

Tutor Peer Review - 2007

Summary Evaluation

During the 2006-2007 academic year all BMP tutors were peer reviewed. The following is a summary of the feedback from both the tutors and the reviewers.

I. Feedback from Tutors

55 Completed reviews. One tutor would not schedule second review. One reviewer was unable to complete two because of death in family.

Responses from the Peer Review Questionnaire:

(1) Did you change any behaviors because of information received from your peer review?

Of 40 tutor respondents: 15 (43%) changed behaviors; 20 (57%) did not change behaviors.

Comments: Primary areas of feedback and discussion included the uninvolved students and redirection of discussion away from the tutor or dominating students. Reviewers acknowledged that they learned a lot from being reviewers. Reviewers tended to reinforce good tutoring behaviors.

(2) Did the presence of the peer reviewer alter the dynamics/ behavior of the group?

Of 40 tutor respondents: 6 (26%) yes and 24 (68%) no.

Comments: Any changes seemed to be that a couple of the groups included the reviewer rather than ignore their presence. Or, the group was more serious or guarded in a few instances.

(3) Did you notify the group about the pending peer review session?

Of 40 tutor respondents: 30 (80%) yes 4 (11%) no.

(4) Did you prepare differently knowing you were going to be peer reviewed?

Of 40 tutor respondents: 3 (8%) yes and 31 (88%) no.

(5) Did the peer review process help you?

Of 40 respondents: 25 (71%) yes and 8 (23%) no.

Comments: Offered me insight on how to improve, encouraged my style, confirmed my behavior was ok. Reassurance was nice. Became more confident, was a validation.

(6) Suggestions that would improve the process:

Immediate feedback after review; have content and process expert reviewers; useful and should be continued however every other year might be best unless requested by a tutor (especially if tutor has a particularly difficult group) or students; offer tutor mentoring; limit to one observation – however, others said two worked well because of the variability of group dynamics, tutor input, etc; do every year for new tutors and limit it for experienced tutors; tutor reviewers should review one or two at the most per year because it is time consuming; have videos for tutors to review with mentors; distinguish good tutoring from Socratic teaching.

II. Feedback from Reviewers

1. **58** total or partial reviews were done; **55** full reviews were done.
2. Most reviewers sat in an unobtrusive place. Many at the chair by the computer so they could see the group and the tutor.
3. **23** reviewers completed an evaluation form. **18 (78%)** used the interaction analysis diagram; **5 (22%)** did not use it.
Those who used it felt it helped give feedback to the tutor. Some did not need it because the group interaction was going well. One was able to document 30 plus statements by the tutor so offered quantifiable information.
4. Were you able to provide useful feedback to the tutor:
Most responded “yes” and comments were made- students looking at the tutor for the final word, lack of confidence or timidity, regarding quiet and controlling students, seating patterns, participation., use of the smart board; reinforcing good behavior. Many also said they gave primarily compliments/confirmation because the tutor was experienced and good.
5. Suggestions
Seemed to work well for the first year. Issues for discussion include whether one or two observations are necessary; how often a tutor should be reviewed; how many reviews a tutor should do; importance of the review to the person doing the reviewing; allowing/encouraging tutors and students to request a review.

The Tutor Development Team is recommending that tutors be reviewed approximately every two or three years unless a particular request is made. The process will continue with two observations per phase. If tutors would like a copy of the entire evaluation, they can contact Dr. Harris.

Tutor peer reviews can also be requested through Dr. Harris.