speakers will take the required International Teaching Assistant (ITA) English Language Fluency test. Those who score a 3 or lower will enroll in the International Teaching Assistant English Language Tutoring groups then retake the test and undergo further training until they score a 4 or higher.

Students will develop a teaching plan for the "Program of Study" in conjunction with the student's area director and academic advisor. The "Program of Study" must be approved by the Doctoral Program Director and will be due in January of the student's first year in the program.

Over the course of the first and second year, students will attend a minimum of six developmental sessions provided by the center for teaching and learning as a first step towards attaining their Achievement in Pedagogy badge. Required and optional sessions at the Center for Teaching and Learning for the business school are listed in the Appendix C. As a replacement for three of the six workshops, students may enroll in FacDev 2200, the University's teaching practicum.

Graduate Student Teaching Fellows and Teaching Assistants are responsible for utilizing the resources available on the University Center for Teaching and Learning website, including the University of Pittsburgh TA Handbook, https://teaching.pitt.edu/graduate-student-teaching/resources/ . Students must read this information and abide by university policies.

In addition to the first six workshops noted above, students will also attend (documenting attendance) two or more business education teaching-related seminars, workshops, or conferences, offered in the business school, the Center for Teaching and Learning, db-Serc, or their professional association.

To work toward meeting their four-credit teaching-related duty requirements (see Appendix A), students may begin participating as a grader, recitation leader, or do other teaching-related duties as approved by their advisor and area coordinators. Please see Appendix A for definitions of teaching-related duty and how to achieve these.

Prior to teaching an undergraduate class independently in year 3, Ph.D. students should sit in on that class. In most instances, the course will be a core course in the student's area, and the student should sit in on that course when it is taught by a full-time faculty member in the area. If the course the Ph.D. student plans to teach is not a core course, or is not taught by a full-time faculty member, the Area Director and the Doctoral Program Director must approve this arrangement.

Students will reflect deeply on how the course is taught, and where appropriate, suggest one or more new activities, or graded assignments that might be used in the course.

Students will serve as the grader, TA, and/or recitation leader for this course. Special Note: The teaching credit for this, because it such an important part of the developmental process, is wrapped into the five development credits that students will receive upon completion of all activities on the Doctoral Student Teaching Development Plan Check-list. In other words, this does not count toward their four credits of teaching-related duty, but rather is considered developmental.

Faculty members teaching the course will help Ph.D. students prepare for their independent teaching by reviewing course content, syllabus development, delivery, etc., with the Ph.D. student and answering any questions they might have.

To continuing working toward meeting their four-credit teaching-related duty requirements students may continue participating as a grader, recitation leader, or do other teaching-related duties as approved by their advisor and area coordinators. Please see Appendix A for definitions of teaching-related duty and how to achieve these.

Year 3 and Year 4

Students should be prepared to teach their own section of an undergraduate course in year 3 or 4 as determined in collaboration with their advisor and Area Director.

Students teaching for the first time should make a request a month before the start of class that the Center for Teaching and Learning record them teaching a class session in the first three weeks of class (not the introduction day) and provide feedback. The student should write up and share with their advisor, what they learned, and what they will change in response.
At the completion of a course and after student evaluations have been received, students should meet with their advisor to look at the student comments and ratings, and explore what additional developmental activities would be beneficial.

Teach independent section(s) of a course as needed to meet six credits of independent teaching requirement.

Students will write up a teaching statement that reflects their learning and contributions, and share those with their advisor. The goal is for this statement to serve as a teaching statement that meets the requirements for their target job positions.

Students receiving funding from Katz must complete any outstanding teaching obligations by the end of the fourth year.

RELATED APPENDIXES AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST

Appendix B: Teaching Portfolio

Please submit the following materials

Teaching Philosophy: A two page document that outlines your teaching beliefs and provides concrete examples of how you enact those inside and outside the classroom. A strong statement will include an overview of 1) goals and objectives you aim to accomplish as a teacher, 2) the strategies and methods you use to attain your goals and objectives, and 3) how you assess your success in meeting those goals and objectives. It provides a foundation for the rest of the teaching portfolio in that it should help situate the elements below.

Teaching Experience:

For the last five years:

listing of all courses taught by Degree Program (CBA, MBA, doctoral)

For each, please indicate required or elective, and formats (regular in-person format, flipped, large lecture, hybrid or blended, on-line).

Doctoral dissertation committee involvement

Non-degree Programs (e.g., Executive Education)

Teaching Outside of Katz

Pedagogical contributions (if any): Scholarship on teaching (e.g. publications or presentations delivered on teaching); Development of new courses; Contribution to interdisciplinary or collaborative courses or teaching projects; Service on teaching-related efforts (e.g. Curriculum revision or development); New teaching materials (e.g. development of a text book, new cases etc.).

List of pedagogical training and development:

Please list courses, classes, workshops that you have attended or participated in in the last 5 years. These may include classes and training offered in the business school, workshops offered by the Center for Teaching and Learning, professional development activities at conferences, etc.

Please describe any formal roles you have taken on to train, develop, or mentor faculty and instructors in the school.

Syllabi: Please provide a copy of the syllabus for the last iteration of each course you have taught in the last 5 years.

Lesson Plan examples - optional: For one of the courses above, please provide a copy of lesson plans for two class sessions of your choice (slides, activities, etc.). Please be sure to include: class session learning objectives; brief note on relation to overall course objectives in syllabus; a rationale for the approach taken. This material may be particularly helpful for the class sessions selected for peer review.

Assignments: Please provide a copy of two assignments or other graded activities, and associated grading rubric related to the lesson plans above. Please provide a rationale for the assignment, what informed its development, and why it aligns well with your teaching philosophy. Optionally, you may include samples of student work (above average, average, below average) together with associated feedback. If you should provide the latter, please remove student identifiers.

Evaluations: The Dean's office will provide OMET data for all courses taught in last five years. Feel free to include reflections on specific OMET data. Also feel free to include assessments of any non-degree teaching. List awards and other accolades received regarding teaching. While two classroom observations will be scheduled by your Promotion and Tenure Fact-Finding Committee, you are also welcome to include letters from others who have observed your teaching.

Exchange with students beyond the classroom: Please list any mentoring, advising, or other activities you do for students outside of the formal classroom.

Any other items you feel the review committee and PTC should be aware of related to your teaching.

Appendix C: Peer Review of Course Instruction - Form[1]

University of Pittsburgh, School of Business

Faculty: ______________________________ Date of Review: _____/_____/_____

Peer Reviewer: ________________________

HOW TO USE THIS FORM:

Peer Reviewer - This Peer Review of Course Instruction Form is designed to guide your observation and evaluation of a peer's class. The areas of focus listed in the form are not limited or exhaustive—feel free to comment on additional relevant components not included here (and expand respond boxes as needed). If used for formative purposes please note teaching strengths as well as provide suggestions for pedagogical or curricular improvement, whenever possible, as a supplement to evaluative comments.

Faculty Reviewee – When this review is used in conjunction with other evidence of teaching effectiveness to inform a reappointment, promotion, or tenure decision, this document will be prepared for the fact-finding committee, and any feedback to you is at the discretion of the fact-finding committee reviewer. Should you decide to request a peer review for formative purposes (i.e. to improve teaching effectiveness), your peer reviewer will provide you with comments and feedback using this form. When used formatively, please schedule a time after the review to discuss feedback and formulate strategies for improvement with your peer reviewer.

[1] *This form was developed by the School of Business in collaboration with the University of Pittsburgh Center for Teaching and Learning. It was adapted from the UC Berkeley Peer Review Form (2013) and based on research-informed instructional best practices described in How Learning Works (Ambrose, 2010) and Teaching at Its Best (Nilson, 2016).*

Preliminary Activities

Potential areas for comment:

- **Setup (i.e., materials, information projected on board/screen, physical arrangement)**
- **Class Start (i.e., on time, overview of class session w/ clearly stated goals or portrayed in an obvious fashion, communicates relevance of lesson)**
- **Review (i.e., Instructor helps students recall what they already know or conducts review)**

Select one: ***Exceeds expectations***	*Meets expectations*	*Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

The Lesson, Instructional Methods (i.e. lecture, discussion, small group work)

Potential areas for comment:

- **Well-suited for teaching the content covered**
- **Has a clear purpose**
- **Prompts student to draw on prior learning and experiences**
- **Breaks complex ideas into simple parts**
- **Covers an appropriate quantity of material or concepts for students of this level and for this type of content**
- **Connects material to real world examples or student interests**
- **Uses multimodal methods for teaching (i.e. visual, auditory, kinesthetic activities, images, metaphors, cases, problem solving, writing activities, group work, etc…)**
- **Provides opportunities for student participation and engagement with the course content, instructor, and/or peers**
- **Provides opportunities for targeted practice and feedback**
- **Provides clear explanation of activities and assignments**
- **Emphasizes and summarizes important points**
- **Examines student understanding and achievement of learning objectives (i.e., questioning students on course material, observing student performance, discussion, quizzes)**

Select one:
Exceeds expectations *Meets expectations* *Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

The Lesson, Content

Potential areas for comment:

- **Appropriateness of content for students of this level**
- **Alignment of content with learning objectives of the program**
- **Alignment of content with learning objectives of the course**
- **Alignment of content, class activities, assessments, and course materials**

Select one:
Exceeds expectations *Meets expectations* *Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

The Lesson, Class Flow

Potential areas for comment:

- **Well organized and easy to follow**
- **Pacing is appropriate**
- **Connects new concepts to previously learned concepts**
- **Transitions between units, sections, concepts and/or topics.**
- **Allows time for and invites student questions**
- **Uses time management to cover content or, in situations in which the instructor must slow down to ensure student understanding, effectively makes adjustments to the lesson**
- **Concludes and reviews the day's topic**

Select one:

Exceeds expectations *Meets expectations* *Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

Interaction with Students

Potential areas for comment:

- **If class is small or moderately-sized, addresses students by name**
- **Exhibits enthusiasm about the topic**
- **Demonstrates respect when responding to students**
- **Manages discussion between high and low responders**
- **Encourages participation from all students**
- **Uses encouraging verbal and non-verbal communication (i.e. making eye contact with students, moving closer to students when speaking to them, verbally affirming students' answers to questions, etc…)**
- **Responds to students verbal and nonverbal cues (for example, slowing down if students express confusion or are unable to answer questions)**
- **Uses statements or examples that do not assume that students share a common background or cultural perspective or, when using examples that some students might not understand, offering an explanation (for example, instead of saying "Rust Belt city," which only American students might understand, saying "Rust Belt city, a city in the Midwest or Northeastern U.S. that experienced economic decline as a result of deindustrialization")**

Select one: ***Exceeds expectations***	*Meets expectations*	*Does not meet expectations*
Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:		

Delivery

Potential areas for comment:

- **Easily heard**
- **Enunciation is clear**
- **Faces the class when speaking. If writing on a board, periodically turns and speaks to the class instead of speaking toward the board.**
- **Uses appropriate tone, gestures, and facial expressions**
- **Provides explanations for visuals (as opposed to reading them)**

Select one:

Exceeds expectations *Meets expectations* *Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

. Use of Media/Technology (if applicable)

Potential areas for comment:

- **Technology is used to engage students, enhance learning, and/or generally enrich students' class experience as part of lecture, activities, or discussion**
- **Technology is leveraged to facilitate a learning experience that would otherwise not be possible**
- **Student work done via technology outside of class is integrated into the class session (i.e. homework, discussion board)**
- **Visuals are displayed in such a way as to be easily seen and understood**
- **Audio easily heard if used**
- **Slides have minimal text. If slides use images, images are relevant to the content being presented.**
- **Diagrams, charts, and maps are clearly labeled.**

Select one:

Exceeds expectations *Meets expectations* *Does not meet expectations*

Strengths, challenges, and additional reviewer comments:

General Comments, Summary & Suggestions: (*to be filled out by peer reviewer*)
-This space could be used to describe the setting in which the lesson took place, relevant information about the makeup of the class, and any other descriptive characteristics that would provide appropriate context to the review. *This space could additionally be used to highlight areas for suggested pedagogical and/or curricular improvement, along with concrete strategies.*

OPTIONAL PRE-PEER REVIEW OF COURSE INSTRUCTION FORM[2]

To be completed by reviewee

University of Pittsburgh, School of Business

Faculty: ______________________________ Date of Review: _____/_____/_______

Time: _______________________________ Location: _________________________

Class: ________________________________ Peer Reviewer: ____________________

This optional form can be used to frame your approach to the course topic and pedagogy so that your reviewer is better informed regarding your pedagogical decisions, providing them with some context for their review. Alternatively, it can be used to simply provide the reviewer with any information you feel would be helpful before the class session. (Feel free to expand the boxes as needed). Along with this form, you may also provide your peer reviewer course materials like your syllabus, a lesson plan, handouts, etc… in preparation for the review.

Your Pedagogical Approach to Course Topic (individual session and/or entire course):
*i.e., explain why you have chosen a specific delivery style, learning activities, assessments, etc.

Miscellaneous Helpful Information for Peer Reviewer Prior to In-Class Evaluation:
*e.g., student dynamics, unit on theoretical concepts versus practical applications, preparing students for a term project

General Remarks for Peer Reviewer:

[2] *Adapted from UC Berkeley Pre-Peer Review Form (2013) https://teaching.berkeley.edu/peer-review-course-instruction by the University of Pittsburgh School of Business in collaboration with the University of Pittsburgh Center for Teaching and Learning.*

Background to be updated and shared annually with Pitt Business Dean's Office team and members of PTC who evaluate faculty teaching performance.

Overview:

Pitt Business relies on OMET student assessment of teaching for both formative and summative assessment of teaching effectiveness. The student perspective is an important one, and can provide productive insights on what is well received in the classroom, as well as a lens on aspects of instruction that might be improved. However, when student evaluations of teaching are used as part of a summative assessment (e.g. for annual reviews, or promotions), **they need to be examined in combination with other assessment indicators such as examples of teaching materials and classroom observations**. This document focuses specifically on the student evaluation of teaching indicators and how to best interpret them. For faculty interested in mitigating student bias, the following may be of interest: https://www.utimes.pitt.edu/news/teaching-pitt-tips-1

Understanding the scale:

The OMET instrument used in Pitt business relies on a 5 point Likert scale, with categories ranging from "Hardly at All" to "A Very Great Degree." While the categories represent a clear ordering, the difference between the anchors is less clear. For example, the difference between 'Hardly at all' and 'To a small degree', is not necessarily the same as the difference between "To a small degree" and "to a moderate degree', even though the numerical values assigned to these categories would suggest a standard difference in value. (1-2 vs 2-3). Further, student responses are often not normally distributed and may be influenced by outliers, particularly when response rates are lower. As a result, the center for teaching and learning suggests **looking at frequencies and medians in addition to the average**. The Center for Teaching and Learning also notes that "it may also be helpful to **compare the overall average of questions 4-8 to the score on question 9 (the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness question)** as those questions examine specific faculty behaviors and actions.

The CTL further suggests that those using OMETs to evaluate faculty:

- "Examine trends in OMET results across time. Avoid relying on a single course or mean semester rating, examining small variations in ratings too closely, or focusing on anomalies.
- Small variations in ratings (<0.4 points) are common and should not be over-interpreted. A variety of factors outside of a faculty member's teaching, including chance, could lead to a slight dip in ratings.
- In addition to mean ratings, consider distribution of ratings across the scale. Student ratings rarely have a normal distribution, which makes the mean a less than ideal measure of central tendency without examining the entire distribution of ratings."

The CTL also states that comparisons **between faculty members or between a faculty member and an average for a course, area, or the school, should be done with great caution**. "Small variations in ratings are not meaningful, and comparisons place minoritized instructors (who receive more ratings influenced by students' biases) at a disadvantage."

[3] Prepared by Lindsay Onufer, Center for Teaching and Learning, and Frits Pil, Pitt Business, drawing on:
[Understanding Your OMET Results]
[A Quick Guide for Interpreting OMET Results for Faculty and Administrators]

Bias:

Student evaluations of teaching are subject to significant bias. Specifically, research indicates that student gender, racial, and cultural biases can all affect faculty ratings. While the magnitude of effects vary from study to study, the data suggests that the biases have negative implications for teaching ratings of female faculty, faculty of color, faculty from different cultural backgrounds, and non-native English speakers. The attached document provides some research articles that may be of interest.

Student Comments – Not available to evaluators outside Dean's Office:

The Pitt Business Faculty voted to support the release of student comments on evaluations of teaching with the following understanding:

> *"In order to better serve our students, the Dean's Office would like to receive a copy of the written student comments from OMET for all evaluated courses. The dean's office in other units at the University are already receiving this information for their faculty, which puts Katz/CBA at a disadvantage in Provost Office discussions of teaching. The comments will only be viewed by the Dean and Associate Deans. They will use the comments to assess trends and patterns and other diagnostic analyses and will not focus on one-off comments. The written comments will be retained for a period of three years, after which they will be destroyed."*

In line with the statement above, the Center for Teaching and Learning recommends **placing little emphasis on outliers**. It suggests that to make sense of comments when a faculty member's evaluations are examined, it is helpful to classify comments. Specifically, it notes the value of using a matrix with key components **and classifying comments into strengths and weaknesses**. This allows for a more systematic understanding of consistent patterns – both positive, and negative. An example of a matrix that the CTL suggests might be used:

Knowledge of Material	Relates to scholarship, with an emphasis on breadth, analytic ability, and conceptual understanding.
Organization/Clarity	Relates to presenting the subject ins a clear and organized manner.
Instructor-Group Interaction	Relates to rapport with the class as a whole, sensitivity to class response, and skill at securing active class participation.
Instructor-Individual Student Interaction	Relates to mutual respect and rapport between the instructor and the individual student.
Dynaminism/Enthusiasm	Relates to the instructors enthusiasm in teaching the material.

Addendum.

A Summary of Resources and Research on Using and Interpreting Teaching Surveys

Prepared by Lindsay Onufer, Center for Teaching and Learning

Resources

Tips for Improving Student Feedback and Mitigating the Effects of Biases in Teaching Surveys
Understanding Your OMET Results
A Quick Guide for Interpreting OMET Results for Faculty and Administrators

Bias and Teaching Surveys

Research on bias in teaching survey results affirms that student gender, racial, and cultural biases affect teaching survey results, but how bias shapes ratings and the significance of its effect varies, likely due to different institutional contexts.

References: General

American Sociological Association. (2019, September). Statement on student evaluations of teaching. American Sociological Association. https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/asa_statement_on_student_evaluations_of_teaching_sept52019.pdf

Benton, S.L. & Cashin, W.E. (2014). Student ratings of teaching: A summary of research and literature. IDEA Paper #50. *IDEA.* https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/PaperIDEA_50.pdf

Benton, S.L. & Li, D. (2015). Response to "A better way to evaluate undergraduate teaching." IDEA Editorial Note #1. *IDEA.* https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/A_Better_Way_to_Evaluate.pdf

Burdsal, C.A. & Harrison, P.D. (2008). Further evidence supporting the validity of both a multidimensional profile and an overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*(5), 567-576. doi: 10.1080/02602930701699049

Linse, A. R. (2017). Interpreting and using student ratings data: Guidance for faculty serving as administrators and on evaluation committees. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *54*, 94-106. doi:10.1016/j.stueduc.2016.12.004

References: Gender Bias

Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PloS One, 14*(2). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0209749

Mengel, F., Sauermann, J., Zölitz, U. (2019). Gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Journal of the European Economic Association, 17*(2), 535-566. doi:10.1093/jeea/jvx057

Mitchell, K. M. W., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 51*(3), 648-652. doi:10.1017/S104909651800001X

Peterson, D.A., Biederman, L. A., Andersen, D., Ditonto, T. M., & Roe, K. (2019). Mitigating gender bias in student evaluations of teaching. *PloS One, 14*(5). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0216241

Punyanunt-Carter, N. & Carter, S. L. (2015). Students' gender bias in teaching evaluations. *Higher Learning Research Communications, 5*(3), 28. doi:10.18870/hlrc.v5i3.234

Smith, B. P., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2012). Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: Implications for non-white women in the academy. *Negro Educational Review, 62-63*(1-4), 115.

Storage, D., Horne, Z., Cimpian, A., & Leslie, S. (2016). The frequency of "brilliant" and "genius" in teaching evaluations predicts the representation of women and African Americans across fields. *PloS One, 11*(3), e0150194. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150194

References: Racial Bias

Smith, B. P., & Hawkins, B. (2011). Examining student evaluations of black college faculty: Does race matter? *The Journal of Negro Education*, *80*(2), 149–162. https://www.jstor.org/stable/41341117

Smith, B. P., & Johnson-Bailey, J. (2012). Student ratings of teaching effectiveness: Implications for non-white women in the academy. *Negro Educational Review, 62-63*(1-4), 115.

Storage, D., Horne, Z., Cimpian, A., & Leslie, S. (2016). The frequency of "brilliant" and "genius" in teaching evaluations predicts the representation of women and African Americans across fields. *PloS One, 11*(3), e0150194. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150194

References: Cultural Bias

Fan, Y., Shepherd, L. J., Slavich, E., Waters, D., Stone, M., Abel, R., & Johnston, E. L. (2019). Gender and cultural bias in student evaluations: Why representation matters. *PloS One, 14*(2). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0209749