NOTETAKER CHECKLIST FORM

(Complete one for each talk.)

Name: Neelesh Tiruviluamala   **Email/Phone:** tiruvilu@usc.edu

Speaker's Name: Deborah Hughes Hallett, Wayne Raskind, Ayse Sahin, and Douglas Ulmer

Talk Title: Observing and Talking about Teaching: Departmental Leadership

Date: 2 / 12 / 16   **Time:** 2 : 00 am (pm) **(circle one)**

List 6-12 key words for the talk: Observation vs. Evaluation, Interdepartmental Relationships, Peer Learning

Please summarize the lecture in 5 or fewer sentences: Department heads spoke of challenges that they have faced in achieving their observation goals. They also compared the systems in place at various types of institutions (e.g. large and public vs. small and private) and discussed ways to incorporate a peer observation process at each.

CHECK LIST

(This is **NOT** optional, we will **not pay** for **incomplete** forms)

■ Introduce yourself to the speaker prior to the talk. Tell them that you will be the note taker, and that you will need to make copies of their notes and materials, if any.

■ Obtain ALL presentation materials from speaker. This can be done before the talk is to begin or after the talk; please make arrangements with the speaker as to when you can do this. You may scan and send materials as a .pdf to yourself using the scanner on the 3rd floor.
  - **Computer Presentations**: Obtain a copy of their presentation
  - **Overhead**: Obtain a copy or use the originals and scan them
  - **Blackboard**: Take blackboard notes in black or blue **PEN**. We will **NOT** accept notes in pencil or in colored ink other than black or blue.
  - **Handouts**: Obtain copies of and scan all handouts

■ For each talk, all materials must be saved in a single .pdf and named according to the naming convention on the "Materials Received" check list. To do this, compile all materials for a specific talk into one stack with this completed sheet on top and insert face up into the tray on the top of the scanner. Proceed to scan and email the file to yourself. Do this for the materials from each talk.

■ When you have emailed all files to yourself, please save and re-name each file according to the naming convention listed below the talk title on the "Materials Received" check list. (*YYYY.MM.DD.TIME.SpeakerLastName*)

■ Email the re-named files to notes@msri.org with the workshop name and your name in the subject line.

Improving Teaching and Learning
at Wayne State University

Wayne Raskind, Dean
College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
Wayne State University
Detroit, MI
raskind@wayne.edu

Quick Info on Wayne State

- Comprehensive Carnegie Very High Research Activity institution in Midtown Detroit, founded in 1868

- About 27,000 students, with about 18,000 undergraduates, 7000 graduate students and 2000 professional students

- Largest single campus medical school by enrollment in the nation, about 1200 students

- More than 50% of undergrad students receive Pell grants

College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS)

- About 10,800 students, 9500 undergrad and 1300 grad
- 19 departments and 400 full-time faculty who are unionized (AAUP/AFT)
- Basic general education math requirement fulfilled by gen ed course, MAT 1000 or sufficient score on placement test or ACT
- Many students need remediation in math, but number is decreasing because student prep is improving
- Special programs such as Rising Scholars Program (RSP) to remediate students very intensively and effectively, but high unit cost
- About 50 full-time faculty (including lecturers) in math and 100 math majors (pressure from the dean to increase...)

Activities to Improve Teaching and Learning

- Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) with director, Dr. Matt Ouellett, who came from UMass in 2013
- NSF WIDER (2013) and IUSE (2015) grants, with PI and co-PI's from all CLAS science departments
- Excellent cooperation among science departments and CTL in promoting active learning
- Robust program of learning communities for peer learning
- Biology and chemistry are probably leading the way, but math has been very active

Challenges

- Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) scores and peer evaluation for promotion and tenure are still main tools to evaluate teaching
- Students have much more access to SET scores than before, and try to coalesce in few sections
- New tools for observing and evaluating teaching not easy to implement outside of faculty contract
- Observation and evaluation are conflated, especially in a unionized environment
- Throughput vs. quality, for general education math and STEM courses

Opportunities

- Math has a special place and needs, but partners in other science departments can be very helpful

- Good relationship between math dept. and math education in College of Education for teacher preparation should be leveraged more to promote student learning

- However, not sure we can get where we want to go until we weave observation into instruction in a fundamental way

- Hard to do that as long as "my classroom (section) is my castle"

Observing teaching
in the context
of a university department

Douglas Ulmer

GeorgiaInstitute
of **Tech**nology

MSRI-CIME
February 12, 2016

Context:

Who, What, Why?

Reference program:

Multidimensional, and formative as well as summative

Reference program:

Multidimensional, and formative as well as summative

Elements:

- Student opinion scores and comments
- Analysis of materials
- Analysis of grades
- Peer observation
- Other contributions
- Reflection and self-analysis
- Feedback

Observations/issues/questions:

Student surveys are often maligned, but they do contain real information.

Observations/issues/questions:

Student surveys are often maligned, but they do contain real information.

Students' *comments* (as opposed to scores) are typically viewed as the property of the instructor. This is unfortunate, as they can contain valuable signals.

Observations/issues/questions:

Student surveys are often maligned, but they do contain real information.

Students' *comments* (as opposed to scores) are typically viewed as the property of the instructor. This is unfortunate, as they can contain valuable signals.

They should be available to the department chair or whoever is mainly responsible for teaching evaluation.

Observations/issues/questions:

"Analysis of documents" is a bit like "showing up on time": Is there a syllabus? Was there graded homework before the end of the semester?

Observations/issues/questions:

"Analysis of documents" is a bit like "showing up on time": Is there a syllabus? Was there graded homework before the end of the semester?

Basic checks like this are unambiguous, non-negotiable, and often indicators of larger problems.

Observations/issues/questions:

"Analysis of documents" is a bit like "showing up on time": Is there a syllabus? Was there graded homework before the end of the semester?

Basic checks like this are unambiguous, non-negotiable, and often indicators of larger problems.

This simple and effective method should not be neglected! Competent, workmanlike teaching is an admirable and attainable baseline goal.

Observations/issues/questions:

Peer evaluation:

- Who is a peer?

Observations/issues/questions:

Peer evaluation:

- ▶ Who is a peer?
- ▶ Who is a suitable peer?

Observations/issues/questions:

Other contributions:

What counts? (Grad students? Outreach to high schools? Reading courses, independent studies, and capstone projects?)

Observations/issues/questions:

Other contributions:

What counts? (Grad students? Outreach to high schools? Reading courses, independent studies, and capstone projects?)

How to weight them?

Observations/issues/questions:

Feedback: Immediate, verbal feedback/discussion after a classroom visit contributes to a culture of opennesss and collaboration around teaching.

Observations/issues/questions:

Feedback: Immediate, verbal feedback/discussion after a classroom visit contributes to a culture of opennesss and collaboration around teaching.

On the other hand, written feedback is much more effective at bringing about needed change in difficult cases.

Observations/issues/questions:

Feedback: Immediate, verbal feedback/discussion after a classroom visit contributes to a culture of opennesss and collaboration around teaching.

On the other hand, written feedback is much more effective at bringing about needed change in difficult cases.

There is tension here between "breaking the egg carton" (encouraging openness and discussion) and having formative evaluations that change behaviour.

Observations/issues/questions:

More on the egg carton:

"Separate instance" courses and resistance to harmonizing grading standards are symptoms of the egg carton.

Observations/issues/questions:

More on the egg carton:

"Separate instance" courses and resistance to harmonizing grading standards are symptoms of the egg carton.

So is resistance to any kind of course coordination, even at the lowest levels.

Observations/issues/questions:

More on the egg carton:

"Separate instance" courses and resistance to harmonizing grading standards are symptoms of the egg carton.

So is resistance to any kind of course coordination, even at the lowest levels.

Amazingly, these are controversial in some quarters.

Observations/issues/questions:

More on the egg carton:

"Separate instance" courses and resistance to harmonizing grading standards are symptoms of the egg carton.

So is resistance to any kind of course coordination, even at the lowest levels.

Amazingly, these are controversial in some quarters.

A socialist/corporatist (but not Stalinist) view of the issue.

Observations/issues/questions:

Formative and summative: It is *essential* that junior faculty undergo formative reviews that have the potential to change behaviour when needed well before a high-stakes summative review.

Observations/issues/questions:

Formative and summative: It is *essential* that junior faculty undergo formative reviews that have the potential to change behaviour when needed well before a high-stakes summative review.

This is as true on pragmatic grounds (e.g., dealing with deans and provosts) as it is on fairness grounds.

Observations/issues/questions:

Formative and summative: It is *essential* that junior faculty undergo formative reviews that have the potential to change behaviour when needed well before a high-stakes summative review.

This is as true on pragmatic grounds (e.g., dealing with deans and provosts) as it is on fairness grounds.

Weak formative reviews vitiate summative reviews.

Observations/issues/questions:

Elaborate reviews as discussed here are very expensive in terms of faculty time.

Observations/issues/questions:

Elaborate reviews as discussed here are very expensive in terms of faculty time.

How often can we afford to do them?

Observations/issues/questions:

Elaborate reviews as discussed here are very expensive in terms of faculty time.

How often can we afford to do them?

Would a more open, less egg-carton culture make all this more natural, transparent, and efficient?

Observations/issues/questions:

Your thoughts?

Observations/issues/questions:

Thank you!