Valdosta State University

A Guidebook for Peer Evaluation

Prepared by
Mike Savoie, Ed.D.
February 2014

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this guidebook is to better understand the factors for effective peer observation and to provide peer evaluation guidelines for the tenure and promotion process. A reason that teaching is generally undervalued in higher education is the lack of information and evidence in teaching performance (Centra, 2000). As a component in assessing faculty performance, the peer evaluation is often overlooked as an important part of the evaluation process. This guidebook provides suggested peer evaluation instruments and procedures based in literature on effective teaching, peer observation, and reflective practice. In addition to the appended instruments, two factors that are essential for effective evaluation include iteration and formative feedback. Peer evaluation of teaching is considered an important part of the tenure and promotion process at Valdosta State University and may be considered as evidence of effective teaching in summative evaluations.

FACTORS FOR PEER EVALUATION

In investigating the factors for successful peer evaluation, one requirement is a faculty member's willingness to participate in the process and to address the recommendations of the findings. It is more useful as a formative tool but it also provides specific information for improvement generally by the colleagues who will inevitably serve on personnel committees. Centra (1993) states that peers play a role in summative evaluation (tenure decisions) but should also have a role in formative evaluation. Well-informed colleagues are in the best position to assess quality of instructional practices. This role should be expanded to improve teaching effectiveness. Further justification for peer observation is presented in Bukalski (2000) further supports the peer evaluation process in that peers are better suited than students to address teaching concerns. Peer evaluations likely include many materials including syllabi, assignments, handouts, and statement of teaching philosophy. It is also usual for faculty members to have at least two major peer reviews before coming up for summative evaluation. These two reviews usually coincide with pre-tenure reviews and the summative tenure review (Bukalski, 2000).

PEER EVALUATION AS EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVE TEACHING

In a peer evaluation process, the peer observations must offer practical information as well as credibility in the evaluation of teaching. The seven guidelines established by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) recommends the following seven principles:

1. Avoid casual, unannounced observations;
2. Make observations part of a consultation process including pre and post meetings;
3. Link observations reviews of teaching materials;
4. Conduct several observations;
5. Use a team approach;
6. Observers must be open to learning; and
7. Inform students of the process.

The guidelines for peer evaluation are outlined in a body of literature partially presented in this study. In addition to generalized steps for the process, an overview of the dimensions of teaching merits investigation. Hart's work on *Teachers Observing Teachers* (1987) establishes six interrelated categories when conducting observations of colleagues' teaching. They include:

1. The Cognitive Dimension – the use of questions and activities to stimulate deeper analysis of the subject or a more thorough understanding of the basics.
2. The Socio-Political Dimension – the building and maintenance of rapport.
3. The Classroom Structure and Procedures – the instructional methods and procedures.
4. The Curricular Context – the relationship between the course, curriculum, and general education.
5. The Effects of Teaching – this is how well students are learning including activities, engagement, and assessments).
6. The Rhetorical Dimension – the use of language, organization, and use of time.
7. The Physical-Temporal Dimension – this includes the time of day, room, and physical comforts.

These dimensions enhance the instruments and objectives for evaluation. Addressing the seven dimensions is an important consideration in an effective formative evaluation.

GUIDELINES FOR OBSERVATIONS

Developing a peer evaluation model requires an understanding of the faculty evaluation process specifically the flow of information to every evaluator. Arreola (2004) provides details in an overview of the flow of information in an evaluation process. In a traditional hierarchical peer model, the flow of information is processed at every level of the evaluation and there are opportunities to present irrelevant or biased information. In a contextual filter model, data is interpreted with context (Arreola, 2004). Context is the missing component from the traditional model. A formative peer evaluation process offers a contextual filter with a thorough assessment of teaching practice as well as providing an opportunity for improvement.

Arreola's suggested peer model recommends:
A triad committee structure with:

1. One member selected by the department head,
2. One by the faculty member, and
3. One appointed at large.

The committee provides evaluative information on:

1. Course structure and organization;
2. Currency in the field;
3. Appropriateness of level; and
4. Accuracy and appropriateness of course material

There should be a minimum of four consultation meetings for the review process. The consultations should include:

1. A general faculty meeting to clarify values, standards, and criteria;
2. An individual pre-conference to provide a foundation for objective, to establish ground-rules, to resolve conflicts, and to clarify any ambiguity;
3. A pre-visit conference that establishes the observation schedule; and
4. A post-visit conference soon after the observation for reflective feedback

UNDERSTANDING TEACHING AND LEARNING

In developing a procedure for evaluating teaching an understanding of teaching practice and student learning are important considerations. In designing a model that if focused on teaching, defining the role of a teacher is requisite. In reference to the role of teachers in higher education, Boyer's (1990) paradigm on the scholarship of teaching references that the practice involves the development of knowledge, skill, mind, character, or the ability of others. Boyer states that, "teaching stimulates active, not passive, learning and encourages students to be critical, creative thinkers, with the capacity to go on learning." (1990, p. 23-4) With regard to teaching as practice, these procedures, as well as pedagogy, must be "carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught." (Boyer, 1990, p. 24)

Kolb (1981) addresses the dimensions of learning and how these styles differentiate with regard to the specific academic programs. His findings reflect a four-stage cycle consisting of 1) concrete experience; 2) observation and reflection; 3) formation of abstract concepts and generalizations; and 4) testing implications of concepts in new situations. Kolb refers to this cycle as the experiential learning theory. He extrapolates on this cycle of learning by identifying two basic dimensions consisting of abstract-concrete learning processes and active-reflective learning processes. With regard to establishing guidelines for peer evaluation, Kolb suggests that identifying the discipline specific differences and dimensions are important concerns for orienting a teaching approach.

CONCLUSION

Pink (2009) states that an individual is intrinsically motivated to perform and external or extrinsic motivators are ineffective in improving performance and capacity. Our motivation is driven by universal human needs and is based on autonomy, mastery, and purpose. Any procedure for peer evaluation must be based on these principles and must engage one to buy-in to the process. McGowan and Graham (2009) state that, "no instructor grows up thinking, I really want to be a bad teacher." (p. 161). We are intrinsically driven to perform and improve our practice. Although self-reflective evaluation is useful, Centra (1993) notes that faculty overestimates their effectiveness in self-evaluation. A process engaged in formative evaluation based on peer observation and reflection has the potential to enhance performance as well as develop faculty cohesion and morale (Millis, 2006). Senge (2006) supports this idea stating that system thinking is essential in transforming organizations into learning organizations. Senge's first principle of *Team Learning*, states

that, “the intelligence of the team exceeds the intelligence of the individuals in the team.” (p. 9)

REFERENCES

Arreola, R. A. (2004). Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System. *CEDA Workshop.*

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered.* Carnegie Ensowment fo the Advancement of Teaching. N.J.: Princeton.

Bukalski, P. J., & Lyons, T. J. (2000). *Guide to Faculty Advancement: Annual Evaluation, Promotion, and Tenure.* University of Film and Video Association.

Centra, J. A. Evaluating the Teaching Portfolio: A Role for Colleagues. (K. E. Ryan, Ed.) *Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education: A vision for the future. , 83*, 87-93.

Centra, J. A. (1993). *Reflective Faculty Evaluation.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hart, F. R. (1987) “Teachers observing teachers.” In J.H. Broderick (ed.) *Teaching at an Urban University*. Boston: University of Massachusetts at Boston.

Hutchings, P. (1996). *Making teaching community property: A menu for peer collaboration and peer review*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

Keig, L. (2000). Formative peer review of teaching: attitudes of faculty at liberal arts colleges toward colleague assessment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 14* (1), 67-87.

Keig, L., & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). *Collaborative Peer Review: The Role of Faculty in Improving College Teaching.* the George Washington School, School of Education and Human Development. Washington D.C. : ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2.

Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences. In A. W. Chickering, *The Modern American College: Responding to the new realities of diverse student and a changing society* (pp. 232-255). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, K. G. *Preparing A Teaching Portfolio.* University of Texas at Austin, The Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment. Austin: University of Texas.

McGowan, W. R., & Graham, C. R. (2009). Factors Contributing to Improving Teaching Performance. *Innovative Higher Education , 34*, 161-171.

Millis, B. J. (2006). Peer Observations as a Catalyst for Faculty. In P. a. Seldin, *Evaluating Faculty Performance.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing

Pink, D. H. (2009). *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us.* New York: Riverhead Books.

Pratt, D. D. (1997). Reconceptualizing the evaluation of teaching in higher education. *Higher Education , 34* (1), 23-44.

Senge, P. M. (2006). *The Fifth Discipline: the Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.* Doubleday.

Svinicki, M., Lewis, K. (n.d.) *Preparing for peer observation*: *A guidebook*. Retrieved July 9, 2010, from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness website: http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/teaching/index.php

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Classroom Observation Instrument - Traditional Model

Classroom Observation Report

Instructor evaluated _____Course_____

Number of students present _____Date _____

Evaluator(s)_____

Purpose: The purpose of this classroom observation is (1) to provide a database for more accurate and equitable decisions on tenure, promotion, and merit increase and (2) to improve faculty performance.

Instructions: Please consider each item carefully and assign the highest scores only for unusually effective performance.

Questions 12 and 13 have been deliberately left blank. You and the instructor being evaluated are encouraged to add your own items.

Each instructor should be observed on two occasions, and the observer(s) should remain in the classroom for the full class period.

It is suggested that the observer(s) arrange a pre visit and post visit meeting with the instructor.

Highest		Satisfactory		Lowest	Not Applicable
5	4	3	2	1	n/a

_____ 1. Defines objectives for the class presentation.
_____ 2. Effectively organizes learning situations to meet the objectives of the class presentation.
_____ 3. Uses instructional methods encouraging relevant student participation in the learning process.
_____ 4. Uses class time effectively.
_____ 5. Demonstrates enthusiasm for the subject matter.
_____ 6. Communicates clearly and effectively to the level of the students.
_____ 7. Explains important ideas simply and clearly.
_____ 8. Demonstrates command of subject matter.
_____ 9. Responds appropriately to student questions and comments.
_____ 10. Encourages critical thinking and analysis.
_____ 11. Considering the previous items, how would you rate this instructor to others in the department?
_____ 12.
_____ 13.
_____ 14. Overall rating

Would you recommend this instructor to students you are advising?

What specific suggestions would you make concerning how this particular class could have been improved?

Did you have a pre visit conference? _____ post visit conference?_____

Source: *Successful Faculty Evaluation Programs,* by P. Seldin. Crugers, N.Y.: Coventry Press, 1980. All rights reserved.

APPENDIX B
Participatory Model

A facilitator asks faculty members working individually, to fill in the table below.

What Should Be Evaluated	How It Can Be Evaluated
Rapport with students	Student interviews Classroom observations Student evaluations
Subject matter knowledge	Review of course materials Review of publications Classroom observations Informal discussions

"This activity serves several purposes. For one, classroom observations are often cited as a valid way of measuring faculty performance, a fact that reinforces the need for departmental use of them. Bit it is important to note that the right column captures the departmental view of what should be measured. This list helps to identify criteria for good teaching. In fact, these entries could be categories on the department's observation instrument."

Reference

Millis, B. J. (2006). Peer Observations as a Catalyst for Faculty. In P. a. Seldin, *Evaluating Faculty Performance.* Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

APPENDIX C
Guidelines for Formative Peer Observation
from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness
Preparing for Peer Observation: A Guidebook

Formative Peer Observation Process
Some basic types of formative peer observation are: *a master faculty program*, *mentor-mentee pairs, peer development triads, graduate student feedback, small group instructional diagnosis,* and *the appraisal interview*.

Master Faculty Program
Katz and Henry (1988) promoted a Master Faculty Program that paired a successful senior professor with a junior faculty member to collaborate on teaching; to observe each other's classes to learn; to compare and improve teaching methodologies; and to foster weekly discussions about effective teaching. These "buddy system" collaborations provide many rewards for both faculty members involved. With information gathered in the observations, faculty pairs meet once a week or so to discuss how student learning has been fostered or hindered in the learning methodologies and to share insights about improving teaching.

Mentor-Mentee Relationships
Roles played by mentors include friendship for emotional and personal support, career guidance for increased professional visibility, information source for discussing departmental and university expectations, and/or intellectual guidance to provide research and writing reviews. More departments are arranging mentor-mentee pairing thereby giving new faculty the greatest opportunity to prove their worth and fulfill institutional expectations. Mentors are generally selected from the same discipline but Boice suggests that effective mentoring does not have to be discipline bound. Boice (1992) found that:

- Only a handful of new hires found useful mentoring on their own. They also tended to teach cautiously by emphasizing facts and principles over active student involvement.

- It was not necessary to pair new faculty members only with senior members from the same department. The pairing of junior faculty members and mentors from other departments was equally effective.

- Useful mentoring did not depend on pairs picking each other. Assigning mentors was equally effective. It was often necessary, however, to prompt pairs to meet regularly until meeting became habitual.

- Although mentoring was generally beneficial, many mentors were reluctant to give advice to new faculty on teaching, scholarly productivity, and time management. Thus, mentoring was not without its deficiencies.

Master Faculty and mentor-mentee programs are very similar in organization, but mentors are not necessarily designated as "master teachers" and may be chosen directly by the mentees for

reason other than teaching expertise.

Peer Development Triads
Peer development triads extend the "pair concept" and offer additional opportunities to share and compare teaching/learning strategies with two peers.

Graduate Student Feedback
An example of a graduate student feedback mechanism can be found in The University of Chicago's Graduate School of Business. They designed a one hour MBA course for graduate students in which they provide feedback to instructors by auditing a professor's classes, videotaping selected presentations, and gathering suggestions from enrolled students for midsemester course changes.

Small Group Instructional Diagnosis
The Small Group Instructional Diagnosis (SGID) is another method used to improve instruction with the aid of a peer or faculty development consultant. The process, which can be easily learned by peers, is described by Bennett (1987) as follows:

- With a half hour or so left in a class period, the instructor introduces a facilitator (peer) as a friend who will gather ideas about the students' learning experiences. The word *evaluation* is not used because of its pejorative connotation to students. Before leaving the room, the instructor informs the class that he or she has voluntarily requested this SGID and hopes to learn about how the course is going.

- The facilitator assures students that the group results are confidential and will be shared only with the teacher. Groups of four or so students are formed to discuss their learning experiences and a notetaker for each group is designated by the facilitator. The facilitator also lists three questions on the board for each group to discuss:
  Which aspects of instruction help you learn?
  Which do not help?
  What do you suggest to improve your learning?

- After ten minutes of discussion, the facilitator records the students' responses using appropriate quantifiers ("most said," "a few said"). The facilitator summarizes the major ideas and shares the summary with the students for additions or corrections.

- The facilitator then shares student responses with the teacher as soon as possible, using the students' own words whenever possible. If serious problems have emerged, the facilitator highlights solutions offered by students.

- During the next class period, if possible, the instructor replies to the students' analysis. Instructors should try to implement at least one of the suggestions made by students; suggestions that are inconsistent with course goals or a teacher's style do not need to be given serious consideration.

Appraisal Interview

The appraisal interview is used by chairs who want to discuss a teaching problem with an instructor. First the chair needs to create a supportive environment for the interview and begins with questions about how things are going in general. The chair may share some insights from her/his classroom observations to offer encouraging comments about the instructor's practices. Then the chair asks whether the instructor is having any difficulties. If the instructor does not mention difficulties, the chair then can refer to information taken from their own classroom observations or problems raised by students. Finally, the chair asks how she/he or the department can help the instructor solve the problem. The appraisal interview must be handled carefully and more than one meeting may be required to bring about the necessary modifications. The primary objective of any type of formative observation process is improvement of teaching.

REFERENCE

Svinicki, M., Lewis, K. (n.d.) *Preparing for peer observation*: *A guidebook*. Retrieved July 9, 2010, from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness website: http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/teaching/index.php

APPENDIX D
Guidelines for Summative Peer Observation
from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness
Preparing for Peer Observation: A Guidebook

Summative Peer Observation Process

The three person committee, faculty, student, and/or administrator, or the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching, is the most frequently used arrangement for summative peer observation. A larger committee becomes too cumbersome and a smaller committee does not provide enough data. The Ad Hoc Committee can be composed of nominations made by the instructor and the chair/ dean; this selection process is particularly helpful for promotion and tenure decisions. Shared nominations provide the instructor the opportunity to recommend one or more observers for the committee. Preferably, the committee members will remain anonymous to each other and the general departmental faculty, in order to avoid contamination of observations. A summary of the three faculty/administrator/ student observations should be provided by the committee chair.

Summary reports based on checklists, rating forms, and/or written analyses should include the following information (Centra, 1993, p. 130):

(1) Classroom performance observation forms
(2) Instructional materials review
(3) Advising activity review
(4) Participation on graduate committees and graduate teaching
(5) Special recognition for teaching
(6) Overall recommendation

Protocol for Summative Peer Observation Committee Members

It is suggested that each Ad Hoc Committee member follow this protocol for summative peer observations (Braskamp & Ory, 1994; Millis, 1987).

- Observers must respect the observed instructor or ask to be removed from the committee. A faculty member with a strong difference of opinion or personal dislike for a peer has difficulty being a fair observer.

- Each observer meets privately with the instructor before the classroom observations to discuss the instructor's objectives for their classes and to review course materials. The observed instructor is allowed to ask questions about the process.

- Each committee member makes arrangements to observe the equivalent of three or four complete class sessions. If the observed faculty member is teaching in two or more teaching venues (i.e., large lecture section, graduate courses, performance class) the observer should arrange to attend classes in more than one course. Fewer classes will not produce a balance of exposure for the observer or the observed instructor.

- The summary report provides overall information that clearly represents all the observation results. Recommendations should be accompanied by specific examples or observation particulars.

REFERENCE

Svinicki, M., Lewis, K. (n.d.) *Preparing for peer observation*: *A guidebook*. Retrieved July 9, 2010, from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness website: http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/teaching/index.php

APPENDIX E
Key Issues for Peer Observation
from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness
Preparing for Peer Observation: A Guidebook

What are some key issues to remember about formative or summative peer observation?

There are key issues to remember as you enter a formative or summative peer observation process:

- Any observation system chosen by a department must be well understood by observers and those observed. Actual classroom practice with the observation instrument is mandatory for its' effective use. The observer must practice with the peer observation form/s before classroom visits. The observation is defined by the instrument and the observer must be able to record behavior in the categories on the form. Training for observers is required in order to help them see what is happening in the classroom. Simple or elaborate systems require extensive training to prepare observers. The turnover of administrators and faculty in all departments indicate that a cyclical peer observation-training program is needed.

- All observation data collected are representative of overall teacher performance in the classroom. Observers must be aware that some classes are atypical so that they will devote enough time to secure typical data about instructor activity. Observers are aware of the content of the class, time of day, length of class, and other temporal factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, general appearance of the instructor, etc., and the possible effect of these factors on observation results.

- Observers and the observed instructor are aware of the institutional and departmental context for the importance of teaching. Deans and chairs need to make a general announcement about the role of peer observation, the observation instruments to be used, committee assignments, and the intrinsic value of formative and summative peer observation and evaluation.

- Each individual faculty observer meets face-to-face with the individual instructors being observed, remembering that some faculty have tremendous fears about being observed, and that the act of observation will effect the overall teaching/learning environment to some degree or another.

- Observers and instructors are aware that observations do not take place in isolation and therefore produce evidence with possible legal implications. Ad Hoc Committee members need to be aware of the sensitivity of observation reports and recommendations made for summative peer evaluations. As Centra (1993, p. 160) stated "Faculty members and administrators should have a general awareness of their legal rights and responsibilities, as stated in federal or state laws and interpreted in

court cases; faculty members are both employees, about whom decisions are made, and peers who sit in judgment." It is recommended that peer classroom observations be used as simply one part of the larger picture with regard to evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Do not give peer observations undue weight in summative evaluations for the following reasons:

- Limited amount of time observed
- Different views of teaching among committee members
- Supplementary to other sources about teaching
- Peers do not observe systematically
- Peer observations often tainted by reputation of instructor
- Colleagues tend to be generous in ratings
- Low correlation of ratings between different colleagues
- Peers generally have limited experience observing teaching
- Historically faculty not trained to observe teaching
- Colleagues better at judging research than service or teaching

REFERENCE

Svinicki, M., Lewis, K. (n.d.) *Preparing for peer observation*: *A guidebook*. Retrieved July 9, 2010, from the University of Texas at Austin, Center for Teaching Effectiveness website: http://www.utexas.edu/academic/diia/teaching/index.php

APPENDIX F
Faculty Observation Form A
from the University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning

Classroom Observation Form
Open Ended – (Form A)

Faculty_____ Date of Observation_____

Peer Observer_____

This form, adapted from the Community College of Aurora's Mentor Program Handbook and Staffordshire University's "Guidelines for the Observation of Teaching," provides 10 areas for observation. Each area includes prompts regarding what should be observed.

1. Development of learning objectives:
   - Are objectives for the class given verbally, written, or not at all?
   - Are specific instructional outcomes used?
   - Are objectives discussed at the end of class?

2. Selection and use of instructional materials:
   - Do films, websites, and other audiovisual materials have a clear purpose?
   - Are handouts appropriate in number and subject?
   - Since the text may be pre-selected, does instructor give help with reading or using the text, if necessary?

3. Educational climate for learning:
   - Are students AND teacher interested and enthusiastic?
   - Does the instructor use student names?
   - Is humor used appropriately?
   - Does instructor not embarrass or belittle students in any way?
   - Is the atmosphere of the classroom participative?
   - Did the instructor have eye contact with students?

4. Variety of instructional activities:
   - Does timing of classroom activities consider attention spans?
   - Does instructor involve students in deciding what issues to discuss?

5. Preparation for class session:
   - Provide examples that show preparation by instructor.

- Do students know what preparation (reading or other assignments) they should have completed prior to class?

6. Instructional methods:
   - List *instructor* activities.
   - Did the opening gain the class's attention? Did it establish rapport?
   - Did the opening outline the topic and purpose of the lecture?
   - Is the delivery paced to students' needs?
   - Does the instructor introduce topic, state goals, present material or activity effectively, summarize, and give assignment or suggest an idea to consider before the next class?
   - Could the instructor be seen and heard?
   - Were key points emphasized?
   - Were explanations clear to students?
   - Were examples, metaphors, and analogies appropriate?
   - Was the lecture stimulating and thought provoking?

7. Opportunity for student participation:
   - List *students'* activities.
   - Does instructor encourage students to summarize and add to other' summaries?
   - Does instructor help quieter students interact with others?

8. Individualization of instruction:
   - Are the emotional, physical, and intellectual needs of students met?
   - Does the instructor prompt awareness of students' prior learning and experiences?
   - Does the instructor offer "real world" application?
   - Is the instructor available before or after class?
   - Does the instructor relate class to course goals, students' personal goals, or societal concerns?

9. Responsiveness to student feedback:
   - Is the instructor paying attention to cues of boredom and confusion?
   - Does the instructor encourage or discourage questions (dissension)?
   - Does the instructor provide students opportunity to mention problems/concerns with the class, either verbally or in writing?

10. Learning difficulties:
    - Does a student need assistance for a temporary or permanent disability?
    - Are one or more students not motivated or unable to follow the class?
    - Does the instructor show favoritism?
    - Are students able to see visual aids?

- Does one group dominate discussion and hinder others' participation?

APPENDIX G
Faculty Observation Report
from the University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning

Classroom Observation Report

Instructor evaluated _____

Observer(s) _____

Number of students present _____ Course _____

Date_____

Instructions. Several days prior to the classroom visit, the instructor should provide the observer(s) with a copy of the course syllabus containing course objectives, content, and organization.

Procedure. The observer(s) should meet with the instructor several days **in advance** of the visit to learn the instructor's classroom objectives as well as the teaching methods to be used. Within several days **after** the visit, the observer(s) should meet with the instructor to discuss observations and conclusions.

Please feel free to use the reverse side of this page to elaborate on your comments

1. Describe the instructor's content mastery, breadth, and depth.

2. Describe the method(s) of instruction.

3. How clear and well organized is the presentation?

4. Describe the form and extent of student participation.

5. What specific suggestions would you make to improve this instructor's teaching?

APPENDIX H
Faculty Observation Scale Form C
from the University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning

Classroom Observation Form Scale — (Form C)

Faculty_____ Date of Observation_____

Peer Observer_____

NOTE:

This form, adapted from the Community College of Aurora's Mentor Program Handbook and Staffordshire University's "Guidelines for the Observation of Teaching," provides 10 areas for observation. Each area includes prompts regarding what should be observed.

Development of learning objectives:

Are objectives for the class given verbally, written, or not at all?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Are specific instructional outcomes used?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Are objectives discussed at the end of class?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Selection and use of instructional materials:

Do films, websites, and other audiovisual materials have a clear purpose?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Are handouts appropriate in number and subject?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Since the text may be pre-selected, does instructor give help with reading or using the text if necessary?

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Educational climate for learning:

Are students AND teacher interested and enthusiastic?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor use student names?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Is humor used appropriately?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does instructor not embarrass or belittle students in any way?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Is the atmosphere of the classroom participative?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Did the instructor have eye contact with students?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Variety of instructional activities:

Does timing of classroom activities consider attention spans?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does instructor involve students in deciding what issues to discuss?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Preparation for class session:

Provide examples that show preparation by instructor:

Do students know what preparation (reading or other assignments they should have completed prior to class?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Instructional methods:

List *instructor* activities:

Did the opening gain the class' attention? Did it establish rapport?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Did the opening outline the topic and purpose of the lecture?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Is the delivery paced to students' needs?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor introduce topic, state goals, present material or activity effectively, summarize, and give assignment or suggest an idea to consider before next class?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Could the instructor be seen and heard?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Were key points emphasized?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Were explanations clear to students?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Were examples, metaphors, and analogies appropriate?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Was the lecture stimulating and thought provoking?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Opportunity for student participation:

List *students'* activities:

Does instructor encourage students to summarize and add to others' summaries?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does instructor help quieter students interact with other?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Individualization of instruction:

Are the emotional, physical, and intellectual needs of students met?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor prompt awareness of students' prior learning and experience?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor offer "real world" applications?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Is the instructor available before or after class?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor relate class to course goals, students' personal goals, or societal concerns?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Responsiveness to student feedback:

Is the instructor paying attention to cues of boredom, confusion?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor encourage or discourage questions (dissension)?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor provide students opportunity to mention problems/concerns with the class, either verbally or in writing?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Learning difficulties:

Does a student need assistance for a temporary or permanent disability?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Are one or more students not motivated or unable to follow the class?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does the instructor show favoritism?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Are students able to see visual aids?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

Does one group dominate discussion and hinder others' participation?

Not Demonstrated *Needs Improvement* *Satisfactory* *Outstanding* *N/A*

APPENDIX I
Classroom Teaching Observation
from the University of Minnesota, Center for Teaching and Learning

Faculty Observed_____ Rank_____
Date of Observation_____ Course Observed_____

Classroom Teaching Observation

Rating scale (1 = very poor, 2 = weak, 3 = average, 4 = good, 5 = excellent, NA = not applicable)

CONTENT						
Main ideas are clear and specific	1	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)	
Sufficient variety in supporting information	1	2	3	4	5	
Relevancy of main ideas was clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Higher order thinking was required	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	
Definitions were given for vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	
ORGANIZATION						
Introduction captured attention	1	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)	
Introduction stated organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective transitions (clear w/summaries)	1	2	3	4	5	
Clear organizational plan	1	2	3	4	5	
Concluded by summarizing main ideas	1	2	3	4	5	
Reviewed by connecting to previous classes	1	2	3	4	5	
Previewed by connecting to future classes	1	2	3	4	5	
INTERACTION						
Instructor questions at different levels	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Sufficient wait time	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Students asked questions	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor feedback was informative	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor incorporated student responses	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Good rapport with students	1	2	3	4	5	NA
VERBAL/NON-VERBAL						
Language was understandable	1	2	3	4	5 (Excellent)	
Articulation and pronunciation clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor spoke extemporaneously	1	2	3	4	5	
Accent was not distracting	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Effective voice quality	1	2	3	4	5	
Volume sufficient to be heard	1	2	3	4	5	

Rate of delivery was appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective body movement and gestures	1	2	3	4	5	
Eye contact with students	1	2	3	4	5	
Confident & enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	

USE OF MEDIA

Overheads/chalkboard content clear & well organized	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Visual aids can be easily read	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor provided an outline/handouts	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Computerized instruction effective	1	2	3	4	5	NA

SPECIAL CLASSIFICATION NOTES:
STRENGTHS: (e.g. metacurriculum, use of comparisons & contrasts, positive feedback, opportunity provided for student questions)

WEAKNESSES: (e.g. unable to answer student questions, overall topic knowledge, relevance of examples, etc.)

OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS RATING 1 2 3 4 5

Date of Conference_____ Observer Signature_____