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Peer Review

Familiar contexts
- Research & Scholarship
- Program Reviews
- Course Reviews
- Accreditation
Peer Review

Barriers to Peer Review

Time commitment

Sense of vulnerability

Doubt of value
Peer Review in Institutional Effectiveness Processes

Department of Institutional Effectiveness and Research

2016-2017 Institutional Effectiveness Plan Form

Academic Program

EI Results and Plan Forms
Review, Approval, and Signature Process for Academic Programs

IE Author
Create Ready Plan
Tape topic on form
Send to Department Head

Department Head
Comment on form and approve
If approved, include in form
Tape to IE Representative
If not approved, return to previous stage

IE Representative
Comments on form
If form is complete, return to the next step
Send to IE Author
If not complete, return to previous stage

IE & SACSOC Coordinator
If ready for next stage, attach signature sheet to form
Send to Dean and forward to the next stage
If not ready, return to previous stage

Dean
Comments on form
If complete, forward to Reviewer
If not complete, return to previous stage

Reviewer
Comments on form
If complete, forward to IE Author
If not complete, return to previous stage

SACSOC Authorization Liaison
Insert signature on all forms
Meta-Assessment

A&M-Commerce Self-Appraisal

Please identify the type of form that you primarily worked on:
- Academic Program
- Support Unit

Go to next page
A&M-Commerce Self-Appraisal

- Section 1: Student Learning Outcomes and Goals
  - Student Learning Outcomes: A statement describing the specific knowledge, skills, and abilities that all students completing an educational program should achieve. Strong student learning outcomes are clearly stated and widely communicated with program faculty and students.
  - Goal: A statement describing an observable and measurable outcome that assesses a particular process, service, or experience. Strong goals are clearly stated and widely communicated with unit staff and other constituents.

- Section 2: Assessment Methodology
  - The design of assessment methods that systematically measure the extent to which student learning outcomes/goals are being achieved.

- Section 3: Assessment Results
  - Assessment results are reported, compared to past results, meaningfully interpreted in relation to the student learning outcomes/goals, and communicated with program faculty or unit staff.

- Section 4: Recommendations for Modifications
  - Evidence that assessment results have been discussed and acted upon, as appropriate.
  - Special Question: Curriculum Maps

A Combined Approach

Assessment | Meta-Assessment | Peer Review
Guiding Principles

- Integrity
- Student Success
- Continuous Improvement

Benefits of Peer Review

- Exchange actionable ideas for assessment
- Improve skills as an evaluator of assessment practices
- Strengthen quality of own assessment practices
Model for Peer Review

- Workshop format
- Open invitation to faculty and staff participants in Institutional Effectiveness assessment
- Pre-registration allowed for pairing of peer partners in advance

Materials
- ✓ Rubric for evaluation
- ✓ Self-Appraisal results
- ✓ Assessment documentation

Model for Peer Review

- Read partner’s assessment documentation
- Rate on Peer Appraisal Rubric
- Exchange completed rubrics with partner
- Compare peer-provided ratings to self-provided ratings on rubric
- Discuss ratings and open-ended feedback with partner

Activity
Overcoming Barriers to Peer Review

- Time commitment
  - Dedicated but contained time
- Sense of vulnerability
  - Addressed up front
- Doubt of value
  - Added value of participants

Enhancing Assessment Practices

- Assessment
- Peer Review
- Meta-Assessment
- Continuous Improvement
Thank you and we welcome your questions!