

Peer Review of Teaching

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Baron Perlman & Lee I. McCann

Peer Review of Teaching

University of Wisconsin Oshkosh

Baron Perlman & Lee I. McCann

(PERLMAN@UWOSH.EDU)
920 424 2300

(MCCANN@UWOSH.EDU)
920 424 2300

Copyright 1998

Table of Contents

Preface	v
Acknowledgments	vii
The Context For Peer Review At UW Oshkosh	ix
Our Philosophy	1
Purpose of Peer Evaluation	3
Benefits of Peer Review	3
Definitions	4
Summative Peer Review	5
Our Teaching Enhancement Philosophy	7
Formative Peer Review	8
Colleagues as Peer Reviewers	9
Colleagues From the Same Department	9
Colleagues From Outside the Department/Discipline	9
Forms of Peer Review	10
The Classroom Visitation Process	10
Pre-Visitation Conference	11
The Classroom Visitation	12
Suggestions for a Classroom Visit	12
Post-Class Visitation Meeting	14
Course Materials	15
Teaching Portfolio	15
Assessment of Course/Teaching Portfolios	17
Reflection	20
Feedback	22
Developing a Department or College Peer Review Policy	23
Important Considerations	23
An Example of a Unit's Peer Review Policy	25
Guiding Principles For Quality Peer Review Of Teaching	27
Recommended Readings	29
Appendices	33

List of Figure and Appendices

<i>Figure 1:</i> A Protocol for a Peer Review Program in the Department of Marine and Coastal Sciences at Rutgers University	26
<i>Appendix 1:</i> Characteristics of Effective Observers	33
<i>Appendix 2:</i> Some Guidelines for Classroom Observation	35
<i>Appendix 3:</i> Teaching Through Presentation, Involvement, and Questioning	36
<i>Appendix 4:</i> Classroom Observation Rating Form	44
<i>Appendix 5:</i> Classroom Observation Guide	50
<i>Appendix 6:</i> Scaled Rating Forms	54
<i>Appendix 7:</i> Teaching Portfolio Information li	59
<i>Appendix 8:</i> Course Materials Review	60
<i>Appendix 9:</i> Checklist for Reviewing the Syllabus	63
<i>Appendix 10:</i> Course Bibliographies	66
<i>Appendix 11:</i> Overhead Transparencies or Presentation Slides	67
<i>Appendix 12:</i> Course Handouts	68
<i>Appendix 13:</i> Multimedia Course Materials	69
<i>Appendix 14:</i> Tests	71
<i>Appendix 15:</i> Class Assignments and Course Exercise Sheets	72
<i>Appendix 16:</i> Instructor Comments on Student Work	73
<i>Appendix 17:</i> The Faculty Interview	74
<i>Appendix 18:</i> Twenty-Seven Questions Directed To Teachers	75
<i>Appendix 19:</i> Instructor Self-Evaluation Form	77
<i>Appendix 20:</i> Constructive Criticism	80
<i>Appendix 21:</i> Guidelines For Providing Written Feedback	81

Preface

This manual summarizes background information on peer review, and describes its various types and the processes for conducting it. As faculty and departments implement the various requirements of UW Oshkosh Personnel Rules for peer review of teaching, use of this manual should assist in better informed, more systematic decisions and procedures to help faculty improve their teaching. A series of appendices provide detailed examples.

This manual begins with a discussion of the **Context for Peer Review at UW Oshkosh**. We then present our **Philosophy** that faculty should be active participants in the review and improvement of their teaching, and can benefit from thoughtful attention to it. Small changes in one's teaching over time produces continuing improvements.

The **Purpose of Peer Review** and its benefits are then discussed followed by **Definitions** to clarify the content to follow.

Next are sections describing **Summative** (evaluation of teaching for personnel purposes) and **Formative** (voluntary) Peer Reviews. We emphasize a formative philosophy for both types—any peer review should help faculty think about, maintain strengths of, and improve their teaching. To accomplish this goal we describe **Colleagues as Peer Reviewers** and the merits of faculty from the same and other departments and disciplines.

Various **Forms of Peer Review** follow. We start with:

The **Classroom Visitation Process**, probably the most discussed and widely used. We describe desirable features for the Pre-Visitation Conference, the Class Visitation with Suggestions for a Classroom Visit, and the Post-Class Visitation Meeting.

Review of **Course Materials** is next.

Use of **Teaching Portfolios** is the third form of peer review presented with numerous questions faculty can ponder when writing a teaching portfolio. When used for summative purposes Teaching Portfolio information must be assessed and we include a section on topic areas generally covered by such assessments.

Reflection and Feedback are two parts of the peer review process which are so important we discuss them separately.

We then turn to **Developing a Department or College Peer Review Policy**. This section contains important considerations, basic questions to be answered, and other advice. It is essentially a check list of items to consider in developing a peer review policy and procedure.

An important section concludes the manual, and can be read on its own. We summarize the salient points in the literature in what we call, **Guiding Principles of Quality Peer Review of Teaching**, in essence, the Fifteen Commandments of peer review.

We end with **Recommended Readings** and **Appendices** containing numerous examples.

Acknowledgments

We would like to acknowledge the support of the University of Wisconsin System Undergraduate Teaching Improvement Council and the UW Oshkosh Faculty Development Board. Susan Kahn at UTIC and Don Weber at UW Oshkosh were especially helpful.

At UW Oshkosh Susan McFadden (Chair, College of Letters and Science Faculty Committee) and Tim Crimmins (Chemistry Department Chair and President of the Faculty Senate) were supportive. We thank Dean Michael Zimmerman, Assistant Vice Chancellor Pat Koll, and Provost and Vice Chancellor Vicki Larson for their backing. We benefitted from the wisdom and expertise of Nancy Van Note Chism at The Ohio State University, and Beth Bowser at Western Carolina University.

We also thank the authors and publishers who gave permission to use copyright work.

Copyright Acknowledgements

Copyright Materials courtesy of and printed with the permission of the following. The authors are grateful for publishers' permission to reproduce copyright materials.

Figure 1, A Protocol for a Peer Review Program in the Department of Marine and Coastal Sciences at Rutgers University, may be found in Nordstrom, K. (1995). Multi-purpose use of a peer review of course instruction program in a multidisciplinary university department. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 6(3), 125-144. Information about the *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* is available from Gregg Wentzell, Managing Editor, *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 106 Roudebush Hall, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056; (513) 529-7224; e-mail; wentzegw@muohio.edu; or at the Journal's Web site: www.lib.muohio.edu/ject/.

Appendix 1, Characteristics of Effective Observers, and Appendix 20, Constructive Criticism, Kenan-Flager School of Business, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Reprinted with permission of B. Bowser (Ed.), (1998). *UNC Intercampus Dialogues on Peer Review of Teaching, Results and Recommendations*. World Wide Web. <http://cte.uncwil.edu/et/prev1.htm>. Printed by Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC.

Appendix 2, Some Guidelines for Classroom Observation may be found on page 15 (Figure 1) in Sorcinelli, M.D. (1984). An approach to colleague evaluation of classroom instruction. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 7(4), 11-17. *Tech Trends for Leaders in Education and Training*, 1025 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 820, Washington, DC 20005.

Appendix 3, Teaching Through Presentation, Teaching Through Involvement, and Teaching Through Questioning, may be found as Figures 1 through 3 on pages 150-151, 151-153, and 153-154 in Helling, B. R. (1988). Looking for Good Teaching: A Guide for Peer Observation, *Journal of Staff, program, and Organization Development*, 6, 147-158. New Forums Press Inc, PO Box 876, Stillwater, OK 74076.

Appendix 4, Classroom Observation Rating Form, may be found on pages 275-281 in Branskamp, L., & Ory, J. C. (1994). *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance*. It is printed here by permission of the Office of Instructional Resources, University of Illinois, and initially appeared in Diamond, N., Sharp, G., & Ory, J. (1978). *Improving Your Lecturing*. Urbana, IL: Office of Instructional Resources.

Appendix 5, Classroom Observation Guide originally appeared as part of reproduction and use of Collaborative Peer Review: The Role of Faculty in Improving College Teaching, page 45 and pages 46-48. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.

opment. This publication in its entirety is available for \$24.00 from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 630, Washington, DC 20036. (202 296-2597).

Appendix 6, Scaled Rating Forms, Appendix 9, Checklist for Reviewing the Syllabus, Appendix 10, Course Bibliographies, Appendix 11, Overhead Transparencies or Presentation Slides, Appendix 12, Course Handouts, Appendix 13, Multimedia Course Material, Appendix 14, Tests, Appendix 15, Class Assignments and course Exercise Sheets, and Appendix 16, Instructor Comments on Student Work, all may be found in Chism, N.V.N. (1998). *Peer Review of Teaching*, Anker Publishing Co, Bolton, MA. Reprinted with permission of Anker Publishing Co, Bolton, MA.

Appendix 7, Teaching Portfolio Information, may be found on page 75 of Perlman, B., & McCann, L. I. (1996). *Recruiting Good College Faculty: Practical Advice for a Successful Search*. Reprinted permission of Anker Publishing Co, Bolton, MA.

Appendix 8, Course Materials Review and Appendix 19, Instructor Self-Evaluation Form and Scoring the Instructor Self-Evaluation Form, may be found in Weimer, M., Parrett, J. L., & Kerns, M. M. (1988). *How Am I Teaching: Forms and Activities for Acquiring Instructional Input*. Printed with permission of Atwood Publishing, Madison, WI.

Appendix 17, The Faculty Interview, and Appendix 18, Exercise Number 10, Questions, may be found on pages 205 and pages 206-207 in Berquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (1978). *A Handbook for Faculty Development*. Washington, DC: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (now the Council of Independent Colleges). 1 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 320, Washington, DC 20036.

Appendix 21, Guidelines for Providing Written Feedback, Center for Faculty Development, East Carolina University, Faculty Senate peer Classroom Observation Training Session. Developed by Dorothy Clayton, Janna Brendell, and Brenda Kurz. Reprinted with permission of B. Bowser (Ed.), (1998). *UNC Intercampus Dialogues on Peer Review of Teaching, Results and Recommendations*. World Wide Web. <http://cte.uncwil.edu/et/prev1.htm>. Printed by Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC.

The Context for Peer Review at UW Oshkosh

Many units at UW Oshkosh had some type of peer review before new personnel rules requiring it went into effect in September, 1998.

The UW Oshkosh Faculty Personnel Rules [FAC 4B.6.B] now require the inclusion of faculty peer evaluations for renewal and tenure decisions in folders for review at all levels, and assign to colleges and departments the responsibility for establishing policies for the acquisition and use of such evaluations. Peer evaluations also are suggested as documentation for teaching for post-tenure review, merit [FAC 6.4.J(2)(e)], and for promotion [FAC 5.b.3.B].

- FAC 4B.6.B. Data on teaching ability including student opinion surveys and faculty peer evaluations must be presented and included in folders for review at all levels.
- FAC 4B.6.B.1. Colleges and departments have the responsibility (through the applicable bylaws) to establish policy pertaining to the acquisition and use of student opinions and faculty peer evaluations.
- FAC 4B.6.B.2. Peer evaluation as used in this section, may include such perspectives as evaluations by tenured or -tenured members of the individual's academic department, evaluations by University of Wisconsin Oshkosh faculty from outside the individual's academic department, and/or evaluations by faculty from other institutions.

Letters and Science college policy on peer review exists for part-time and temporary instructional academic staff, who need at least one recent peer review of teaching to be rehired. It is currently being proposed that all university instructional academic staff obtain peer review before rehiring.

Our Philosophy

Our goals are to:

- Educate and inform all faculty and instructional academic staff about peer review of teaching,
- Assist units to design a thoughtful, practical peer review process, and
- Help faculty improve their teaching.

Outcomes of peer review must not be arbitrary, but rather the result of a process that recognizes the time available, resources, and goals of the unit, and it must help improve teaching.

We present alternative approaches for peer review and discuss what the literature recommends. Appendices contain forms and information useful in the peer review process. We are not wedded to any one approach (e.g., quantitative or qualitative data gathering). Each unit and faculty must decide on an approach which best meets their unique needs.

Better teaching is something to which every faculty member can aspire. We believe that all faculty can benefit from thoughtful attention to their teaching, and deserve help with such efforts. Furthermore, we believe that faculty, as much as possible, should be in charge of, and active participants in, the assessment and improvement of their own teaching.

We approach the task of peer review as your peers, not experts. Peer review is ongoing at UW Oshkosh and is required in some circumstances. We believe that each unit should discuss a peer review of teaching process, and when warranted, establish or improve procedures designed to enhance teaching while meeting personnel requirements. Even small changes will have incremental effects in problem avoidance, and teaching enhancement.

Units need to take a close and honest look at their history regarding the evaluation of teaching. Establishing or modifying a formal evaluative process for teaching is best done incrementally (in small steps) and with great patience. Each unit must decide what form of peer review process is best for its faculty--there is no one best or right way to conduct peer review of teaching.

Peer review works best within the context of a win-win philosophy. Focusing on a colleague's teaching, the thought and effort put into it, and on ways to improve should not only serve to meet required personnel rules for teaching assessment, but increases

the chances teaching will be discussed and enhanced.

If you have questions after reading this manual, please e-mail (MCCANN, PERLMAN) or call (2300). We are more than happy to work with faculty on peer review processes and the enhancement of their teaching.

Purpose of Peer Evaluation

Peer evaluation of teaching is becoming more prevalent nationally. Its goals are to:

- Help faculty examine their teaching for purposes of self improvement, and
- Systematically assess teaching performance as a professional faculty activity in connection with personnel decisions.

For whatever purpose it is done, peer review should provide information designed to be useful for individual faculty teaching improvement.

Benefits of Peer Review

- Attention to the improvement of teaching may be the most important step we can take toward **maintaining and improving the reputation of our university and the quality of education our students receive.**
- Peer review is one step toward more faculty *ownership* of teaching, toward making its discussion and improvement more visible in the academic community. Making peer review *community property* assists both new and established faculty in their teaching development.
- Pressures beyond the academy seek greater accountability and responsibility for teaching. **Peer review is one way faculty can document what it is we do as teachers.**
- Peer review demonstrates **attention to the art and craft of teaching** by the profession and assists good teachers to become better. This is important since faculty are teaching professionals without licensing, certification, or continuing education requirements,
- Peer review adds **professionalism** to the process of evaluating teaching, particularly as compared with student opinion surveys.
- **Improvements in teaching, learning and faculty morale and collegiality often follow effective peer review, for both the faculty member being reviewed and the reviewer.**

Definitions

Classroom Visitation: One form of peer review typically involving a meeting between teacher and reviewer before the class, one or more class visitations, and a follow up meeting.

Formative Peer Review: Conducted at the request of faculty members who voluntarily seek feedback on some aspect of their teaching, typically for self validation or improvement.

Peer: A faculty member who may be of the same or different rank from the same or a different department. Synonymous with colleague.

Peer Review of Teaching: A systematic assessment of teaching in all its forms. It includes processes by which faculty work with faculty to assess and enhance teaching and related activities, such as:

- **Development models** (e.g., skills workshops, seminars, team teaching, Faculty Colleges).
- **Assessment and feedback** (classroom visits, teaching portfolios, micro-teaching),
- **Discussion and sharing** (pedagogical coaching, mentors, discussion groups, private discussion),
- **Dissemination models** (information shared via books, WEB, handouts, and discussed),

Summative Peer Review: Done for personnel purposes (e.g., renewal, tenure, promotion, merit pay). It is not voluntary.

Teaching Materials: Course syllabi, exams, handouts, etc. submitted for purposes of review without an attached narrative.

Teaching Portfolio: A compilation of one's teaching: philosophies, materials, strategies, outcomes, etc. used for formative or summative purposes.

Unit: An academic department or college in which there are rules and committees for review of faculty performance.

Summative Peer Review

Summative Peer Review may be defined as evaluation of teaching for personnel purposes. Teaching is one component of faculty behavior evaluated by others for purposes of Renewal, Tenure, Promotion, Merit Pay Increases, etc. The review is typically general, speaking to a faculty member's teaching in a variety of global categories. We believe that summative reviews should have formative value. To enhance teaching the process must be participatory and collaborative.

Summative peer review is most often done with junior faculty. When done in a supportive manner it may be vital in helping them become better teachers and in retaining them. Junior faculty need to establish competence and a repertoire of effective teaching skills. They need freedom to explore and fail while not continuously being judged by others. Summative peer review with a formative philosophy can facilitate this, and meet young faculty members' needs for collegiality, while clearly communicating institutional teaching expectations. Our philosophy is that the summative process must include opportunities for self improvement. Absent such chances it is strictly an evaluative and critical process, with the steps needed to improve the rating (one's teaching) left to inference.

Mentors for junior faculty may be an important source of information about the process and importance of summative peer review. They also provide formative support of teaching and scholarship.

Some points to consider when designing a department or college policy on summative peer review:

- Units must answer three questions before developing, changing, or maintaining a summative peer review policy.
 - For what purpose is the review being conducted (e.g., required by college, by institution)?
 - From what sources will information be obtained (e.g., talking with faculty member, visiting class, course materials, teaching portfolio)?
 - Who will interpret this information (e.g, faculty member, mentor, senior faculty, college committee)?

In other words, what are we trying to do and why? How do we best accomplish this?

- Units need to decide who shall do observing for summative purposes (e.g., only tenured faculty, faculty from other departments, a Distinguished Teacher invited by the person being observed).

- Units need to decide the form of a summative review. Is it a narrative letter (supported in the literature), forms with numerical ratings (also used), or both? Units must evaluate their needs and develop what works best for them. Borrowing from our own experiences and the literature, we recommend that all narrative reviews for summative purposes consider:
 - Type of course (traditional classroom, internet, distance education).
 - Course design and materials (e.g., syllabus, text).
 - Assessment of learning (e.g., assignments, exams).
 - Classroom Teaching.
 - Knowledge of subject matter.
 - Appropriateness of course objectives.
 - Organization and clarity, instructor's success in teaching that content.
 - Intellectual level of subject matter presented, quality of course content as related to type and level of the course.
 - Interpersonal skills (e.g., respect for students, discussion).
 - Other (e.g., pedagogical ethics, advising, collaborative work with students).
 - Faculty being reviewed for summative purposes should be equal partners in the process, active participants working collaboratively with the reviewer to achieve self improvement.
- Do not be so explicit that faculty feel the need to behave in certain ways or do certain things to look good in this evaluation.
- Evaluation is a powerful means by which faculty learn department, college or university expectations of teaching, and it can encourage faculty attention to their teaching. If formative values and procedures are included within summative requirements faculty should have greater opportunity and incentive to increase their teaching (and morale).
- New faculty often need external validation of their teaching (senior faculty often forget how long it took to trust their self perceptions of teaching). If carried out with care, summative (and formative) peer review can contribute positively to a new faculty's development as a teacher.
- Summative review processes must be explicit; faculty must know what information is expected from them and how it will be used.
- Summative review must be fair; information requested must represent both the criteria used to evaluate teaching (e.g., listed in department renewal and tenure policy) and the complexity of the teaching process. It must allow faculty to present all of their teaching efforts and accomplishments.

- The review must be credible in content and process.
 - Information must be comprehensive enough to be reliable.
- Information is most useful if it focuses on teaching behaviors and practices over which the instructor has some control.
- How information is communicated during a peer review can be more important than the content. Faculty can be anxious, defensive, or eager to learn about their teaching.
 - Be supportive.
 - Take as much time as is needed.
 - Descriptive information with examples will be heard more readily by faculty being evaluated and have more impact than evaluative comments.
 - Problems in teaching must never be explicitly identified unless alternative solutions are also presented. Any recommended changes in teaching must be achievable.

Our Teaching Enhancement Philosophy

Our teaching enhancement philosophy is one in which concern, even during summative peer review, is on helping colleagues to think about their teaching, maintain their strengths, and improve their teaching. Evaluation of teaching for summative purposes without this philosophy makes no sense.

Formative Peer Review

In formative peer review information is collected to improve teaching, as requested by the faculty member, not for personnel purposes. In other words, this is a voluntarily sought peer review, ideally ongoing throughout one's teaching career. Often the faculty working with the teacher do not even give advice, but merely reflect on what they have discussed, experienced in the classroom, or read in portfolios.

Formative peer review can be conducted using direct classroom observation, videotaping of classes, evaluation of course materials, assessment of instructor evaluations of the academic work of students, and teaching portfolios. (Keig & Waggoner, 1994, have an excellent discussion of formative review methods, with examples, including the use of videotape.)

The basic principles of a formative review are:

- At any given time, focus on one or two specific behaviors to be looked at and perhaps changed (e.g., clarity of lecture, speed of talking) or on specific components of the course such as texts used or tests.
- Confidentiality between teacher and reviewer must be maintained.

Examples of how to facilitate a formative peer review are for faculty to:

- Keep logs or journals of their teaching, before and after peer review, learning what works and what does not.
- Meet in bi-weekly or monthly pedagogy groups to talk about their teaching and help each other.
- Complete self rating forms or self assessments using the same questions a student might complete in a student evaluation of teaching, but reworded from the faculty member's perspective.

An interesting variant of formative enhancement of teaching uses featured faculty (recognized outstanding teachers). These faculty volunteer to be observed, interested colleagues come to their class to watch them teach, and a subsequent discussion covers any aspect of teaching.

Colleagues as Peer Reviewers

There are advantages and disadvantages to having colleagues from one's own unit or discipline as peer reviewers, as compared to other colleagues. Depending on the focus of the review, either may be an appropriate choice.

Colleagues From The Same Department

These colleagues can best judge:

- Realistic course objectives and goals.
- Content (e.g., presenting research to students, relevance of examples, appropriate level of difficulty of material, integration of topics, structure of the lecture, congruence between instructor goals and accomplishments, current material).
- Knowledge and expertise in the field as reflected in syllabus, reading list, and in-class behavior.
- Assignments, group projects and examinations.
- Contributions to teaching/curriculum in the department.
- Thesis supervision.
- (Instructional) research.

Colleagues From Outside the Department/Discipline

These colleagues can judge:

- Student-instructor interactions in the classroom.
- Instructor's style as scholar and model teacher.
- Process of teaching (e.g., speed of talking, use of overhead/board/computer).

❖ *Appendix 1: A list of Characteristics of Effective Observers* including behaviors and attitudes observers should avoid. **A reviewer should read this list and reflect on it before working with a colleague in the peer review process.**

Forms of Peer Review

The Classroom Visitation Process

This is the most familiar form of peer review.

The unit must decide if it wants a peer review which is **quantitative, qualitative, or both**. Forms exist for quantifying a classroom visit but qualitative reviews (letters) are becoming more common nationally. In any case, the unit should define a standard form or process which all observers use.

Important guidelines for the process of classroom visitation:

- Peer review via classroom visitation takes **considerable time and effort**.
- **Trust** must be established and maintained. This is not a process of someone *doing* something to someone else. It is a process by which two professionals work together to help one faculty member, and often both, enhance their teaching.
 - Peer review requires openness and sharing; it may leave the person being reviewed feeling vulnerable.
 - Faculty new to classroom observation and new observers may be uncomfortable with the situation.
- Both the person being reviewed and the reviewer must take **ownership** of the process. A junior faculty should have as much say about what takes place as a senior faculty doing the reviewing. No one is an expert, but merely professionals, working as colleagues, trying to assist one another.
- **Strive for an honest exchange, of both strengths and suggestions for improving teaching**. To facilitate a productive peer review reviewers should always begin by discussing what is right and good about a colleague's teaching.
- **Reviewer training and experience strengthen peer review**. The literature finds that with proper training and experience, classroom observations are **sufficiently reliable** (consistency over time) and **valid** (relate to other measures of teaching) to be useful.
- **Too much feedback information can be overwhelming and confusing**, diluting its impact and message.
- **Poorly synthesized and unfocused information is frustrating** to the person being reviewed.
- **Avoid judgments about student motivation or satisfaction**, as these are difficult to make (inferential).

- **Judgments about style and relationships with students should be judicious.**
- **Emphasize substantive issues**, such as accuracy of content, sequence of topics, ethical and professional conduct, evaluation of students' work, etc.

Pre-Visitation Conference

During this meeting the observer gathers a great deal of information concerning the teacher's goals, the class, students and specific problems to be attended to (if a formative review).

Keep the following in mind when planning a pre-classroom visit meeting.

- Both reviewer and reviewee must understand and agree on the purpose of the classroom visit, the criteria to be employed, and how information will be shared and used afterward.
- Both must know the method to be used for recording classroom observations (checklists, rating scores or written appraisals).
- Either before or during this meeting copies of course materials (e.g., syllabus, handouts, exams) can be given to the observer and/or discussed.
- The observer needs to learn about specific characteristics of the:
 - Student (class level, major field).
 - Teacher (rank, experience).
 - Course (size, required or not, prerequisite for other courses).
- The observer and teaching faculty must understand:
 - Goals of the course.
 - Intent of the class period(s) to be observed.
 - Teaching methods to be used.
 - How the class relates to previous (and subsequent) ones.
 - If the class observed is typical of the faculty's teaching.
 - Method of observation.
 - The literature states that visiting more than one class is desirable (time allowing).
 - The teacher may ask that the observer focus on certain course dimensions or concerns.
 - The place of courses in the curriculum, what faculty try to accomplish in these courses, and what they value in teaching should all be discussed.
- Arrange a time for the classroom visit(s).

- Arrange a time for a post-class visit meeting. Schedule this meeting for as soon as possible after the peer reviewers believe their thoughts and suggestions will be organized.

The Class Visitation

There are differing opinions on how classroom observations should be conducted. Some suggest the reviewer act as an observer, perhaps with numerical forms filled out as the class progresses. Others recommend behaving as a student would, sitting in class and taking notes. Regardless of the role one adopts, after class one would use reference materials on classroom behaviors (see Appendices) as sources to organize observations and impressions.

A word about reliability and validity.

- Classroom observations provide data that are the closest to actual day-to-day teaching, and the observer actually sees many of the behaviors to be evaluated.
- Units must decide if they will require one observer to attend more than one class, or over time have several different observers attend a class. Either way, more than one observation needs to be made.
- Training improves reliability in (1) visiting class or viewing videotapes of someone teaching, (2) use of numerical or narrative forms, or (3) applying criteria to teaching portfolios or submitted materials.
- Faculty should know when someone will visit class. The argument is made that what is seen is best behavior. That is exactly the point. What is the faculty member's best effort?

Suggestions For A Classroom Visit

- **Be invisible**, try not to affect the teaching-learning process. Sit out of the way and observe.
- **Act like a student**, take notes, listen, try to follow and understand what is taking place.
- If making notations instead of acting like a student attend to the *big picture* such as importance and suitability of content, organization, presentation style, clarity, questioning ability, quality and nature of contact with students.
- Have a **method of recording** what takes place. Either during the class or more desirably after, have materials which serve as templates to organize what you experienced.

Classroom visits can take various forms. Whether the visitor acts as a student, or writes voluminous notes about the process and teaching observed, there are typically major teaching issues which are attended to. These include:

- Pre-class behavior (arrive early, talk with students, outline on board).
- Does the class start and end on time?
- Putting the lecture in a context, referring to last class period, outlining what will be covered.
- Mechanics (voice can be heard, speaks slowly enough, writing can be read, material well paced).
- Atmosphere (active, quiet, questions, deference).
- Interpersonal (respectful of students and questions, answers questions carefully and precisely, is concerned for what the students are learning, communicates enthusiasm, elicits discussion).
- Clarity and organization.
- Content (knows what he/she is talking about, true intellectual content, well prepared, can explain concepts clearly, good use of examples).
- Teacher Behaviors.
 - Use of blackboard, overhead, computer.
 - Answering questions.
 - Level of understanding required by students.
- Student learning activities.
 - Taking notes.
 - Asking questions.
 - Discussion participation.
 - Small group activity.

Appendices 2 to 6 are designed to assist in peer review using classroom visits.

❖ **Appendix 2:** *Some Guidelines for Classroom Observation.*

❖ **Appendix 3:** A listing of behaviors to think about (or check off) about *Teaching Through Presentation, Involvement, and Questioning.*

❖ **Appendix 4:** A complete *Classroom Observation Rating Form* with 6 sections (Importance and Suitability of Content, Organization of Content, Presentation Style, Clarity of Presentation, Questioning Ability, and Establishing and Maintaining Contact With Students). Each item is scaled from Poor to Excellent. It can easily be used as a basis for a narrative letter. **It is a valuable rating form for a teacher to read and think about, whether for classroom visits, or for writing a teaching portfolio.**

- ❖ **Appendix 5:** Another *Classroom Observation Guide*.
- ❖ **Appendix 6:** A Scaled Rating Form with 9 sections. Important sections not often seen in the literature are **Instructor Strategies and Instruction in Laboratories, Studios or Field Settings**.

Post-Class Visitation Meeting

This meeting works best as discussion, not just the observer giving feedback. Here are some steps which help insure a productive post-visit meeting:

- It is best if the teacher gets the first opportunity to comment before the reviewer does.
- Start by discussing what the teacher is doing well, and why.
- The reviewer may ask one or two questions such as:
 - *How do you think the class went?*
 - *What do you think about your teaching during the class?*
 - *What went well or not so well?*
 - *What were your teaching strengths? Weaknesses?*
 - *What did you like best about this class?*
 - *What was your best teaching in this class?*
 - *Did students learn/accomplish what you wanted them to? How do you know?*
 - *Does your class usually go this well (poorly)?*
 - *Would you have liked being a student in this class, and why?*
 - *If you had to change one thing that happened in this class, what would it be and why?*
- Examples are more useful and powerful than generalities.
- After the class is observed teachers may suggest concerns and course dimensions on which they would like additional feedback.
- A written appraisal of the observation is most useful. It should contain information about strengths, special teaching behaviors and suggestions for alternative ways to improve teaching.
- When peer review is done for summative purposes, the unit must decide if it will allow teachers to write a letter of response if consensus cannot be reached between observer and the faculty member observed. The literature supports this idea; the process is not always one in which trust and mutual respect carry the day.

- Part of this second meeting should be an **evaluation** of the effectiveness of the peer review by the participants. In brief, how did it go? What was helpful? Were there any barriers or problems which influenced the effectiveness of the peer review?

Course Materials

These may be submitted as part of a Teaching Portfolio with observation and comments by the faculty, or faculty members may submit course materials with no portfolio component, although the literature does not recommend this practice. Course materials may include but are not limited to:

- Course syllabi.
- Course assignments, learning experiences such as tests, papers, projects, presentations, etc.
- Lecture notes.
- Overheads.
- Exams and grading practices.
- Copies of feedback to students (e.g., graded exams, papers).
- Text and required/suggested reading suggestions.
- WEB sites.

Criteria for evaluating course materials must be explicit. These criteria mirror teaching portfolio criteria that follow.

Sometimes faculty will work with a colleague, in *instructional consultation* or *collegial coaching*, focusing on course materials.

The Appendices of materials described in the Teaching Portfolio section are useful here as well.

Teaching Portfolio

There are three sources of teaching data: students, peers-colleagues-consultants, and self. Teaching Portfolios focus on self evaluation and assessment, the teacher as a **Reflective Practitioner**.

A teaching portfolio contains documents and materials that collectively capture the scope and quality of teaching performance in a **careful and thoughtful manner**. It displays and documents one's teaching, using selected information and solid evidence of effectiveness.

Portfolios should be complete compilations of one's teaching.

- ❖ **Appendix 7: *Teaching Portfolio Information*** lists 5 major areas which should be covered in a portfolio with numerous examples of each.

In writing a teaching portfolio, teachers are confronted with the question of whether the way they teach and spend their time is congruent with their philosophy of teaching and goals for students. Often faculty work with a collegial coach, using the portfolio as a springboard for discussions about one's teaching.

More specifically, writing a teaching portfolio either confirms or forces a teacher to reconsider and rethink the answers to the following questions:

1. Personal teaching activities

- What is my present situation (e.g., courses I teach, students with whom I work)?
- What is my role within the department?
- What do I want to do?

2. Teaching goals (e.g., students learn facts, general principles)

- What are my objectives as a teacher?
- Should I change my courses to reflect these goals?

3. Teaching strategies (lecture courses, writing, use of discussion, etc.)

- What kinds of activities are taking place in my classroom? Why?
- How do I define effective teaching?
- Do I want to make changes in my teaching strategies?

4. Priorities and investment of time and energy

- How do I spend my time and energy now?
- Could my efforts be modified to better reflect my teaching priorities?

5. Expectations of students intellectually

- Are my courses rigorous or not? If rigorous, what supports do I provide for students to meet my expectations?
- If my courses are not rigorous, why not?
- What types of student assignments and feedback to students do I utilize? What is my rationale for them?
- Should I change my teaching to better reflect my expectations for students?

6. Respect for students

- How do I answer questions, arrange time for students during office hours, and what is the nature of my interactions with students?

- What changes are needed to better demonstrate my respect for students?

7. Definition and identity as a teacher

- What is my philosophy of teaching?
- What do I value and do which is uniquely me when I teach?
- Can I articulate the complexities of my teaching practices?
- Can I connect the (1) particulars of what I teach to the (2) students I teach in the (3) conditions in which I teach?
- Can I describe my abilities as a teacher; my strengths and relative weaknesses?

8. Rewards as a teacher

- What about teaching do I find rewarding? Do I do enough of the things that I find rewarding when I teach? Why or why not?
- What do I need to do to maintain or increase the rewards I get from teaching?

9. Development as a teacher

- How much time, if any, do I spend in collaboration with others (mentor, other colleagues) about teaching?
- In the last five years has my teaching changed for the better? Why or why not? In my teaching, what have I risked and experimented with?
- Am I burned out? Do I teach the same way semester after semester? Why? Am I satisfied with this sameness? Should I tinker with courses and change them?
- How can I maintain and improve my teacher development?

10. Plans for the future

- As a result of writing a portfolio what have I learned about myself as a teacher?
- What needs to be changed, and what shall I work on first?
- What time periods will I set aside to ponder and critically think about my teaching each academic year?

Assessment of Course/Teaching Portfolios

The unit must decide what is valued in teaching and adopt criteria which reflect these decisions. The literature does not favor a numerical rating over a descriptive/narrative one. In either case the same questions are asked and answered as one reads materials submitted by the teacher.

Topic areas generally covered include but are not limited to:

- **The Syllabus** (e.g., Complete? Well Organized? Communicates goals of course?)
- **Course Content** (e.g., Congruent with place of course in curriculum? Justification

for content (e.g., current and valuable information?) Well organized?)

- **Availability to Students** (e.g., Office hours, e-mail?)
- **Reading Lists and Texts** (e.g., Intellectually appropriate? Relevant to course content and goals? Respected work in the discipline?)
- **Exams, Quizzes, and Other Assignments** (e.g., Reflective of course goals and assignments? Give students fair opportunity to show what they have learned? Adequately cover topic areas? Well written?)
- **Evaluation Criteria and Grading** (e.g., Fair and consistent? Rigor? Standards clearly communicated? Amount of grade inflation? Feedback is timely and constructive?)
- **Assignments** (e.g., Not merely busy work, advance the goals of the course? Coordinated with in-class work and readings? Meaningful for students? Appropriate in difficulty, frequency, amount of time to complete?)
- **Across the Curriculum Teaching Emphasis** on across the curriculum topics such as:
 - Diversity (e. g., cultural, age, gender).
 - Critical thinking.
 - Active Learning.
 - Writing - Speaking.
 - Mathematics.
 - Any others the unit agrees on.

The unit must agree on the criteria to be used in reviewing portfolios. Briefly, some general criteria (Chism, 1998) could include:

- **Completeness:** Is it thorough?
- **Consistent:** Do the materials reflect teaching philosophy and goals?
- **Reflection:** Is the teacher thinking about his/her teaching?
- **Quality:** Do the materials and self assessment of teaching reflect high quality teaching?
- **Balance:** Is the portfolio well-rounded and detailed ?

Appendices 8 to 16 contain materials useful for both teacher and reviewer in the compilation and review of teaching materials. The reader will find:

❖ **Appendix 8:** A complete **Course Materials Review** including Syllabus, Assignments, Handouts, Exams (graded and ungraded), Textbooks, Supplementary Reading Lists, Lecture Outlines (provided students), Study Questions/Review Materials, Visual Materials, and Overall Conclusions.

Criteria and numerical rating forms for:

- ❖ **Appendix 9:** Checklist for Reviewing the Syllabus.
- ❖ **Appendix 10:** Course Bibliographies.
- ❖ **Appendix 11:** Overhead Transparencies or Presentation Slides.
- ❖ **Appendix 12:** Course Handouts.
- ❖ **Appendix 13:** Multimedia Course Materials.
- ❖ **Appendix 14:** Tests.
- ❖ **Appendix 15:** Class Assignments and Course Exercise Sheets.
- ❖ **Appendix 16:** Instructor Comments on Student Work.

Reflection

Peer review, whether of teaching portfolios, classroom visits, or submitted course materials, involves reflection by the teacher and the reviewer.

Teachers must step back, formulate and organize, and present what they value and do with students. Talking with others often helps teachers reflect on their pedagogy. Reading materials in the appendices to this handbook may generate questions, suggest ideas not previously considered, and help organize answers.

Reflection on one's teaching includes questions such as:

- What are my strengths as a teacher?
- What are my limitations? What must I learn to do better?
- What teaching activities do I do best?
- What do students perceive I am good at? Why do they like my courses?
- What do students perceive I need to do more of, or improve?
- What have I done to maintain or improve my teaching?
- Who are the first people I would talk to, and sources I would consult, about a teaching problem?
- What teaching style or methods best fit my strengths and personality?
- What have I read, and what authors and writings influence how I think about teaching?

Reviewers must:

- Avoid hasty judgments.
- Consider personality differences.
- Reflect on the nature of the review (summative or formative), the person with whom they will be doing the review, and the course and materials to be read or visited.
- Put aside their own model of teaching (e.g., lecture format) to best consider the teaching and faculty member being reviewed (e.g., discussion, small group format).

Note: Appendices 17 to 19 contain materials useful for both teacher and reviewer consideration. All provide food for thought.

- ❖ **Appendix 17:** A series of questions for a *Faculty Interview*.
- ❖ **Appendix 18:** *27 Questions Directed To Teachers*.
- ❖ **Appendix 19:** An *Instructor Self-Evaluation Form* which can be narrative or scored (Adequacy, Enthusiasm, Stimulation, and Relations Scales)

Feedback

The process of giving feedback during a peer review is critical in those being reviewed improving their teaching. The chances that teaching improvement will occur increases when feedback:

- Is accurate and specific, with examples.
- Contributes to what the teacher has already thought about (dovetails with self knowledge).
- Comes from a trusted and credible source.
- Is given in a supportive, nonjudgmental manner.
- Has positives intermixed with areas for growth.
- Provides specific alternatives for teaching which needs change or improvement.
- Is focused.
- Is relevant.
- Is sensitive to:
 - The teacher's feelings and self esteem.
 - What the teacher can control.
 - The experience level of the teacher.
- Reduces teacher uncertainty.
- Allows for discussion and interaction.

Note: Appendices 20 and 21 are useful reading for anyone engaging in peer review – teacher or reviewer.

- ❖ **Appendix 20:** Guidelines for *Constructive Criticism* including sample statements from peer review letters.
- ❖ **Appendix 21:** A listing of specific *Guidelines For Providing Written Feedback*.

Developing a Department or College Peer Review Policy

There are many decisions to be made in crafting a peer review policy. Since formative peer review is done at the voluntary request of a faculty member, we emphasize the summative review. We detail the major areas for consideration and suggest some options.

Important Considerations

- The policy must reflect what the unit defines as good teaching (but should not exclude forms of teaching which may be excellent but are different, e.g., non-lecture approach in class, distance learning delivery).
- The policy should emphasize and encourage teaching improvement.
- The policy should be brief and clearly stated (see example department policy from Rutgers University, page 26).
- The policy should not overly burden faculty. Peer review takes time, but keep the activities manageable!
- The policy should allow all involved to know what is expected and what the outcome will be.
- The policy should standardize expected content of a summative letter, and the forms/materials to be consulted and used in the peer review.
- The policy should be fair; the information requested and outcome must meet the stated criteria and reflect the complexity of the teaching process.
- The review must be credible in content and process.
- The methods used should try to discover the philosophy and thinking which forms the foundation for a faculty member's teaching.
 - Can be discussed during pre-classroom visit meeting.
 - Can be in teaching portfolio.
- The review should gather information on more than classroom teaching (e.g., supervising, guiding, mentoring, advising collaborative work with students, development and growth as a teacher).
- The policy should be updated periodically.
- Three basic questions must be answered.
 1. For what purpose is the review being conducted (summative or formative)?
 2. From what sources will information be obtained and who will interpret it?
 3. What methods will be used to gather the information and who will evaluate it?

- Decide on the type of peer review to be used.
 - Classroom visitation.
 - Teaching portfolio.
 - Submission of teaching materials only.
- Decide Who Will Do the Peer Review.
 - Colleagues from the home department?
 - Colleagues from another department?
 - Colleagues from outside the university?
 - Tenured, untenured, or both?
 - Who decides on reviewers? The department policy may mandate who they can be.
 - May the faculty member being reviewed invite faculty (e.g., distinguished teacher from another department, a mentor) to review?
 - Some combination of the above.
- Reliability and Validity.
 - Information must be comprehensive enough to be reliable and valid.
 - Reviewers should receive some type of training.
 - Attend a Faculty College, workshop, or conference on peer review of teaching.
 - Several can visit the same class and compare impressions.
 - View videotape of someone teaching and compare assessments.
 - Read a portfolio and compare ratings.
- A faculty member should have more than one faculty visit a class or read portfolio materials, or have the same faculty member visit more than one class.
- Select Criteria and Rating Sheets.
 - Keep number of criteria manageable.
 - Try them for a year or two and do not be afraid to revise.
 - All reviewers should use the same materials for reference, rating, and templates as they think about a colleague's teaching.
 - Remember that the summative review is done for personnel purposes, and provides a global outcome, a general overview of a faculty's teaching. It works best when participatory and collaborative, with a teaching enhancement philosophy.
- Decide on Review Outcomes.
 - Qualitative -- Narrative letter? (our recommendation).

- Quantitative -- Forms with numerical ratings?
- Both?
- Decide on Content of Review (information to be considered).
 - Course design and materials, course objectives.
 - Classroom Teaching.
 - Process (e.g., at class early, knows students' names).
 - Knowledge of subject matter.
 - Organization and Clarity (e.g., can be heard, speaks slowly enough, good pace, material presented in organized fashion).
 - Intellectual level of subject matter.
 - Interpersonal skills (e.g., respect for students, during discussion, questions asked).
 - Other (e.g., ethics, advising, collaborative work with students)
- Expectations for Reviewees.
 - What materials must be provided?
 - How often must a faculty member be reviewed, especially if classroom visits are involved?
 - Deadlines needed for completion of reviews.
- Expectations for Reviewers.
 - Has read peer review handbook.
 - Completed training if required.
 - Meets timelines for completion of work.
 - Knows the form of feedback (must be timely and thoughtful).
- Disagreements.
 - Can faculty being reviewed for summative purposes invite a neutral third party if they disagree with content of a peer review?
 - Can teachers write a letter of rebuttal/disagreement if they believe parts of a summative review are inaccurate?

An Example of a Unit's Peer Review Policy

The protocol for a peer review program in the Department of Marine and Coastal Sciences at Rutgers University, which appears on the next page, is a simply written, yet complete peer review policy for an academic department. It serves as a starting point and model for whatever changes units wish to make in their guidelines for peer review.

Figure 1

A Protocol for a Peer Review Program in the Department of Marine and Coastal Sciences at Rutgers University

1. The Department should have an established process of peer review for faculty to use in improving their course instruction and enhancing their chances of success in personnel decisions.
2. Peer review is strongly recommended, but not required, for all courses an instructor teaches.
3. Peer review should be considered only one of many different ways that teaching effectiveness can be evaluated.
4. The emphasis on peer review should be on its value to the instructor, the process should be instructor-driven, and the results should be the property of the instructor.
5. The review should involve using standardized, faculty-approved worksheets: one for review of course materials and one for review of classroom instruction.
6. The worksheets should be constructed so the reviewers can obtain insight along with the instructor being reviewed.
7. Prompts may be included in the worksheets to ensure that the instructor and the reviewers consider important aspects of a teaching program.
8. The worksheets should be updated periodically to reflect changing departmental goals and conceptions of student learning and to make them compatible with new initiatives for improving teaching effectiveness.
9. The review should be conducted no earlier than midterm if the course is being offered for the first time.
10. The instructor should provide copies of the syllabus and all handouts, assignments, and exams for the review of course materials. A copy of the documentation used for course approval and the description of the course in the University catalog should also be available.
11. At least two in-class observations are suggested for review of classroom instruction.
12. A meeting should be held as part of both the review of course materials and the review of classroom instruction to facilitate dialogue on teaching issues of mutual interest. The meetings also allow the instructor to elaborate on teaching goals and strategies and to rebut negative comments.
13. Comments on the reviewers' worksheets should be finalized only after these meetings if the review will be used in making a personnel decision.
14. Use of peer review results in making a personnel decision should occur via the instructor to the maximum extent possible (e.g., through incorporation into a teaching portfolio).
15. Peer reviews for personnel decisions and course improvement should not be conducted simultaneously, but the same reviewer worksheets should be used for both types of review.
16. An individual conducting a review for a personnel decision should have experience in reviewing other courses, should have taught a course at the same level as the course being reviewed, and should be open to alternative teaching strategies and conceptions of student learning.
17. The opportunity for remedial action, through subsequent reviews initiated by the instructor, must be made available following negative reviews made for a personnel decision.
18. Subject to approval by instructors, worksheets may be synthesized to identify department-wide teaching and curricular problems needing remediation.
19. A departmental library of teaching resources should be maintained for faculty use.

Guiding Principles for Quality Peer Review of Teaching

Whether a peer review of teaching includes classroom visits, a teaching portfolio, or a more limited submission of teaching materials (e.g., syllabi) there are certain general principles to consider. These include the following: (We will not emphasize Team Teaching and other models of Instructional Consultation peer review strategies, or the Pedagogical Colloquium.)

- **Be patient.** Changing unit or institutional culture and climate regarding a systematic peer review process can be slow and difficult. Those being reviewed need time to adjust to the idea and the process. Those doing the reviewing need time to improve their skills and learn how to work with colleagues on teaching related issues.
- **Peer review takes time.** The process is often more time consuming than what many faculty are currently doing. Yet the sense of contributing to teaching development and working with colleagues usually makes the additional responsibility and time commitment worthwhile.
- **Reviewers also benefit from peer review.** Ideas to improve their own teaching are likely to develop.
- **No surprises.** Faculty must know the use to which a peer review will be put! Everyone in a unit must know the process and criteria as clearly set forth. The reviewer and teacher must agree on the process of peer review. Confidentiality in a formative review must be maintained.

The literature supports visiting a class, for example, by invitation only. Yes, you may get the teacher's best effort, but since there should be multiple sources for assessment of teaching (e.g., student evaluations, portfolio, materials) the unit will learn if this best effort is representative.

- **Knowing and understanding a subject does not mean you can teach it well.** Good teachers are made, not born.
- **Considerable thought and effort are needed for good peer review.** The unit must consider both its criteria and process. A review involves gathering data, insight by reviewer and teacher, and helpful feedback. Both the reviewer(s) and the reviewed will contribute significant time and effort.
- **To sit beside.** Two professionals working collaboratively is critical. Peer review does not work as well when a non-expert consults with or is evaluated by an expert. The most successful peer review processes are collaborative. Such peer review involves:
 - Two professionals working together on teaching.

- Helping and building, not judging.
- Engagement, collaboration, reflection, describing and understanding.
- Dialogue and discourse.
- **Do no harm.** Peer review can be anxiety producing and difficult for both reviewer and reviewee. Reviewers may worry that their findings may cause someone to not receive tenure, be made public and cause dissension and disagreement, or that they were not sensitive enough to the self esteem and feelings of the person reviewed.

The person being reviewed, whether for summative or formative purposes, may be concerned about being found wanting, about being less than excellent, or being treated unfairly or harshly. Trust, working together, and clarity of purpose minimize the potential for harm, and maximize positive outcomes such as better teaching.

- **Good peer review involves being tough on the issues, but tender on the person.**
- **Peer review includes a focus on the thinking behind the work**—faculty members' reasons for teaching the way they do, as well as the actual work itself. Teachers need to give thought to their approaches to teaching. Those teachers who know why they are using the practices they are, and why these are effective, have a firmer foundation for their teaching than the naturals or those who stumble onto good teaching practices. Focusing on the why adds depth to one's teaching philosophy and work with students.
- **Unit guidelines and processes must allow for presentation and review of more than classroom teaching**, i.e., the advising, supervising, guiding, and mentoring of students, and developing learning activities such as designing or redesigning courses, unit curriculum, and development as a teacher.
- **Peer review should focus on specific teaching behaviors** (e.g., syllabi, handouts, organization of lecture, eliciting questions from students, level of content).
- **Discourse should be based on reasoned opinions**, not personal biases or judgments. A good peer review requires reflection, by both reviewees on their teaching and course materials, and by reviewers on what they have read, discussed, and experienced.
- **Build on strengths.** It is easy to determine what needs work. First identify what went well and only then offer feedback on what needs work, to allow the faculty member to teach even better.
- **Feedback must be provided in a timely and thoughtful manner**, and the reviewer should meet with the faculty member being reviewed to provide this feedback. This conversation should be followed by written feedback when summative review is taking place.

Remain available for assistance in the future. Your feedback may be needed again at a later date.

Recommended Readings

- Angelo, T. A., & Cross, K. P. (1993). *Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for College Teachers*. (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. (Eds.). (1978). *A Handbook For Faculty Development*. Baltimore, MD: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges in association with The College Center of the Finger Lakes.
- Bowser, B. (1998). *UNC Intercampus Dialogues on Peer Review of Teaching, Results and Recommendations*. World Wide Web. <http://cte.uncwil.edu/et/prev1.htm>
- Branch, V. (1995). Teaching is job number one: New faculty at a comprehensive university. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 12, 209-218.
- Brinko, K. T. (1993). The practice of giving feedback to improve teaching: What is effective? *Journal of Higher Education*, 64, 574-593.
- Carroll, J. G., & Goldberg, S. R. (1989). Teaching consultants: A collegial approach to better teaching. *College Teaching*, 37, 143-146.
- Centra, J. A. (1975). Colleagues as raters of classroom instruction. *Journal of Higher Education*, 46, 327-337.
- Carbin, W. (1994). The course portfolio as a tool for continuous improvement of teaching and learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 5(1), 95-105.
- Chism, N. V. (1998). *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Dahlin, A. (1994). The teacher as a reflective professional. *College Teaching*, 42(2), 57-61.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P., & Quinlan, K. (1991). *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship in Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Elson, J., & Hill, H. H. (1990). Creating workshops for new faculty. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 8, 223-234.
- Ferren, A., & Geller, W. (1983). Classroom consultants: Colleagues helping colleagues. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 31, 82-86.
- Helling, B., (1988). Looking for good teaching: A guide to peer observation. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 6, 147-158.
- Helling, B., & Kuhlmann, D. (1988). The faculty visitor program: Helping teachers see themselves. In K.G. Lewis & J.T. Povlacs (Eds.). *Face To Face: A Sourcebook of*

- Individual Consultation Techniques For Faculty Development Personnel* (pp. 103-119). Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- Hilsen, L., & Rutherford, L. (1991). Front-line faculty development: Chairs constructively critiquing colleagues in the classroom. *To Improve the Academy*, 10, 251-269.
- Hutchings, P. (1996). *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu For Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Kahn, S. (1993). Better teaching through better evaluation: A guide for faculty and institutions. *To Improve the Academy*, 12, 111-126.
- Keig, L., & Waggoner, M. D. (1994). *Collaborative Peer Review: The Role of Faculty in Improving College Teaching*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University School of Education and Human Development.
- Levinson-Rose, J., & Menges, R. J. (1981). Improving college teaching: A critical review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 403-434.
- Lewis, K.G., Svinicki, M. D., & Stice, J. E. (1985). Filling the gap: Introducing new faculty to the basics of teaching. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 3, 16-21.
- Massy, W. F., Wilger, A. K., & Colbeck, C. (1994). Departmental cultures and teaching quality: Overcoming hollowed collegiality. *Change*, 26(4), 11-20.
- Ory, J. C. (1991). *Teaching and Its Evaluation: A Handbook of Resources*. Urbana-Champaign, IL: University of Illinois.
- Millis, B. J. (1992). Conducting effective peer classroom observations. *To Improve the Academy*, 11, 189-206.
- Paulsen, M. B., & Feldman, K. A. (1995). *Taking Teaching Seriously: Meeting the Challenge of Instructional Improvement*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Perlman, B., & McCann, L. I. (1996). *Recruiting Good College Faculty: Practical Advice For a Successful Search*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Quinlan, K. M. (1996). Involving peers in the evaluation and improvement of teaching: A menu of strategies. *Innovative Higher Education* 20, 299-307.
- Renegar, S., Summary, B., Bonwell, C., & Eison, J. (1987). Mandatory teaching effectiveness workshops for new faculty: Lessons learned the hard way. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 5, 114-118.

- Roth, J. K. (Ed.). (1996). *Inspired Teaching*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Seldin P. (1997). *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions*. (2nd Ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Seldin, P. and Associates (1990). *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching.: Moving From Talk to Action in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. and Associates. (1993). *Successful Use of Teaching Portfolios*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. *Educational Leadership*, 42(7), 43-48.
- Shulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change*, 25(6), 6-7.
- Shulman, L. S. (1995). A pivotal opportunity to foster a culture of teaching. *AAHE Bulletin*, 47(9), 6-9. PEDAGOGICAL COLLOQUIUM.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. (1984). An approach to colleague evaluation of classroom instruction. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 7(4), 11-17.
- Sorcinielli, M. D. (1994). Effective approaches to new faculty development. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 474-479.
- Sorenson, D. L (1994). Valuing the student voice: Student observer/consultant programs. *To Improve the Academy*, 13, 97-108.
- Theal, M., & Franklin, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Effective Practices For Improving Teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 48, (Winter), Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass.
- Travis, J. E. (1995). *Models For Improving College Teaching: A Faculty Resource*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 6. Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1987). Starting at the beginning: The concerns and needs of new faculty. *To Improve the Academy*, 6, 41-55.
- Turner, J. L., & Boice, R. (1989). Experiences of new faculty. *Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 7,
- University of Wisconsin Madison (1998). *Peer Review of Teaching*. World Wide Web. <http://wisc.edu/MOO/>.
- Urbach, F. (1992). Developing a teaching portfolio. *College Teaching*, 40, 71-74.
- Weimer, M. (1990). *Improve College Teaching: Strategies for Developing Instructional Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weimer, M., & Lenze, L. F. (1991). Instructional interventions: A review of the literature on efforts to improve instruction. In J.C. Smart (Ed.). *Higher Education: Hand-*

book of Theory and Research (Vol. 7) (pp. 294-333). NY: Agathon.

Weimer, M., Parrett, J. L., & Kerns, M. M. (1988). *How Am I Teaching? Forms and Activities For Acquiring Instructional Input*. Madison, WI: Magna Publications.

Wright, W. A., & Associates. (1995). *Teaching Improvement Practices: Successful Strategies for Higher Education*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.

Wright, W. A., & O'Neil, M. C. (1994). Teaching improvement practices: New perspectives. *To Improve the Academy, 13*, 5-37.

Appendix 1

Characteristics of Effective Observers

The primary characteristics of effective peer observers are closely related to characteristics of good teachers. A good observer:

1. Has sensitivity; can empathize with the person being observed.
2. Sees teaching improvement as an important objective of the observation process.
3. Is reflective about his/her own teaching.
4. Is a good listener.
5. Has the ability to give advice; gives constructive feedback.
6. Takes the observation process seriously and carefully prepares for the observation.
7. Accepts the validity of different teaching methods and styles, even when they differ from his/her own.

These characteristics consistently appear in the literature on peer observation, and successful programs emphasize the necessity of keeping them constantly in mind when performing observations. By contrast, poor observers may fall into one or more of the errors listed below:

Things to Avoid

The 'Halo' Effect

Allowing one positive factor to outweigh all other aspects of the assessment.

The 'I Don't Like Your Face' Effect

Allowing one negative factor to outweigh all others.

Leniency

Being uncritical in order to avoid controversy.

Central Tendency

Evaluating everyone as 'average' because it is less trouble.

Tunnel Vision

Focusing on only one part of the performance rather than the whole picture.

Going Through The Motions

Not taking the evaluation seriously, or

Making up your mind in advance.

The Expert

Using your own teaching performance as criteria for judgment rather than agreed-upon evaluation standards.

Gotcha

Using the evaluation for political purposes or personal revenge.

One problem that surfaces consistently in the early stages of peer observation programs is the difficulty in keeping an open mind about teaching styles and methods different from our own. One should be very cautious about absolute statements such as ‘you should never use overhead transparencies that way,’ or ‘Case studies should only be conducted this way.’ Our task as observers is to ascertain if the method being used seems to be effective, not whether it conforms to notions of teaching derived from our own experience. There are many ways to be effective.

(Reprinted with permission from a school in the UNC system.)

Appendix 2

Some Guidelines for Classroom Observation

1. Arrive at class ahead of time. Note the physical arrangement of the room, student-to-student interactions, what happens when the instructor arrives, and interactions before class between instructor and students. Listening to students before class often gives clues to their expectations and attitudes concerning the class and instruction.
2. Record as much of what is said and done as possible, creating a “log” of the class session. Record comments verbatim.
3. Write impressions or questions about the teaching in the margins or in parentheses. Separate them from observations.
4. Describe verbal and non-verbal behavior, emphasizing what happened rather than interpretations of events. “Student looking at clock 9:30, 9:34, 9:38” is preferable to “student appears anxious for class to end,” or “Instructor talking to board 9-9:15” rather than “instructor mannerism is distracting.”
5. Inform the instructor that times will be recorded and notes will be written during the observation.
6. Wear a watch when observing a class. Every few minutes note the time in the margin so that the class structure can be put in context.
7. Diagrams of instructor and student positions and interactions are helpful for illustrating the degree of student participation, who participates in class and how often.
8. Stay through an entire class session. If you must leave, make sure the instructor knows beforehand.
9. Observe from a position that is minimally distracting to students and the instructor and to have another vantage point of students from that of the instructor-unless he or she requests otherwise.
10. Don't intervene in the teaching during the observation. As exception, only intervene by explicit prior agreement with the instructor.

Appendix 3

Teaching Through Presentation, Involvement, and Questioning

Teaching Through Presentation

Mechanics

- Maintain eye contact
- Moves about room
- Pays attention to physical comfort and needs of the group (temperature, ability to see, hear, break, etc.)
- Variety (change of pace, movement, gesture, variation in voice quality, use of silence...)
- Varies activities over class period
- Vocabulary comprehensible to students
- Assists in mastering new vocabulary (defines, uses)
- Uses illustrative materials or teaching aids
 - pictures, blackboard, slides, video, charts or diagrams, maps
 - stories, personal references, current events items
 - demonstrations, activities, games
 - examples, analogies
- Has students' attention
- Sensitive to response of class
 - Paces delivery to students' capacity to follow
 - Notices questions, volunteers
 - Makes allowance for note-taking
 - Anticipates slowness or difficulty in understanding

- Notes and reacts to non-attending behavior, lack of interest, confusion, etc.
- Determines if one student's problem is common to others
- Checks comprehension with specific questions before moving on
- Begins and ends class on time

Scholarship

- Includes factual knowledge
- Includes fundamental principles, generalizations, theories
- Includes applications for problem solving and decision-making
- Indicates how knowledge is obtained
- Relates content to skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in related fields
- Shows relation of theory to practice
- Discusses or contrasts more than one point of view
- Suggests implications of an idea position, or theory
- Goes into detail, presents supporting evidence rather than just generalizations
- Presents facts or concepts from related fields or relates topics to other areas of knowledge
- Refers to recent developments in the field

- Gives references for interesting or involved points
- Presents origins of ideas and concepts
- Distinguishes between fact and opinion, data and interpretation
- Deals with controversial topics
- Talks about research he has done himself
- Emphasizes ways of solving problems rather than solutions

Organization

Opening

- States topics
- Provides an overview of what is planned for the class period
- Focuses student attention (by demonstration, activity, question, etc.) before launching into lecture proper
- Presents broader framework within which day's topic can be placed and related
- Relates to previous topic and ties in
- States foals or objectives for class session
- Starts slowly, allowing class to "warm up"

Structure and clarity

- States and follows plan
- Makes organization (chronological, cause-effect, problem solution, etc.) explicit (outline on board, handout, flow chart, diagram, etc.)
- Presents material in several short blocks
- Summarizes periodically
- Indicates transitions

- Emphasizes important points by incidental cues (voice, gesture, pauses, etc.), repeating key phrases, explicit statements ("This is important"), listing or elaboration (through detail, examples, analogies, rephrasing...)
- Groups subordinate ideas under major ones
- Points out relationships between ideas (i.e., uses specific linking words other than "and")
- Refers back to points made or terms used earlier
- When comparing, makes basis of comparison clear
- When evaluating, specifies criteria
- Gives more than one example or application of a generalization, concept, or principle
- Leaves some connections to be made

Closing

- Social ("Have a good weekend")
- Summarizes major points or sees that class does so
- Draws conclusions
- Establishes relationships
- Integrates major points
- Established links between familiar and new
- Makes opportunities for questions (see also below)
- Gives students a feeling of accomplishment
- Looks forward to next topic or step
- Indicates whether a topic will be returned to

- Makes an assignment or suggests an activity which builds on day's topics, something to do or think about

Classroom relationships

- Appears interested and enthusiastic
- Interacts informally at beginning, end of class
- Calls students by name
- Shows knowledge of individual student's interests talents, etc.
- Gives motivational cues: indicates important and difficult ideas
 - indicates certain topic will be examined
 - suggests that material is difficult but learnable
- Relates goals and content to social context, course or personal goals
- Includes material relevant to existing student interests
- Prompts awareness of students' relevant knowledge or experience (gives or asks for examples, refers to prior learning, etc.)
- Makes clear (demonstrates) his own way of considering ideas, attacking problems, etc.)
- Refers to work students are doing outside of class
- Uses humor
- Departs from plan to pursue an idea of spontaneous interest
- Requires or makes opportunities for student to process information being provided (from rhetorical questions to discussions, written assignments)
- Admits he doesn't know or is wrong
- Talks about why he does what he does in class

- Informs students of coming campus events related to course
- Seeks feedback on his own performance
- Accepts student ideas and comments (by reflecting, clarifying, summarizing, encouraging, or praising)
- Makes value implications explicit
- Stresses aesthetic and emotional aspects of subject
- Invites challenge
- Indicates his availability for giving individual help
- Suggest resources for students to explore independently
- Shifts easily from presentation mode to questioning or discussion mode
- Provides opportunities for an encourages audience participation and questions
 - Clarifies material when asked
 - Calls for questions in a way that does not embarrass or belittle the questioner
 - Allows time for the formulation of questions
 - Praises question asking, good question
 - Clarifies thinking by identifying reasons for questions
 - Makes sure that comments or questions have been heard by all
 - Draws out implications of the question
 - Answers questions clearly and directly
 - Checks to see whether answer has been understood
 - Helps student answer his own question

- Encourages students to answer peer questions
- Relates student comments to one another
- Invites students to share their knowledge and experience
- Remembers and refers to student ideas
- Interacts with students not physically nearest him
- Asks follow-up questions
- Uses student questions or comments to introduce new material

Other:

Teaching Through Involvement

Mechanics

- Group is of manageable size (15 or fewer)
- Room arranged so all can see and hear one another
- Eye contact indicates that responsibility is shared among members of the group
- Calls students by name

Preparation

- Establishes common ground prior to discussion
- Has provided for input – reading, TV or film viewing, observation, etc. – prior to discussion
- Uses specific means to insure that group members come prepared
- Helps the group agree on definitions and assumptions

- Allocates time for the various steps in the discussion
- Uses specific means to involve students initially in the discussion
- States objectives
- Lets students know what will be expected of them in terms of participation
- Sets a specific objective for the discussion (i.e., produce a list of pros and cons)

Conclusion

- Draws together contributions of various members of the group
- Allows time to consider implication of the content of the discussion outside the classroom
- Requires the group to make a conscious effort to relate the discussion to ideas and concepts acquired in other meetings or other learning situations
- Summarizes and draws new conceptualizations at end
- Encourages students to conclude with a review including:
 - restatement of positions taken
 - checking if any positions have been modified and why
 - consideration of future action
- Suggests a follow-up activity (“Watch for...” “Try this...”) related to discussion

Choice of topic

- Selects issues which are important and which students take seriously
- Involves students in deciding what issues to discuss

- Allows the group some choice in specific discussion content

Involving students

- Uses questions to stimulate discussion
- Prevents or terminates discussion monopolies
- Makes opportunities (i.e., going around table) for all to participate
- Seeks to involve individuals who are not participating
- Recognizes potential contributor and makes an opening for that person
- Reinforces infrequent contributors
- Assists a quiet student in “saying what he means”
- Protects a quiet student from penalties for being wrong
- Accepts silence

Quality of Interaction

- Intervenes when pauses become long, not to fill them but to find out why
- Willing to abandon an exhausted topic
- Listens
- Reminds students to listen to one another
- Shares his perception of group process or feeling
- When discussion is not going well, stops to deal directly with group processes
- Indicates that personal attacks are out of order
- Helps student to accept correction or appropriate criticism
- Calls attention to and rewards the playing or facilitative group roles
- Encourages students to acknowledge comments of others by summarizing them

- Relieves tension
- Allows time for evaluation of the discussion itself

Quality and content of discussion

- Sees that group reviews information from input material before going on to matters of opinion and judgment
- Encourages feeling and opinion before moving to fact
- Sees that errors of fact, logic, or relevance are corrected
- Introduces relevant considerations that have been missed
- Provides needed or relevant information (Contributes facts, need information, or sees that they are contributed)
- Questions misconceptions, faulty logic, unwarranted conclusions
- Sees that the group questions the accuracy of statements, the relevance of example and analogy, the adequacy of logic
- Distinguishes a value from a fact
- Pursues student ideas when they are not clearly expressed
- Requires student to defend his position, relate it to other ideas, or modify it
- Points out areas of confusion
- Intervenes when discussion gets off the track
- Uses questions to guide discussion
- Tolerates confusion and doubt while student search for a solution
- Summarizes discussion periodically
- Helps students remain aware of logical organization
- Refers back to points made or terms used earlier in discussion

Role of teacher

- Shifts easily back and forth between presentation and discussion or questioning modes
- Makes own role clear and sticks to it (i.e., moderator, resource person, etc.)
- Delegates role of moderator
- States the issue at the beginning, restates as needed
- Resists the temptation to comment on each student's comment
- Paraphrases student comments for his own or students' understanding
- Uses non-verbal cues (looking, pointing, silence, facial expression) to direct the discussion without intruding
- When necessary to intervene, does so briefly
- Uses strategy on distractors
- Admits not having an answer
- Admits losing control of discussion (How did we get here?)

Controversial issues

- Selects topics on which a variety of opinion can be expected
- Encourages expression of differences of opinion
- Sets up situation in which students will have to think about both sides of an issue
- Encourages students to challenge, cross question, evaluate one another
- Accepts student point of view where there is legitimate variation in position
- Supports the rights of speakers who hold minority or unpopular views
- Attempts to mediate or resolve differences or conflicts among group members

- When very different positions are taken, obtains temporary agreement on part of issue so discussion can continue
- Opens two-member controversy to whole group
- Encourages students to interact directly by asking students to comment on each other's remarks and/or by asking one student to respond directly to another
- Refrains from introducing his own opinion to avoid biasing discussion
- Presents his own opinion to enhance seriousness of discussion
- Encourages students to challenge his expressed opinions
- Encourages students to examine a variety of points of view before drawing conclusions or making judgments

Other:

Teaching Through Questioning**Mechanics**

- Sees that everyone hears question and answer
- Calls on individuals before question to alert
- Asks group-oriented question, lets all think, then one answer
- Calls on non-volunteers as well as volunteers
- Allows time after question for formulation of good answers
- Allows time after answer to consider it
- Invites alternative or additional answers
- Involves a large proportion of the class

Design of the Questions

- Questions are easily understood, clear in intent and precisely expressed
- Asks “leading” questions which provide clues to appropriate strategy or way of organizing
- Prompts with hints, rephrased or simplified questions
- Asks questions which focus student attention of a particular relevant aspect of the matter at hand
- Asks related questions in a series
- Asks questions which require recall of information
- Asks questions which require processing of information:
 - Grouping and classification
 - Compare and contrast
 - Specify cause and effect or other relationship
 - Analysis
 - Generate examples
- Asks questions with more than one right answer
- Asks students to apply information from reading or lecture
 - Selecting the information to be applied
 - Selecting the problem and letting student decide what is relevant
- Asks questions which require student to generalize
 - to make inferences
 - to evaluate
- Asks questions on matters of opinion, where any answer is right
- Asks questions which encourage students to guess or hypothesize about the

unknown or untested, to speculate or invent

- Asks questions that relate to the experience of the student
- Requires student to support answer with evidence or argument
- Requires student to specify standards or criteria when expressing judgments or making evaluative statements
- Asks questions that go beyond facts
- Asks questions that stimulate reflection beyond the class itself
- Asks a variety of questions for different pedagogical purposes:
 - Emphasis
 - Practice (drill)
 - Self-awareness (student to realize he isn't getting it)
 - Attention
 - Variety, change of pace in classroom
 - Review

Class Atmosphere

- Lets students know they are free not to respond
- Makes it:
 - “safe” to speak
 - “safe” to be wrong
- Holds attention of students who are not directly interacting with teacher
- Allows students to respond to one another

Reception of answers

- Gives evidence of listening to answers, not just waiting to hear an expected answer
- Rephrases an answer to be sure he understands

- Tries to understand a divergent response rather than rejecting it
 - Asks for further clarification
 - Corrects misconceptions, sees that correct answer is brought out
 - Returns response to student for correction, clarification of thought, rewording of fuzzy statements
 - Gives reasons when rejecting an answer
 - Follows up short or inadequate answers with a probing response that requires student to extend or improve his answer
 - Accepts and acknowledges all answers (“I see what you mean,” “Mmhm”) or by reflecting,
 - by clarifying
 - by summarizing
 - Responds directly rather than praising
 - Praises answer
 - Praises an answer selectively, finding some good part
 - Acknowledges the correct part of a partially correct answer and tries to get the incorrect part improved – by the same person or another
 - Praises or corrects answers which can be judged by definition, custom, or empirical validation, not others
 - Accepts all responses but praises those closest to the standard more vigorously
 - Asks student to check a wrong answer against other known information or evidence
 - Reminds student of relevant known information or evidence
 - Recognizes student’s right to his own opinion where question is a matter of opinion
 - Accepts the emotional content of an answer independent of its correctness
 - Responds by expressing his own ideas
 - Returns question to student to pinpoint difficulties, begin to conceptualize solutions
 - Encourages students to evaluate their own or one another’s answers (What would happen if you did it that way?)
 - Allows, even encourages students to disagree
 - Accepts wild or far-fetched answers
- Other:

Appendix 4

Classroom Observation Rating Form

Instructor: _____ Course: _____

Number of students present: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

Instructions: You may want to focus your attention on a few of the lecture skills which are listed below under the appropriate category. Select one or more to concentrate on while you observe or view the videotape.

Respond to each of the statements below by circling the number which most closely corresponds to your observation.

- 5 = Excellent
- 4 = Very Satisfactory
- 3 = Satisfactory
- 2 = Needs Improvement
- 1 = Poor
- NA = Not Applicable

I. Importance and Suitability of Content

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. The material presented is generally accepted by colleagues to be worth knowing. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. The material presented is important for this group of students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Students seem to have the necessary background to understand the lecture material. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. The examples used drew upon students' experiences. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 5. When appropriate, a distinction was made between factual material and opinions. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 6. When appropriate, appropriate authorities were cited to support statements. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. When appropriate, divergent viewpoints were presented. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 8. A sufficient amount of material was included in the lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 9. Content represents current thinking in the discipline | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 10. Lecture material is relevant to course objectives and assigned readings. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Circle one if appropriate:

- a. too much material was included.
- b. not enough material was included.

Other Comments:

II. Organization of Content

Introductory Portion

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Stated the purpose of the lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. Presented a brief overview of the lecture content | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Stated a problem to be solved or discussed during the lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. Made explicit the relationship between today's and the previous lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Body of Lecture

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 5. Arranged and discussed the content in a systematic and organized fashion that was made explicit to the students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 6. Asked questions periodically to determine whether too much or too little information was being presented. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. Presented information at an appropriate level of "abstractness." | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 8. Presented examples to clarify very abstract and difficult ideas. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 9. Explicitly stated the relationships among various ideas in the lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

10. Periodically summarized the most important ideas in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

Conclusion of Lecture

11. Summarized the main ideas in the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

12. Solved or otherwise dealt with any problems deliberately raised during the lecture.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

13. Related the day's lecture to upcoming presentations.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

14. Restated what students were expected to gain from the lecture material.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Other Comments:

III. Presentation Style Voice Characteristics

1. Voice could be easily heard.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----

2. Voice was raised or lowered for variety and emphasis.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

3. Speech was neither too formal nor too casual.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

4. Speech fillers, for example, "okay now," "ahmm" were not distracting.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

5. Rate of speech was neither too fast nor too slow.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

Nonverbal Communication

6. Established eye contact with the class as lecture began.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

7. Maintained eye contact with the class.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

8. Listened carefully to student comments and questions.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

9. Wasn't too stiff and formal in appearance.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

10. Wasn't too casual in appearance.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	----

11. Facial and body movements did not contradict speech or expressed intentions. (For example, waited for responses after asking for questions.)	5	4	3	2	1	NA
--	---	---	---	---	---	----

General Style

12. Demonstrates enthusiasm for subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

13. Demonstrates command of subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	NA
---	---	---	---	---	---	----

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 14. Where appropriate, models professional and ethical behavior. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 15. Uses instructional aids to facilitate important points. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

IV. Clarity of Presentation.

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Stated purpose at the beginning of the lecture. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. Defined new terms, concepts, and principles. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Told the students why certain processes, techniques, formulae were used to solve problems. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. Used relevant examples to explain major ideas. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 5. Used clear and simple examples. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 6. Explicitly related new ideas to already familiar ones. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. Reiterated definitions of new terms to help students become accustomed to them. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 8. Provided occasional summaries and restatements of important ideas. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 9. Used alternate explanations when necessary. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 10. Slowed the word flow when ideas were complex and difficult | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 11. Did not often digress from the main topic. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 12. Talked to the class, not to the board or windows. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 13. The board work appeared organized and legible. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Other Comments:

V. Questioning Ability

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Asked questions to see what the students knew about the lecture topic. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. Addressed questions to individual students as well as the group at large. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Used rhetorical questions to gain students' attention. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. Paused after all questions to allow students time to think of an answer. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 5. Encouraged students to answer difficult questions by providing cues or rephrasing. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 6. When necessary, asked students to clarify their questions. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. Asked probing questions if a student's answer was incomplete or superficial. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 8. Repeated answers when necessary so the entire class could hear. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 9. Received student questions politely and when possible enthusiastically. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 10. Refrained from answering questions when unsure of a correct response. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 11. Requested that very difficult, time-consuming questions of limited interest be discussed before or after class or during office hours. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 12. Asked a variety of types of questions (rhetorical, open-and closed ended). | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 13. Addressed questions to volunteer and non-volunteer students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 14. Adjusted questions to the language ability and level of the students. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Other Comments:

VI. Establishing and Maintaining Contact with Students

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. Greeted students with a bit of small talk. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 2. Established eye contact with as many students as possible. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 3. Set ground rules for student participation and questioning. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 4. Used questions to gain student attention. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 5. Encouraged student questions and contributions. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Maintaining Contact

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 6. Maintained eye contact with as many students as possible. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 7. Used rhetorical questions to reengage students attention. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

- | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 8. Asked questions which allowed the instructor to gauge student progress. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 9. Was able to answer students' questions satisfactorily. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 10. Noted and responded to signs of puzzlement, boredom, curiosity, and so on. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 11. Varied the pace of the lecture to keep students alert. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
| 12. Spoke at a rate which allowed students time to take notes. | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |

Appendix 5

Classroom Observation Guide

Students' and Teacher's Attitudes and Behaviors Before Class Begins

1. Do students arrive noticeably early or late?
2. Do they talk to each other?
3. Do they prepare for class? Take out books and notebooks?
4. When does the instructor arrive?
5. What does he or she do before class (write on board, encourage informal discussion with students, sit behind the desk)?

Teacher's Knowledge of Subject Matter

1. Does the instructor exhibit knowledge and mastery of the content?
2. Is the depth and breadth of material covered appropriate to the level of the course and this group of students?
3. Does the material covered relate to the syllabus and goals of the course?
4. Does the instructor present the origin of ideas and concepts?
5. Does he or she contrast the implications of various theories?
6. Does he or she emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?
7. Does he or she present recent developments in the discipline?
8. Does he or she present divergent points of view?
9. Is there too much or not enough material included in the class session?
10. Is the content presented considered important within the discipline or within related disciplines?

Teacher's Organization and Presentation Skills

A. Engaging Student Interest

1. Does the instructor prepare students for the learning that is to follow by assessing what they know about the topic through use of analogy, a thought-provoking question, reference to a common experience, etc.?

B. Introduction

1. Does the instructor provide an overview of the class objectives?

2. Does he or she relate the day's lesson to previous class sessions?
3. Does he or she use an outline on the board or overhead projector?

C. Organization and Clarity

1. Is the sequence of covered content logical?
2. Is the instructor able to present content in a clear and logical manner that is made explicit to students?
3. Does he or she provide transitions from topic to topic, make distinctions between major and minor points, and periodically summarize the most important ideas?
4. Does he or she define new concepts and terms?
5. Does he or she use illustrations and examples to clarify difficult ideas?
6. Does he or she use relevant examples to explain major points?
7. Does he or she provide handouts when appropriate?

D. Teaching Strategies

1. Are the instructor's teaching methods appropriate for the goals or the class?
2. Is he or she able to vary the pattern of instruction through movement around the class, gestures, voice level, tone, and pace?
3. Does, or could, he or she use alternative methods such as media, discussion, lectures, questions, case studies, etc.?
4. Is the use of the chalkboard effective? Is the board work legible, organized?
5. If appropriate, does he or she use students' work (writing assignments, homework assignments, etc.)?
6. Are the various teaching strategies effectively integrated?

E. Closure

1. Does the instructor summarize and integrate major points of the class session at the end of the period?
2. Does he or she relate the class session to upcoming class sessions or topics?
3. Are assignments presented clearly? Hurriedly or drawn out?
4. Are assignments appropriate to class goals and course level?
5. Are students attentive until the class session ends? Or are they restless (talking, closing notebooks, etc.) before the class ends?
6. What happens after class? Are there informal discussions among students or between the instructor and students after class?

Teacher's Discussion and Questioning Skills

A. Introduction to Discussion

1. How is discussion initiated?
2. Are the purposes and guidelines clear to students?
3. Does the instructor encourage student involvement?

B. Types of Questions

1. Are questions rhetorical or real? One at a time or multiple?
2. Does the instructor use centering questions (to refocus students' attention on a particular topic), probing questions (to require students to go beyond a superficial or incomplete answer), or redirecting questions (to ask for clarification or agreement from others in the class)?

C. Level of Questions

1. What level of questions does the instructor ask? (lower-level questions usually have a fixed or "right" answer and require students to recall, list, or define principles or facts. Higher-level questions ask students to generalize, compare, contrast, analyze, or synthesize information in meaningful patterns.)

D. What Is Done with Student Questions

1. Are questions answered in a direct and understandable manner?
2. Are questions answered politely and enthusiastically?

E. What Is Done with Student Responses

1. How long does the instructor pause for student responses (formulating answers to difficult questions takes a few minutes)?
2. Does he or she use verbal reinforcement?
3. Does he or she use nonverbal responses (e.g., smile, nod, puzzled look)?
4. Does he or she repeat answers when necessary so the entire class can hear?
5. Is he or she receptive to student suggestions or viewpoints contrary to his or her own?

Teacher's Presentation Styles

A. Verbal Communications

1. Can the instructor's voice be clearly heard?

2. Does he or she raise or lower voice for variety and emphasis?
3. Is the rate of speech appropriate? Too fast or too slow? Appropriate for note taking?
4. Are speech fillers (e.g., “you know” or “in fact”) distracting?
5. Does the instructor talk to the class, not to chalkboard or ceiling?

B. Nonverbal Communication

1. Does the instructor look directly at students?
2. Does he or she scan the class when asking or responding to questions?
3. Does he or she focus on particular students or sides of the room?
4. Do facial and body movements contradict speech or expressed intentions?
5. Does the instructor use facial expressions (such as raised eyebrows), body posture (sitting, standing, folding arms), or body motions (proximity to students, clenched fists, pointing) to sustain student interest?

Students' Behaviors

1. What are the note taking patterns in the class (do students take few notes, write down everything, write down what instructor puts on the board, lean over to copy others' notes in order to keep up)?

Appendix 6

Scaled Rating Forms

Rating forms with scales and with or without space for comments focus on higher inference evaluation of specific behaviors. Usually a 5-point scale with specific anchor words such as “Strongly Agree-Strongly Disagree, Effective-Ineffective, Excellent-Poor” is used. Arreola (1995) cautions that standards of performance be identified, e.g., “The syllabus contains the following items:” etc.) so that reviewers are rating the same thing and labels on the rating scale are related to the criteria to be evaluated. He also says that interior points of the rating scale be labeled as well as end points. Others would argue that such precision is cumbersome and ignores the contextual difference between settings. For example, one department might expect a bibliography to be an essential part of a good syllabus, while less print-oriented departments might not. Within a given context, however, it is important that reviewers have some common understanding of what constitutes “excellent” as opposed to “very good,” “fair,” and the like.

Comments can go below each item, in spaces to the right or left of the item, or at the end of the form. When one form is used for a variety of situations, the rating N/A is provided in case certain specific behaviors may not applicable to the setting that is being observed. Illustration:

	Extremely	Very Well	Adequately	Inconsistently	Not at All	Comments
The instructor is well-prepared for class.	5	4	3	2	1	N/A

Sometimes, such instruments give behavioral indicators of general characteristics in order to increase the likelihood that raters will be attending to the same characteristics. In the above item, for example, the following might be included.

	Exceeds level of expected qualities	Meets level on all qualities	Meets level on most qualities	Meets level on some qualities	Meets no/few expected qualities
The instructor is well-prepared for class. (Arrives and starts promptly, has all materials ready and in order, has an articulated class plan, shows content preparation)	5	4	3	2	1

Possible Items for Scaled Ratings Forms (higher inference items involving values)

I. Teacher organization

The instructor is well-prepared for class.

The objectives of the class are clearly stated.

The instructor uses class time efficiently.

The learning activities are well organized.

The class remains focused on its objectives.

II. Instructional Strategies

The instructor's choice of teaching techniques is appropriate for the goals.

The instructor has good questioning skills.

The instructor raises stimulating and challenging questions.

The instructor mediates discussion well.

The class schedule proceeds at an appropriate pace.

The instructor uses multimedia effectively.

Board work is legible and organized.

Course handouts are used effectively.

The instructor provides clear directions for group work or other forms of active learning.

The instructor facilitates group work well.

The instructor helps students to learn from each other.

The instructor helps students apply theory to solve problems.

The instructor effectively holds class attention.

The instructor provides an effective range of challenges.

III. Instruction in Laboratories, Studios, or Field Settings

Experiments/exercises are well chosen and well organized.

Procedures/techniques are clearly explained/demonstrated.

The instructor is thoroughly familiar with experiments/exercises.

The instructor is thoroughly familiar with equipment/tools used.

Assistance is always available during experiments/exercises.

Experiments/exercises are important supplements to course.

Experiments/exercises develop important skills.
Experiments/exercises are of appropriate length.
Experiments/exercises are of appropriate level of difficulty.
Experiments/exercises help to develop confidence in subject area.
The instructor provides aid with interpretation of data.
The instructor's emphasis on safety is evident.
Criticism of procedures/techniques is constructive.
The instructor works well with students and other parties in the setting.
Clinical or field experiences are realistic.

IV. Content knowledge

The instructor is knowledgeable about the subject matter.
The instructor is confident in explaining the subject matter.
The instructor pitches instruction to an appropriate level.
The instructor uses a variety of illustrations to explain content.
The instructor provides for sufficient content detail.
The instructor focuses on important content in the field.
The instructor demonstrates intellectual curiosity toward new ideas or perspectives.
The instructor incorporates views of women and minorities.
The instructor corrects racist or sexist bias in assigned materials.

V. Presentation skills

The instructor is an effective speaker.
The instructor employs an appropriate rate of speech.
The instructor uses classroom space well.
The instructor is enthusiastic about the subject matter.
The instructor makes the subject matter interesting.
The instructor's command of English was adequate.

VI. Rapport with students

The instructor welcomes student participation.

The instructor models good listening habits.

The instructor motivates students.

The instructor stimulates interest in the course subject(s).

The instructor responds well to student differences.

The instructor demonstrates a sense of humor.

The instructor uses effective classroom management techniques.

The instructor demonstrates flexibility in responding to student concerns or interests.

The instructor welcomes multiple perspectives.

The instructor anticipates student problems.

The instructor treats students impartially.

The instructor respects constructive criticism.

The instructor does not express sexist or racist attitudes.

The instructor is able to help many kinds of students.

The instructor is sensitive to individual interests and abilities.

VII. Clarity

The instructor responds to questions clearly.

The instructor emphasizes major points in the delivery of the subject matter.

The instructor explains the subject matter clearly.

The instructor relates course material to practical situations.

VIII. Impact on Learning

The instructor helps develop rational thinking.

The instructor helps develop problem-solving ability.

The instructor helps develop skills/techniques/views needed in field.

The instructor broadens student views.

The instructor encourages the development of students' analytic ability.

The instructor provides a healthy challenge to former attitudes.

The instructor helps develop students' creative capacity.

The instructor fosters respect for diverse points of view.

The instructor sensitizes students to views or feelings of others.

The instructor helps develop students' decision-making abilities.

The instructor develops students' appreciation of intellectual activity.

The instructor develops students' cultural awareness.

The instructor helps students develop awareness of process used to gain new knowledge.

The instructor stimulates independent thinking.

IX. Overall

The overall teaching ability of the instructor was high.

Appendix 7

Teaching Portfolio Information

1. Candidate Statement on Teaching
 - Philosophy
 - Strategies
 - Goals
 - Rewards
2. Depth, Breadth, and Expertise In Teaching
 - Specialty area and courses a candidate could teach in this area
 - Breadth, other areas and courses a candidate feels prepared to teach
 - Self-Evaluation
3. Teacher Preparation and Experience
 - Past Teaching Including Teaching Assistant experience
 - Information and Observations on courses taught
 - Teaching Innovations
 - Self-Evaluation
4. Instructional Materials and Feedback
 - Course Syllabi, Reading or Repertoire Lists From Courses Taught
 - Student Evaluations/Opinion Data
 - Peer Evaluations of Teaching
 - Examinations and Assignments
 - Teaching Technology and Equipment Needed
 - Work With Students Outside the Classroom or Studio
 - Outcomes of Teaching (e.g., student posters, papers, recitals)
 - Teaching Across the Curriculum
 - Awards/Recognition
 - Videotape of Teaching or Artistic Performance, Presentation of Art Work
 - Self-Evaluation
5. Development as a Teacher
 - Reading
 - Other Evidence of Development
 - Self-Statement

Appendix 8

Course Materials Review

This form contains descriptions which should be helpful in judging the instructional materials you are reviewing. Please indicate the extent to which you would agree or disagree with each statement pertaining to course materials.

SA = strongly agree D = disagree
A = agree SD = strongly disagree NA = not applicable

Course Syllabus

- _____ Identifies instructional resources like books, films and guest speakers
- _____ Outlines the sequence of topics to be covered
- _____ Describes evaluation procedures
- _____ Includes a class or activity schedule or calendar
- _____ Lists major assignments and due dates
- _____ Contains information about the faculty member, i.e. name, office address, office hours, phone number
- _____ Includes a statement or description of course objectives
- _____ Is structured so that the information is clear and easily understood
- _____ Is neatly typed without spelling or grammatical errors

Assignments (as they appear on the syllabus or in written descriptions elsewhere)

- _____ Produce meaningful and challenging learning experiences
- _____ Include a variety of activities which are responsive to varying student interests, abilities and learning styles
- _____ Are appropriate to course objectives and content level
- _____ Are spaced at appropriate intervals in the course
- _____ Are challenging but not overburdensome
- _____ Prepare students for more complex courses in this subject area

Handouts

- _____ Are relevant additions and/or elaborations of course content
- _____ Are structured so that the content is clearly communicated to readers
- _____ Are neat and minus spelling and grammatical errors

Lecture Outlines (provided students)

- _____ Communicate a sense of proportion and detail that is consistent with content
- _____ Provide enough information to assist the notetaking process without making taking notes unnecessary
- _____ Include space for students to write additional information
- _____ Are enhanced by lecture presentations in class

Study Questions/Review Materials

- _____ Prepare one to perform successfully on exams (compare with exams)
- _____ Cover content that is covered on the exam
- _____ Are designed so that their completion facilitates student retention and understanding
- _____ Do not force students to focus on large quantities of material that are irrelevant to exam content
- _____ Provide adequate opportunity to practice problem solving skills

Visual Materials (as in prepared slides and transparencies)

- _____ Illustrate aspects of the content which are enhanced by visual representation
- _____ Are clear and “graphically” illustrate the content
- _____ Include written elaborations that are clear and easily read
- _____ Can be seen and read with ease everywhere in the classroom
- _____ Contain manageable amounts of material so excessive amounts of time are not required to copy down the material

Overall Conclusions

- _____ Compared with other course materials you have seen these are better than average
- _____ As demonstrated by these materials, the content selected for inclusion in this course is appropriate and justifiable
- _____ These materials communicate an appropriate level of instructor preparation and concern

Other Comments and/or Elaborations:**Exams***An Ungraded Copy:*

- _____ Contains content consistent with course objectives—in other words, the instructor is evaluating students on what he/she believes they ought to be able to do or know.
- _____ Contains items written so that the intent of the questions are clear and explicit
- _____ Uses questions in which what the question asks is clearly understood
- _____ Covers manageable amounts of material in terms of time allocated for studying it
- _____ Is too long, given the time limit of the exam period
- _____ Requires analysis and application of content as opposed to regurgitation of details

A Graded Copy:

- _____ Includes written comments which give some feedback about both right and wrong answers
- _____ Presents written comments that are clear and readable
- _____ Includes some explanation of how the instructor calculated the exam score

Textbook(s):

- _____ Are appropriate to course level
- _____ Are clearly related to course objectives
- _____ Are generally acceptable in terms of departmental standards
- _____ Present content in a systematic and logical order so as to enhance the understanding of someone unfamiliar with the topic (Note: assess content order based on the sequence the instructor has assigned it)
- _____ Present material interestingly so as to encourage reading

Supplementary Reading List

- _____ Contain relevant and current material
- _____ Supplement course content
- _____ Include content that is challenging yet not inappropriately difficult
- _____ Specify location of supplementary materials
- _____ Include information to direct reading in terms of its relationship to course content

Appendix 9

Checklist for Reviewing the Syllabus

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

Part A: The Document Itself

	Exceeds level of expected qualities	Meets level on all qualities	Meets level on most qualities	Meets level on some qualities	Meets no/few expected qualities
<p>Completeness (Does it have each of the following, if relevant?)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Course information · Instructor information · Information on course readings · Goals and objectives of course · Policies on grading, academic misconduct, late work, absences, safety issues, accommodations for special needs · Calendar of class activities · Descriptions of assignments and dates due · Support services available 	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				
<p>Clarity of communication (Is syllabus clear? Are rights, responsibilities, and consequences spelled out? Is information internally consistent? Consistent with department or university policy?)</p>	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				
<p>Appropriateness of tone (Does the syllabus further rapport and respect between instructor and students? Does it communicate a helpful positive attitude? Is it motivational, nonthreatening? Does it communicate the challenge of the course?)</p>	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

	Exceeds level of expected qualities	Meets level on all qualities	Meets level on most qualities	Meets level on some qualities	Meets no/few expected qualities
Professional appearance (Is it formatted well? Are the grammar and spelling correct? Is it attractive?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

Other:

Part B: The Course Described by the Syllabus

Currency of content (Does this course portray the current state of the field in this area? Does it use readings that reflect the latest scholarship?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

Fit within the curriculum (Does the course fulfill expectations of the academic unit for content and process skills needed for subsequent courses? Does it match the catalog description and expected overall fit within the curriculum of the institution? Does it duplicate other courses or is it undesirably idiosyncratic to one topic area of school of thinking?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

Level of challenge (Does the course require students to do an appropriate amount of reading and other assignments? Are these at an appropriate level of challenge?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

Pacing (Is the course calendar realistic? Has the instructor selected a reasonable amount of content for the time allotted? Are the due dates for assignments distributed well?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				

	Exceeds level of expected qualities	Meets level on all qualities	Meets level on most qualities	Meets level on some qualities	Meets no/few expected qualities
Testing and grading (Do the students receive frequent feedback? Are the grading policies fair and appropriate for the goals?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				
Student-centeredness (Do the office hours or other information portray that the instructor is accessible for help? Are other resources available to the student? Do the activities show a concern for active student engagement?)	5	4	3	2	1
	<i>COMMENT:</i>				
Other:					

Appendix 10

Course Bibliographies

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Currency of works listed (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Importance of works cited (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Thoroughness of bibliography (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Completeness of citations (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
If annotated, usefulness of summaries (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness for course (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness for level of student (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Relationship to course content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Other

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 11

Overhead Transparencies or Presentation Slides

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Enhances representation of course content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Expresses content clearly (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Presents material legibly (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Displays appropriate amounts of material (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Contains accurate content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Shows evidence of proofreading (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Other

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 12

Course Handouts

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Supplements course content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Contains accurate content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Shows evidence of proofreading (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Is at appropriate reading level (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Is at adequate level of detail (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates instructional skills (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
(If applicable) Shows creativity (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Other

*It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 13

Multimedia Course Materials

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

Overall Items.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Match with goals of course (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Accuracy of content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Currency of content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Production quality (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Interest level (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Attractiveness (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of length (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriate level of difficulty (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Clarity of organization (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

User friendliness (Comment:)	5	4	3	2	1
---------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Optional Items (If applicable)

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Permits interactivity (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Permits self pacing (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Provides branching options (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
--	---	---	---	---	---

Provides user feedback (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Provides accommodations for students with special needs (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---

Other

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 14

Tests

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Clarity of directions (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Match of content to course goals (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Legibility and layout (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Evidence of proofreading (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of length (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Clarity of items (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriate level of challenge (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Inclusion of higher order thinking (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Organization of content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Other

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 15

Class Assignments and Course Exercise Sheets

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor*
Supplements course content (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Provides clear directions (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Encourages meaningful learning experience (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Is at appropriate level of challenge (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Outlines assessment method (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Clearly states purpose (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Demonstrates instructor creativity (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Promotes student engagement (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Provides adequate time and resources for completion (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Other					

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 16

Instructor Comments on Student Work

For formative use: Focus on providing comments.

For summative use: Complete ratings and use comments to explain them.

Feedback is clear (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Feedback is legible (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Feedback is supportive of student efforts (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Constructive suggestions are provided (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Comments show consistency (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Comments are motivational toward further progress (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Comments show appropriate expectations for level of student (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Comments display content accuracy (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1
Amount of feedback is appropriate (COMMENT:)	5	4	3	2	1

Other

* It is important that groups using this form define their standards for what each of the descriptors in this row mean within their context on each item.

Appendix 17

The Faculty Interview*

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where did you do your undergraduate work? 2. Where did you do your graduate work? 3. What was your dissertation [thesis] on? 4. What department are you in here? 5. How long have you been on the faculty here? 6. What courses did you teach this year? 7. Which of those courses worked the best? 8. Tell me about your goals in that course? 9. What methods did you use to reach those goals? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. How were the classes conducted? b. What did students do to show you they had learned? 10. What is your philosophy of education? 11. How does this philosophy express itself in the way you teach? 12. How did you decide to become a teacher? 13. What do you enjoy most about teaching? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. What are the less attractive aspects of your teaching career? 15. How effective do you think you are as a teacher? 16. Can you remember a time when you departed from your usual method of teaching to try something different? 17. What did you learn from that experiment? 18. How did you learn to teach as well as you do? 19. How do today's college students differ from the persons you went to college with? 20. What pattern of relationships with students do you try to maintain? 21. What pattern of relationships with colleagues do you try to maintain? 22. Who is the most successful teacher here? 23. Why is this person so successful? 24. If you were not a teacher, what do you think you would like to be? 25. Would you like to tell me anything else about yourself as a teacher? |
|--|--|

* This interview schedule was developed for the College Center of the Finger Lakes by Dr. John F. Noonan, Virginia Commonwealth University. Most of these and many other questions can be found in "Personal Development and Professional Practice in College and University Professors," a Ph.D. dissertation presented to the Graduate Theological Union, Berkeley, by J. Wesley Brown and Robert C. Shukraft in June, 1971.

Appendix 18

Twenty-Seven Questions Directed to Teachers

Source: Steven R. Phillips and William H. Bergquist

General Description: One of the simplest ways of generating clarifying discussions about teaching is to ask questions. This exercise provides a number of questions that have proven useful in stimulating valuable discussions.

Instructions For Use: A number of questions about various aspects of faculty life are presented below. The leader should select those he feels would be most useful for the group he is working with. The questions may be presented one at a time for the participants to discuss in small groups or pairs or presented together so that each participant has time to reflect on each before discussing his responses with the others.

In addition to a number of the interview questions in Instrument Number Thirteen, the following questions are suggested:

1. How did you become a teacher?
2. Who was most influential in your deciding to become a teacher?
3. Have any of the teachers which you had as a student strongly influenced the way in which you now teach, evaluate students, relate to students, and so forth?
4. What would you most like to hear about your teaching from your students? From your colleagues?
5. What is the one criticism that you are most fearful of receiving from a student? From a colleague?
6. Imagine that you were just informed that one-half of the students enrolled in one of your courses are going to die at the end of the semester. You do not know which students will die. Would you change the way you are now teaching the course? How? Why?
7. If you were to leave teaching, what would you do?
8. If you were to teach another subject than your own, what might it be?
9. What do you like most about teaching? Least?
10. In thinking back to a recent class session that was particularly successful, what were the ingredients that made it this way? How would you cause this experience to happen again?
11. What is the best thing that could happen to you in a class? Worst?
12. How do you feel about the idea of having some of your colleagues visit your classes?

13. If you were given the task of training twenty new college teachers in your discipline, what do you think are the five most important things they should *know* about teaching to be effective teachers? What are the five most important things they should be able to *do* as effective teachers?
14. How valuable do you feel grades are?
15. What kind of activities take place in your classes? Why?
16. Do you think that you will be teaching five years from now? If you are going to be teaching, will any important changes have taken place in your attitudes toward teaching, or in the way you teach? What might these be? What are your reactions to these possible changes?
17. What is the one thing that you most want your students to learn?
18. If this were your last semester of teaching, would you do anything different? What?
19. Does any other teacher that you now work with have a significant influence on the way you teach? What is the nature of that influence? Why does this influence occur?
20. Are there one or two members of the faculty at your institution with whom you are likely to discuss your successes in the classroom? Your failures? Why these people?
21. What is the one thing you would most like to change about your teaching?
22. What is your greatest strength as a teacher? Weakness?
23. To what extent do you think that you can have a significant influence on your students? What is the nature of this influence? To what extent do you design your courses to minimize or maximize this influence? Are you happy with the amount of influence you now have?
24. What is the most important thing about teaching for you?
25. When students reflect back after ten years on courses that they have taken from you, what would you most like them to remember about you as a teacher?
26. What has been your most significant accomplishment as a teacher over the past three years? Your greatest failure? What, if anything, have you learned from these experiences?
27. What is the most important thing a student can learn from you?

Appendix 19

Instructor Self-Evaluation Form

Directions: Following are a number of statements describing aspects of college teaching. Examine the items in each set and rank them from 1 to 4 as to the degree to which they apply to your beliefs about teaching generally or your attitudes towards a course specifically. In responding, first examine the set and find the item that describes you or your course MOST, and assign a rank of 1 to that statement. Then decide which statement describes you or your own course second best, assign a rank of 2 to that item. Do likewise with the two remaining statements, assigning to them ranks of 3 and 4, respectively. If you find some items difficult to rank, show what your choice would be if you had to choose. It is important that you assign a different rank to each item and complete all sets in order to score the instrument.

Set 1

- _____ a. I present thought-provoking ideas.
- _____ b. I am sympathetic toward and considerate of students.
- _____ c. I assist students in appreciating things they did not appreciate before.
- _____ d. I am interested in and concerned with the quality of my teaching.

Set 2

- _____ a. My students feel efforts made by them in the course are worthwhile.
- _____ b. I am aware of students' needs.
- _____ c. I raise challenging questions or problems in class.
- _____ d. I make every effort to improve the quality of students' achievement in my course.

Set 3

- _____ a. I encourage students to share in class their knowledge, opinions, and experiences.
- _____ b. I help students become aware of the implications of the course's subject matter in their life.
- _____ c. I remind students to come to me for help whenever it is needed.
- _____ d. I analyze previous classroom experience to improve my teaching.

Set 4

- _____ a. I take an active, personal interest in improving my instruction.
- _____ b. I stimulate and answer questions in class.
- _____ c. I relate to students easily.
- _____ d. I help students to develop the ability to marshal or identify main points or central issues.

Set 5

- _____ a. I organize my course well.
- _____ b. I am knowledgeable about related areas aside from my own.
- _____ c. I stimulate students' appreciation for the subject.
- _____ d. I get along well with students.

Set 6

- _____ a. I restate questions or comments to clarify for the entire class.
- _____ b. I try to make every course the best every time.
- _____ c. I am sensitive to students' feelings.
- _____ d. I promote students' satisfaction in learning the subject matter

Set 7

- _____ a. My students gain new viewpoints and appreciations.
- _____ b. I have zest and enthusiasm for teaching.
- _____ c. I develop a sense of mutual respect with students.
- _____ d. I present clear and relevant examples in class.

Set 8

- _____ a. I find teaching intellectually stimulating.
- _____ b. I make students feel at ease in conversations with me.
- _____ c. I stimulate students' interest in the subject.
- _____ d. I answer questions as thoroughly and precisely as possible.

Set 9

- _____ a. I coordinate different activities of my course well.
- _____ b. I look forward to class meetings.
- _____ c. I enjoy having students come to me for consultation.
- _____ d. My students feel that they can recognize good and poor reasoning or arguments in the field.

Set 10

- _____ a. I try to function creatively in teaching my course.
- _____ b. I encourage students to participate in class.
- _____ c. I actively help students who are having difficulties.
- _____ d. I stimulate students' intellectual curiosity.

Set 11

- _____ a. I meet with students informally out of class when necessary.
- _____ b. I make the objectives of the course clear.
- _____ c. I try to make every course the best every time.
- _____ d. My students become motivated to study and learn.

Scoring the instructor self-evaluation form

The form has four scales. One statement from each set is associated with each scale.

Adequacy of Classroom Procedures.

Enthusiasm for Teaching and Knowledge of Subject Matter.

Stimulation of Cognitive and Affective Gains in Students.

Relations with Students

STEP 1 - Record the score assigned each individual item in each of the four areas.

STEP 2 - Total each scale's scores

Adequacy Scale	Enthusiasm Scale	Stimulation Scale	Relations Scale
<i>Score</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Score</i>	<i>Score</i>
Set 1-a _____	Set 1-d _____	Set 1-c _____	Set 1-b _____
2-c _____	2-d _____	2-a _____	2-b _____
3-a _____	3-d _____	3-b _____	3-c _____
4-b _____	4-a _____	4-d _____	4-c _____
5-a _____	5-b _____	5-c _____	5-d _____
6-a _____	6-b _____	6-d _____	6-c _____
7-d _____	7-b _____	7-a _____	7-c _____
8-d _____	8-a _____	8-c _____	8-b _____
9-a _____	9-b _____	9-d _____	9-c _____
10-b _____	10-a _____	10-d _____	10-c _____
11-b _____	11-c _____	11-d _____	11-a _____
Total _____	Total _____	Total _____	Total _____

STEP 3 - To interpret the results, consider the lowest total score to represent the area in this course or in your teaching generally to which you ascribe the highest priority.

Appendix 20

Constructive Criticism

What are the Essential Elements of Constructive Criticism?

Positive phrasing — provides a positive framework for the message.

Concreteness — is grounded in specific, observable behavior.

Action-orientation — gives the individual a specific plan of action to follow.

Focus — provides feedback on behavior that the individual can change.

When providing feedback to the teacher, it is important to follow the principles of constructive criticism. Constructive criticism is descriptive and specific; it focuses on the behavior rather than on the person and it is directed toward behavior that a person can change. Constructive criticism also is affirming in the sense that achievements and efforts toward change should be acknowledged, and suggestions for change should be made in a positive way. When giving constructive criticism one should always check to insure clear communication — verify that the receiver understands exactly what you are talking about. The examples below exemplify various aspects of constructive feedback.

‘The time and energy you devoted to the preparation of the class discussion questions is clearly well-received by the students; they do the work and are clearly interested in the subject. This is a definite plus. However, you might find that many of the detailed, fact-based questions that you asked in class might be given to the students ahead of time to self-test their comprehension, and emphasize higher-order, integrating questions in class discussion. This tactic would allow you to delve more deeply into the issues with the students.’

‘The case study discussion seemed to be very productive and most of the students participated with meaningful comments and good answers to your questions. Unfortunately, there didn’t seem to be enough time for closure, and I sensed that the students needed to have some resolution of at least the major issues in the case, especially since their mid-term is coming up soon. Since you are trying to keep to your schedule, it is probably impractical to resume the discussion in the next class, but one solution might be to prepare a handout to tie up some of the loose ends that you can give to the students next time.’

‘Your opening points of the lecture were very interesting and I could see how they were related to the day’s topic, but during the lecture the students seemed a bit confused about the connections. Perhaps you could write these points on the board or prepare them ahead of time on an overhead transparency so you could refer to them again during the remainder of the lecture.’

(Reprinted with permission of a school in the UNC system.)

Appendix 21

Guidelines for Providing Written Feedback

Written and verbal feedback should contain positive reinforcement of good teaching practices as well as suggest constructive changes. These statements help both the instructor and the Personnel Committee document what the faculty member does well in the classroom/lab. When offering suggestions for modifications or changes, the wording should indicate your interest in the recipient teacher's effectiveness in the classroom and should be sensitive to the fact that the written comments will be used in the personnel process. Constructive feedback for East Carolina University's peer classroom/lab observation has two purposes:

1. To help the instructor look at his/her behavior in the classroom without placing them on the defensive.
2. To provide basic information about classroom/lab behavior and activity which can be used by the Personnel Committee and the Chair in assessing, for personnel decisions, that faculty member's teaching.

The role of the observer is to collect data by observation in the classroom/lab not perform the evaluation of the faculty member's teaching for personnel decisions. Information and materials collected by the peer classroom/lab observation are one among several sources of information used by the Personnel Committee and the Chair to assess the quality of the faculty member's teaching.

Be as descriptive and specific as possible when writing the 'strengths' and 'recommendations' portions of the peer review forms as well as the narrative portions. The observation forms should be marked and written with care. Do not use jargon or vague words. Use active voice rather than passive voice. Look at the subject, verb, and object or complement for each sentence. Those three words should convey the sense of the sentence. Be careful about the adjectives and modifying phrases which you use.

Be descriptive (rather than evaluative) and specific (rather than general) when writing the 'strengths,' 'recommendations,' and the summary portions of the peer classroom/lab review forms. This will help those who will read your comments to gain an accurate picture of the class or lab.

Place your comments in context. This will help both the instructor and others clearly understand your meaning. Use examples to support general statements.

Make your comments collegial and professional.

Phrase your comments in a positive manner whether they are compliments or suggestions for change.

Begin the discussion and the written summary with a statement of ‘what went well’ or the ‘teaching strengths.’

Be careful when using adjectives or linking words or phrases (...but,... on the other hand) as the latter increase the ambiguity of statements.

Be sensitive to different teaching styles. Make recommendations appropriate for the teaching style.

Direct your suggestions or recommendations toward behavior the teacher can do something about. Suggestions that require resources or support which are not available, that require complete revisions of courses or major departures from the individual’s teaching style are likely to be neither helpful nor doable.

Be balanced and unbiased in your comments and recording of what occurred.