

# Peer Review of Teaching: A Manual for Peer Review at IU Southeast

**Sponsored by:**  
**Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence**  
**and**  
**Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching**

Updated: Robin K. Morgan, 2005  
Online Addendum: 2009

## Table of Contents

<b>Peer Review of Teaching: Background Information</b> .....	2
Principles Underlying Peer Review .....	3
What is good teaching?.....	4
What areas will peer review cover?.....	5
Is Peer Review Formative or Summative?.....	8
Issues Involved in the Co-Existence of Formative and Summative Assessment.....	10
<b>Campus Procedures</b> .....	11
The Brass Tacks of Being a Peer Reviewer.....	12
What should I do in my first meeting with the faculty member?.....	13
What should I not do?.....	13
How should I begin discussion of the observational data?.....	14
How do I give constructive criticism?.....	15
<b>Other Teaching/Learning Assessment and Improvement Methods</b> .....	17
Why use Student Focus Groups?.....	17
What is the Peer Reviewer’s Role?.....	18
Guidelines for Peer Reviewers.....	18
Reviewing course material: What should I look for?.....	18
What type of questions should the students be asked?.....	19
What is the best way to conduct the Student Focus Group?.....	20
What about large classes?.....	21
<b>Confidentiality</b> .....	23
<b>Selected Bibliography on Peer Review</b> .....	22
<b>Addendum 1: Proposed Peer Review Standards for Quality Online Classes</b>	
<b>Appendices</b>	

## **Peer Review of Teaching: A Manual for Peer Review on the IUS Campus**

According to Hutchings (1996) "...teaching, like other forms of scholarly activity, is substantive, intellectual work. That is, teaching is a matter not simply of method and technique (though these are the aspects of teaching that have received the most attention) but of selecting, organizing, and transforming one's field so that it can be engaged and understood at a deep level by students. Like scholarly research, our courses are acts of intellectual invention, and our teaching of those courses enacts the ways we think about and pursue our fields of study. Seen in this way, the work of teaching ... rightly belongs to and requires the attention of the community of scholars." Specifically, Hutchings outlines three 'corollaries' of viewing teaching as scholarly work. First, teaching is a 'process of ongoing inquiry and reflection.' That is, in order to continue to be successful, the instructor must 'step back and examine' what occurs in the classroom and the impact of our teaching on student learning. A second corollary to this view of teaching as scholarly work is the need for 'collegial exchange and publicness.' Peers are crucial for helping an instructor see what they do in the classroom from a more objective perspective. Finally, faculty members must take 'professional responsibility for the quality of their work as teachers.' Just as peer review is used to set standards in traditional scholarship, faculty members must set such standards in teaching or be content with bureaucratic standards set by bodies outside academe.

Peer evaluation of teaching is a practice that has become more prevalent over the last 20 years (Seldin, 1984). To be most effective, the peer evaluation process should be neutral, open, relatively unthreatening, and structured. Several factors are critical in ensuring a valid and fair peer review process. First, what questions are asked and answered by the reviewers is central. Some kind of replicable protocol is necessary to ensure fairness and accountability for the process. This is true for whatever data are being reviewed, whether course materials, classroom performance or student learning. Developing a set of questions to focus the reviewer can make the task less arbitrary and subjective. Second, the entire peer review process should be governed by a set of procedures established prior to any peer review. Finally, a training process ensures uniformity and eliminates some of the positive biases that have been shown to occur in

such evaluation procedures. Positive bias refers to the tendency of faculty members to focus on the more positive aspects of a fellow faculty member's teaching and to ignore or downplay negative aspects. This natural tendency must be addressed if the peer review process is to be of value in helping to improve the quality of teaching.

This document establishes the procedures and rationale for peer review of teaching for the IU Southeast campus. Peer-review is established for two principal reasons: First, a formative peer review supports faculty in becoming effective in instruction, both in classroom delivery and in preparation for classroom delivery; secondly, a summative peer review establishes, in part, performance for the purpose of evaluation in the promotion-and-tenure review process or evaluation for teaching awards.

#### **Principles Underlying Peer Review:**

- **Peer review plays a critical role in promotion, tenure, and professional development:** Peer review is widespread in academia. Faculty members regularly seek informal feedback from peers on their course topics, teaching methods, and outcomes. Typically, these requests are voluntary and not subject to evaluation for promotion, tenure, nor financial compensation purposes. Likewise, a formally implemented procedure for peer review has been found to be most effective when the faculty member initiates the review. The need for a more formal peer review process most commonly arises when a candidate applies for reappointment/promotion and/or tenure. The candidate's teaching needs to be evaluated at the department, school, and/or university level. Observation and evaluation of teaching by peers is recommended in the IUS promotion and tenure guidelines (IUS Faculty Manual). It is in the interest of the candidate to receive peer reviews in order to document teaching performance.

- **Peer review should also be available to those who ask for it, with special consideration for first-year, second-year, third-year, and P&T candidates:** Peer review is helpful to all who teach. It is especially useful for new faculty. Peer review is most productive when the faculty member requests it and when this process starts early in their teaching career. A formative peer review process beginning within the first year of the faculty member's teaching career allows the

faculty member to generate substantial improvement in teaching that can then be the basis for later summative evaluations. By starting the process in the first year, the faculty member has an opportunity to evaluate his/her performance, decide what steps need to be taken for further development, and if desired, request a second-year evaluation. These first- and second-year evaluations are most useful if they remain confidential and the property of the faculty member unless the faculty member wishes to share them with the department for his/her annual review or other similar purposes (Bernstein, Jonson, & Smith, 2000).

• **IU Southeast provides support of peer review of faculty through training of peer reviewers and logistical administration by the Institute for Learning and Teaching Excellence (ILTE).** Additionally, numerous workshops relating to improvement of teaching are offered through the ILTE and the Faculty Colloquium for Excellence in Teaching (FACET).

### **What is good teaching?**

Good teaching takes many forms. Perhaps one of the basic characteristics of good teaching is that students are learning. This learning, according to many experts, should occur in a positive, supportive environment rather than a negative, aversive environment. However, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the contribution of any single faculty member in relation to what a student has learned. Students enter the classroom with differing abilities, motivations, backgrounds and level of knowledge. End of course testing cannot differentiate what an individual faculty member has contributed to a student's overall knowledge level. Assessing these types of outcomes may best be done on a program level.

So, how can peer reviewers assess 'good teaching' at the individual, faculty member level? Chickering and Gamson (1987) offer seven principles based on research on good teaching and learning in colleges and universities. These principles are **not** about getting everyone to teach in the same way, it is about helping individuals to reflect on and evaluate their own approach to teaching. The list below incorporates not only the principles outlined by Chickering and Gamson, but also an eighth suggested by the recent literature on the assessment of student learning.

### **The effective teacher:**

- Principle 1: **Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning.**
- Principle 2: **Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning.**
- Principle 3: **Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners.**
- Principle 4: **Communicates and interacts effectively with students.**
- Principle 5: **Attends to the intellectual growth of students.**
- Principle 6: **Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.**
- Principle 7: **Incorporates learning beyond the classroom.**
- Principle 8: **Reflects on, monitors and improves teaching practices.**

In 1994, the American Association for Higher Education advanced the concept of peer review of teaching. The AAHE suggested that good teaching was more than simply focusing on the teaching behaviors of the faculty member but should combine inquiry into the substance of the course work with a careful investigation of what the students actually learned. With this model, peer reviewers focus on student understanding as an index of successful teaching.

### **Principle 1: Sets clear goals and intellectual challenges for student learning.**

- Is the depth and breadth of the material appropriate for the level of the course and the students?
- Does the faculty member emphasize a conceptual grasp of the material?
- Is the material selected by the faculty member appropriate for the specified goals and objectives?
- Has the professor clearly outlined his/her goals and objectives for the course?  
Would a student know?
- Are materials designed in a clear, logical, and appropriately structured format?
- Is there evidence of short and long term planning?
- Does the course syllabus reflect course policies?

Principle 2: **Ties course goals and objectives to the assessment of student learning.**

- Does the instructor have assessable learning objectives?
- Are the faculty member's course objectives reflected in course assignments and grading?
- Do daily course lessons and assignments aid the student in achieving final course objectives? Is this built sequentially?
- Are the evaluation techniques appropriate to curricular goals and objectives?
- Are a variety of evaluation techniques being used?
- Are assignments and exams directly related to curricular goals and objectives?
- How does the instructor assess to see if the learning objectives are being achieved?
- What procedures are used at the end of the semester to assess student learning?
- How does this course fit into the overall assessment goals of the discipline?
- How does the instructor utilize assessment information in teaching this course?
- If applicable, does the course meet the appropriate General Education category criteria and assessment guidelines?

Principle 3: **Employs appropriate teaching methods and strategies that actively involve learners.**

- Does the faculty member help students learn to apply what they are learning?
- How are the students reacting to the lesson?
- Are course materials logically organized?
- Is there sufficient time between assignments?
- Is evaluative feedback provided promptly?
- Does the faculty member keep personal problems outside of the classroom?
- What procedures are used during the semester to assess whether students are learning the material prior to a quiz or exam?

Principle 4: **Communicates and interacts effectively with students.**

- Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about teaching?
- Does the faculty member appear to be enthusiastic about the subject matter?
- Are the faculty member's interactions with students conducive to learning?
- Does the faculty member show interest in students and their learning?
- Does the faculty member communicate effectively (oral and written)?
- Is the faculty member's use of humor appropriate?
- Does the faculty member use effective active listening skills?
- Are course assignments returned promptly?
- Is confidential information handled ethically and with discretion?
- Does the faculty member recognize and deal effectively with crisis issues in students (e.g., substance abuse, suicidal behavior, and mood changes)?

Principle 5: **Attends to the intellectual growth of students.**

- Are the faculty member's goals appropriate for the level of the course and the students?
- Is higher-order learning or critical thinking a part of the curriculum?
- Are materials designed to challenge and stimulate students who quickly master basic goals and objectives?
- Is material previously learned incorporated into subsequent course materials?
- Are supplemental materials available when the students need them?

Principle 6: **Respects diverse talents and learning styles of students.**

- Does the faculty member recognize when students do not understand? How is this handled?
- How does the faculty member deal with students of diverse backgrounds?
- What accommodations are made for students with varied learning styles?
- Does the faculty member model respect for other faculty and students?
- Does the course syllabus provide information for students who may be having difficulty in the course?

Principle 7: **Incorporates learning beyond the classroom**

- Do assignments require students to apply material learned in class to their own life?
- Do class discussions make use of prior student learning?
- Are there class assignments that require students to work together outside of class?

Principle 8: **Reflects on, monitors and improves teaching practices.**

- What are the implications of the observed student behaviors for the faculty member's approach to teaching?
- What reflections does the faculty member report on the success of this course?
- How has this course changed as a result of assessment data and reflection?

These categories and questions are intended as an organizational framework and not a checklist. Modifications will be required to reflect individual differences among faculty and among courses. All peer review, however, should begin with a thorough review of course materials developed by the faculty member.

**Is Peer Review Formative or Summative?**

Formative Assessment

Keig and Waggoner (1995) describe formative assessment as information gathered for the purpose of improving and developing teaching. That is, the information obtained is meant to *inform* change. In order to accomplish this change, the feedback provided must be specific and concrete enough to suggest actions for improvement. Frequently, formative assessment is requested well before the end of a semester of teaching, so that the faculty member may use the information to improve teaching in the current course. For example, consider a professor who asks her students, halfway through the semester, to write a few sentences about how the current instruction has promoted or hindered learning. This faculty member has gathered information that she may now use to make teaching and learning more effective. The formative feedback process entails requesting information, making sense of the information, and implementing changes

based on the information collected. This process belongs to faculty members. They are responsible for making all decisions along the way. They may gather, analyze, and react to the information on their own; or they may decide to invite an instructional consultant to assist in this process. In the case of the professor whose students responded in writing to the current instruction, the faculty member chose the method of collecting data and, after reading students' responses, determined which of the issues would be addressed. Several other examples of formative feedback exist. Faculty may opt to conduct classroom assessment for the purpose of improving teaching. They may ask an instructional consultant to videotape their teaching in order to reflect on teaching development. They may invite trained facilitators to conduct small group "quality control" or "student focus group" interviews with students. Finally, they may ask a trained peer reviewer to provide feedback about a course. In all of these examples, only the faculty member who has initiated the formative feedback process need see the results.

### Summative Assessment

Cavanagh (1996) describes summative evaluation of teaching as a judgment about teaching that is used to make a decision—a decision about promotion, tenure, or, even, teaching awards. A summative evaluation of teaching attempts to *summarize* the complex phenomena of teaching. It typically consists of global ratings of teaching, thus, reducing teaching to generalities. An example of summative evaluation is end-of-course student ratings (SET's). Most SET's prompt students to rate six to ten aspects of teaching (e.g., organization, clarity, enthusiasm, etc.), and they ask students to make an overall, summarizing judgment of the instruction. Although some universities then average these ratings and provide them to faculty as summaries of their teaching, IU Southeast provides the raw data to the faculty members. Faculty members are then responsible for summarizing the data as they see fit and have complete control over sharing these data. Although at IU Southeast we have some choice (depending on your discipline) about the actual items on the instrument by which we are evaluated; we do not choose the time of the semester at which we are evaluated. In addition, most faculty members would argue that, if they wish to receive positive evaluations, the SET's must be included in annual reports and dossiers for reappointment/promotion and tenure.

On most campuses, it may seem that SET's are the ONLY type of summative data available to make decisions about teaching. Summative peer review, however, offers a viable addition to the use of SET's. Bernstein, Jonson, & Smith (2001) found that peer review led to increased student performance when the peer review led to the faculty member improving the quality of feedback to learners and when the faculty member appropriately raised the expectations of student performance. These types of results would definitely be of interest in summative evaluation.

### ***Issues Involved in the Co-Existence of Formative and Summative Assessment***

The distinctions just drawn between these two concepts exist at the definitional level; but in practice, the two are intertwined. Many faculty members may begin with formative assessment. Using formative assessment requires little risk and allows the faculty member to improve those areas of his/her teaching prior to any summative decisions being made. When a summative decision point is reached, it is not uncommon for faculty members to submit formative assessment reports to assist in the decision-making process. Likewise, the extensive training given to those who provide formative assessment has led to significant improvements in the quality of peer review. Providing the same training to those involved in summative peer review allows for a more fair and objective decision to be reached.

When a campus uses both formative and summative peer review, those who make decisions about a candidate and who might be involved in summative peer review at the time of reappointment/promotion and tenure should not be involved in that candidate's formative assessment. Unintentionally, early 'inadequacies' of the candidate uncovered by formative assessment may color the perceptions of the individuals if they are the same individuals who are making later decisions. One solution to this problem is to have formative assessment conducted by faculty members outside the candidate's discipline.

### **Campus Procedures:**

- **Initial Request:** Any faculty member desiring peer review simply contacts the ILTE. The ILTE will ask the faculty member if they prefer a formative (either topical or general) peer review or a summative peer review. When requesting a summative peer review, the faculty member will also indicate to the ILTE the administrative person to whom the summative report should be provided. In addition, the ILTE will request that the faculty member complete a brief questionnaire, available at the ILTE or on the ILTE website, which outlines what the faculty member would like to achieve with the peer review (A copy of this form may be found in Appendix D). If the faculty member requests a formative peer review, a list of three trained peer reviewers outside the faculty member's discipline will be prepared by ILTE. In the case of formative peer review, the ILTE will simply record that a request for formative peer review was made and that a particular peer reviewer conducted the review. The distinction between topical and general being that a topical review focuses only on one topic or aspect of a class (i.e. active learning) and not on the course at large. In the case of a topical review, the review will specialize in the area of review and when reviewing the syllabus and course, will focus on the appropriate components. In the case of summative peer review, a list of three trained peer reviewers will be prepared by the ILTE. Peer reviewers may be from inside or outside the school, but must be outside the discipline of the faculty member. As in the case of formative review, the ILTE will keep a list indicating the request for a summative review and the name of the person conducting the review. In addition, a copy of the summative peer review will be provided to the administrative person identified by the faculty member.
- **Selection of Peer Reviewer:** The ILTE will contact the first peer reviewer on the list to see if they are available. If the peer reviewer is available, the name of the peer reviewer is provided to the faculty member requesting the review. The faculty member must agree to the peer reviewer.
- **First Meeting:** Once the selection process is complete, the peer reviewer schedules an appointment to meet with the faculty member. During this meeting,

- the peer reviewer will explain the process of peer review and will request the course syllabus and course materials. A systematic review of course materials is an essential component of a thorough peer review. In addition, a copy of discipline-specific criteria used to evaluate teaching will be provided to the peer reviewer. A date is set for the peer reviewer to attend the faculty member's class.
- Class observation: More than one observation **may** occur at this point depending upon the needs of the faculty member and what the peer reviewer believes will be most valuable. During this observation, the consultant will be looking for several instructor behaviors, student behaviors, and evidence to support the instructional goals outlined by the faculty member.
  - Second Meeting: The peer reviewer schedules a second meeting with the faculty member to review observations and make suggestions for improvement. Suggestions may be made about course materials or about classroom issues.
  - Class observation: Once again, this **may** be one observation or two depending upon the faculty member and consultant.
  - Final Report Preparation: The peer reviewer prepares a report (see Appendix E for what should be included in a report). In formative reviews, this report will be given **ONLY** to the faculty member. In summative reviews, a copy of the report is also provided to the administrative person previously identified by the faculty member. -
  - Final Meeting: The peer reviewer meets with the faculty member to discuss the report and to make recommendations for continued improvement.

### **The Brass Tacks of Being a Peer Reviewer:**

#### ***What makes a good peer reviewer?***

First, and foremost, the literature suggests that faculty respect peer reviewers who have been recognized as outstanding teachers and who have been through a training process. Second, peer reviewers for this program will be required to engage in peer observations. The literature suggests that the primary characteristics of effective peer observers are closely related to characteristics of good teachers. An effective observer must:

- **Be sensitive** – must be able to empathize with the person being observed,
- **View teaching improvement** as an important objective of the observation process,
- **Be reflective** about his/her own teaching,
- Be a **good listener**,
- Have the ability to give advice – **constructive feedback**,
- Take the observation **process seriously** – carefully prepare for the observation, and
- Accept the **validity of differing teaching methods and styles**, even when they differ from his or her own.

***What should I do in my first meeting with the faculty member?***

During your first meeting, you will want to explain the process, allow the faculty member to ask whatever questions he or she may have, gather course materials, and prepare for the first observation. The following questions might be used to help prepare for the observation:

- *What are the goals for the class I will attend?*
- *What are your plans for achieving these goals?*
- *What teaching/learning activities will be taking place?*
- *Will this class be typical of your teaching style? If not, why?*
- *What would you like me to focus on during this observation?*

Be sure to schedule not only the date of the observation but also the date you and the faculty member will meet for feedback. This date should not be longer than two weeks from the date of the observation.

***What should I not do?***

There are many things to avoid. Most are self-evident, once you are aware of them. However, most of us will catch ourselves engaged in these errors.

- ***The ‘Halo’ Effect***

Allowing one positive factor, or prior positive feelings, to outweigh all other aspects of the assessment.

- ***The ‘Reverse Halo’ Effect***  
Opposite of the ‘halo’ effect. Allowing one negative factor, or prior negative feelings, to outweigh all other aspects of the assessment.
- ***Leniency***  
Being uncritical in order to avoid controversy or because you dislike conflict.
- ***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 performance.
- ***Going through the motions***  
Not taking the evaluation seriously, making up your mind in advance, or boredom.
- ***The Expert***  
Using your own teaching performance as criteria for judgment rather than agreed-upon evaluation standards. This is one of the most common problems when just beginning as a consultant. Be very cautious about absolute statements such as “you should never use overhead transparencies that way”.
- ***Gotcha***  
Using the evaluation for political purposes or personal revenge.

***How should I begin discussion of the observational data?***

The following questions are examples of the kinds of reflective questions that are often used. There are many other possibilities.

- *Did the lesson proceed in the way you had planned it? Why?*
- *Did the students react to the lesson in the way that you thought they would?*

- *What specific things did you do to help the students understand difficult parts of the lesson?*
- *Did you do anything that confused the students or made it difficult for them to understand the lesson?*
- *What did you do in the lesson to allow for individual differences in students' learning styles or abilities?*
- *Do you think your students learned all that you wanted them to learn in this lesson? What brings you to this conclusion?*
- *What did you do to encourage the students to participate actively in the lessons?*
- *What did you learn about teaching from this class?*
- *If you were to teach this lesson again tomorrow, what would you do differently? Why?*

### ***How do I give constructive criticism?***

#### Essential Elements of Constructive Criticism

- Give positive feedback first – begin by providing positive reflections to the faculty member. Your positive comments should be specific.
- Follow positive feedback with an opportunity for the faculty member to comment – After providing your positive feedback, allow the faculty member to tell you what they thought went well and what they thought did not go well.
- Positive phrasing
- Concreteness – comments should be grounded in specific, observable behavior
- Action-orientation – point out problem area (s), provide the faculty member a chance to comment about these problem areas, and together develop a specific plan of action to follow
- Focus – provide feedback on behavior the faculty member can change
- Affirmation – acknowledge achievements and efforts toward change

- Confirm the message – check that what you are saying is what the faculty member is hearing

Example:

*I was very impressed with the beginning of your lecture. Using the opening sketch allowed students to recall what you had covered in the previous lecture and gave students the opportunity to question you about anything that still needed clarification. I also like how you introduced the new material for the day. Using the story from the newspaper was a great way of getting students to engage and to set up the main points you wanted to cover.*

*What parts of the class do you believe went well?* Allow the faculty member to share. Then work into, *What parts of the class concerned you? What do you believe needs improvement?* Use this discussion to bring up your concerns as well. In most situations, the faculty member will address each of your concerns without your having to broach them.

### **Other Teaching/Learning Assessment and Improvement Methods:**

Obviously, peer review is not the only possible method to evaluate the effectiveness of a course. Peer review is a great way for a professor to discover how he or she can improve performance in the classroom. It is not very useful in determining what students like best or least about a particular class or program of study. Different methods (student questionnaires, focus groups, pre- and post-tests) may be used to obtain a more complete picture of the teaching and learning experience.

As part of the training procedure here at IU Southeast, peer reviewers may also be trained in facilitating **Student Focus Groups**. A trained peer reviewer interviews students using pre-selected questions from the faculty member designed to assess whether the students are learning what the faculty member intends.

A faculty member initiates this process with a request to the ILTE. Once such a request is made, a trained peer reviewer will contact the faculty member and schedule an appointment with them to review the process. During this initial meeting, the entire process is explained and the faculty member supplies the peer reviewer with the course syllabus, other appropriate course materials and explains course objectives. Just as in the procedures described under Peer Review above, using Student Focus Groups still begins with a systematic review of course materials prepared by the faculty member. Together the peer reviewer and the faculty member create a series of questions that address the concerns the faculty member has expressed. The creation of appropriate questions is one of the critical aspects of this approach. Questions should probe the breadth and depth of student understanding. A class time is scheduled when the peer reviewer will interview the students during class time. During the interview, the faculty member will not be in the class. Following this Student Focus Group, the peer reviewer will meet with the faculty member to report on the results of the interviews. A final report is written by the peer reviewer and given to the faculty member.

#### ***Why use Student Focus Groups?***

Directly interviewing students provides a greater sense of what students are actually learning, what impact various pedagogical techniques might be having on the students and what kinds of connections to other course material the students were able to make.

Many professors report that the information they receive from Student Focus Groups is richer and more directly relevant to their courses than the standard student evaluation of teaching forms.

***What is the Peer Reviewer's Role?***

Peer Reviewers must:

- Meet with faculty member to review course materials and to create questions for the Student Focus Group,
- Interview students,
- Meet with faculty member to report on results of Student Focus Group,
- Prepare and submit a summary report outlining the results of the Student Focus Group (See Appendix F for what should be included in such a report).

***Guidelines for Peer Reviewers***

- It is preferred that peer reviewers not be linked with faculty from their own discipline.
- On this campus, interviews are conducted with all students in the course.
- Total time for the interview should be at least 30 minutes but no more than 45 minutes.
- Peer reviewers should take notes regarding the tenor and substance of the student-interviewer discussions.
- The peer reviewer should attempt to ensure all students are heard and all opinions are equally weighted.
- It is best to conduct a Student Focus Group near the end of the semester, preferably when only three or four class sessions remain.

***Reviewing course materials: What should I look for?***

By looking through the sections above describing 'good teaching' and 'areas to cover,' you should develop a sense of what topics you would like to consider when reviewing course materials. Each course will differ and the goals each faculty member will have will differ. In spite of this, a few general questions should always be addressed:

- ***Goals/objectives:***
  - Has the professor clearly outlined his/her course goals and student learning objectives for the course? Would a student know?
  - Are lectures and assignments geared toward achieving the goals and objectives the faculty member has outlined?
- ***Assignments/lectures:***
  - Are materials designed to challenge and stimulate students who quickly master basic goals and objectives?
  - Are materials designed in a clear, logical, and appropriately structured format?
  - Is material previously learned incorporated into subsequent course materials?
  - Is there evidence of short and long term planning?
- ***Evaluation of Students:***
  - Are the evaluation techniques appropriate to curricular goals and objectives?
  - Are a variety of evaluation techniques being used?
  - Is the effectiveness (student success) of student learning objectives being evaluated?
  - Are assignments and exams directly related to curricular goals and objectives?
  - Is evaluative feedback provided promptly?

***What type of questions should the students be asked?***

Asking good questions is critically important. Some experts have stated that failure to ask appropriate questions is the most common reason for failure of these types of focus groups. Developing questions for the Student Focus Groups must be taken in two stages.

- ***Stage One:***

During your meeting with the faculty member, ask them what questions they would like you to ask the students. What concerns does the faculty member have about the course? What aspects of the course does

the faculty member believe are going well? What aspects do they believe are problematic?

Record all of these questions. Be sure that the faculty member has given you at least four to five questions that he or she would like answered.

- ***Stage Two:***

Prior to meeting with the students, take the questions the faculty member has provided, possible questions that have occurred to you, and the following list of questions:

- *What do you like most about this course?*
- *What do you like least about this course?*
- *What does the professor do that helps you the most in learning the material?*
- *Is there anything the professor does that makes it hard for you to understand the material?*
- *What would you like to see the professor do differently?*
- *Is there anything that other professors have done that helped you to learn?*

Rewrite all questions in an open-ended format. There might be one question that cannot be re-structured in an open-ended form. If this question is critical, keep it. If it isn't critical, omit it. Organize the questions so that you begin and end the Student Focus Group on a positive note.

It is recommended that you write the questions out on a sheet that you can take with you to the Student Focus Group. You may only have time for about five to six questions, so choose carefully. Prepare a few extra questions in case the class moves quickly.

***What is the best way to conduct the Student Focus Group?***

Faculty members using procedures such as the Student Focus Group conduct the interviews in a slightly different manner. The manner suggested here has been in effect on the IU Southeast campus for the past six years and has been

highly effective. To date, no problems have arisen with the approach. As we conduct more Student Focus Groups, we may discover variations that would increase our effectiveness.

- a. Prior to attending the class where you are to conduct the Student Focus Group, the faculty member should be asked to explain that a consultant working with the ILTE would be coming to the next class. Explain that the consultant is coming to discover how the class is going and what can be done to improve the class for future students. Request that the faculty member explain that the consultant will interview the students as a group while the professor will be out of the room. Also ask the faculty member to explain to the students that their comments will be confidential.
- b. On the day of the Student Focus Group, place the students into a circle around you. If the desks do not move, see if you can move the students into another classroom or go outside, weather permitting. If the class is over 40 students, see the procedures for large classes below.
- c. Begin the session by introducing yourself and asking the students if they know why you are there. If they cannot answer, give them the same information you had requested the faculty member to provide and emphasize the confidential nature of the proceeding (Do not assume the faculty member did not provide the information. Some classes won't respond to you at first and you will need to warm them up.). Specifically state that you will be taking notes but that you will not be giving the professor any detail about which student said what (if you don't know the students, use that as further evidence that you couldn't possibly reveal who said what).
- d. Start the actual interview with an easy, positive question. The nature of the question will vary depending upon the class. Gauge which students are responding. You will want to give all students a chance to respond so specifically ask students to respond when they do not

spontaneously respond. Even when most of the class seems to agree on a point, be sure to ask if there is anyone who does not agree.

- e. Frequently, after you ask one or two questions, the class will begin to volunteer information that answers questions that you have yet to ask. Don't stifle them. Provide responses that keep the conversation going as long as you are getting useful information. Don't worry if the students take the conversation into areas you didn't expect.
- f. When time is running out, be sure that students who have not participated have a chance to add any additional information. It is okay to turn to a student who has not responded and say, "I've noticed you haven't said very much. What is your reaction to how this course is going?"
- g. Finally, end the conversation on a positive note. A good final question might be, "What do you like best about this class?"

***What about large classes?***

For classes with 35 or more students, a different approach is recommended. First, prepare your questions in a written format with sufficient space between the questions for short answers to be written. Make enough copies for groups of five students plus a copy for yourself. On the day of the Student Focus Group, provide general information as a large group. Then split the class into groups of five students. Ask each group to select a spokesperson. Allow the groups about 15 minutes to talk about the questions you have provided. While the groups talk, walk among them asking them to explain more about a particular comment or to share an example of something they are discussing.

At the end of the group time (you may shorten the time if they are all done early), have the class reform into a whole. Try to put them in a layered semi-circle around you if at all possible. Ask the group spokespeople to share their answers. Have each spokesperson deliver one response then move to the next spokesperson until all responses are given. Encourage anyone who wants to add to the comments to do so.

## **Confidentiality**

### ***What do you mean by confidentiality?***

Faculty members need to feel confident that the peer reviewer is not sharing their opinions of a colleague's teaching in an unprofessional manner. Whenever you are a peer reviewer in a formative review, the information is completely confidential. This means that you, as the peer reviewer, do not reveal **who** you reviewed nor do you reveal any information about the content of the review. In a formative peer review, the written report is provided ONLY to the faculty member who has been reviewed. In a summative peer review, the written report is provided not only to the faculty member but also to the previously identified administrative person with the prior understanding that the information may be used for personnel decisions. Although less confidential, those seeking a summative review still have the right to expect that the peer reviewer will not be discussing their strengths and weaknesses in a casual manner.

### ***What if the Chancellor or the Dean asks whether a faculty member is seeking assistance?***

They won't. In the time the ILTE has been operating, no administrator has asked the ILTE Director to violate the ILTE policy on confidentiality. If this question arises, simply tell them that confidentiality binds you and they should speak to the Director of the ILTE.

### ***Can I write a letter of recommendation for faculty members who I have provided peer review?***

Of course. The letter, however, must not contain any information acquired through the formative peer review process. You could, however, include information obtained through a summative review process.

### ***Doesn't this policy penalize the faculty member?***

The literature is clear that formative assessment and summative assessment need to be complementary but separate. This is in the best interest of

the faculty. There is nothing to prevent the faculty member from utilizing the information from the peer reviewer's formative report to supplement their dossier.

It is recommended that the faculty member summarize the report and reflect on how this report led to their continued efforts at improving their teaching. Simply attaching the report is typically not seen as sufficient.

## Selected Bibliography

- Arreola, R.A. (1999). Steps in developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. Presented at the 24<sup>th</sup> Annual POD Conference in Split Rock, PA.
- Bernstein, D.J. & Edwards, R. (2001). We need objective, rigorous peer review of teaching. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(17)
- Bernstein, D.J., Jonson, J., & Smith, K. (2000). An examination of the implementation of peer review of teaching. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 83, 73-86.
- Cavanagh, R.R. (1996). Formative and summative evaluation in the faculty peer review of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education*, 20, 241-248.
- Centra, J.A. (1999). *Reflective faculty evaluation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z.F., (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. Racine, WI: The Johnson Foundation, Inc./Wingspread.  
[Available by contacting the Seven Principles Resources Center, P.O. Box 5838, Winona State University, Winona, MN 55987-5838; (507) 457-5020]
- Chism, N. (1999). *Peer review of teaching: A sourcebook*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Co.
- Cohen, P.A. & McKeachie, W.J. (1980). The role of colleagues in the evaluation of college teaching, *Improving College and University Teaching*, 28, 147-154.
- French-Lazovik, G. (1981). Peer review: documentary evidence in the evaluation of teaching. In Milliam J (Ed). *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hutchings, P. (1996). *Making teaching community property: A menu for peer collaboration and peer review*. Washington, D.C.: AAHE.
- Keig, L. & Waggoner, M.D. (1995). Collaborative peer review: The role of faculty in improving college teaching, *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 2*, Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.

- Killen, R. (1995). Improving teaching through reflective partnerships. *To Improve the Academy, 14*, 125-141.
- Millis, B.J. (1987). Colleagues Helping Colleagues: A Peer Observation Program Model. *The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development, 7(1)*, 15-21.
- Seldin, P. (1984). *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation: A Critical Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Shulman, L.S. (1995). The peer review of teaching: A framework for action: Three distinctions. *A Project Workbook*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

## Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

### Proposed Standards for Quality Online Teaching:

1. Detailed Syllabus
  - Instructor contact information (e-mail, phone/fax, e-office hours, etc)
  - Required textbook(s) and course materials: ISBNs
  - Course goals and instructional objectives/outcomes
  - Assignments (papers, exams, projects, etc) and due dates
  - Grading criteria
  - Disability statement
  - Expectations and penalties for academic dishonesty; be specific about whether and to what extent collaboration among students is appropriate
2. Orientation materials
  - Audio/video of professor welcoming student –personal contact
  - Detailed orientation to expectations of an online course
3. Interactive Learning Community
  - Interaction opportunities with instructor
  - Interaction opportunities with other students
  - Interaction opportunities with other students and instructor
  - Mandatory face-to-face activities should not be scheduled unless students are notified of such meetings at the time of registration.
4. Clear timelines for when to submit course assignments and expect instructor feedback
  - Should be one very early assignment to allow students to introduce self
  - Work should be paced throughout semester
  - Clear policies for accepting late work
  - Clear grading criteria
  - Specify when student should expect feedback from professor
5. Electronic media appropriate and current
  - As electronic media are considered for a course, the following questions should be considered:
    - Are the file sizes appropriate and download times worth the wait?
    - Are new web technologies adopted?
    - Is guidance given to assist students in using the tools?
    - Are audio clips and video clips supported by text for the disabled?
  - Copyrights?
  - Links current?
6. Equivalent in rigor, assessment and time commitment to face-to-face courses
7. Course materials professional in appearance and error-free
8. Assessment



Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

honesty, including plagiarism, are clearly stated in the syllabus.							
I.5 Netiquette guidelines for the course, including etiquette regarding discussions and email communications, are clearly stated.							
I.6 The self-introductions by the instructor are available and appropriate.							
I.7 Audio/video of professor welcoming students							
I.8 Students are requested to introduce themselves to the class.							

**II. LEARNING OBJECTIVES (COMPETENCIES)**

**General Review Standard:** Learning objectives are clearly defined and explained. They assist the learner to focus on learning activities.

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
II.1 Outcomes of course match outcomes in course catalog. Any additional outcomes used are observable, measurable, and achievable.							
II.2 Instructions to students on how to meet the learning objectives are adequate, clearly written, and easy to understand.							
II.3 Learning activities are relevant to course outcomes.							
II.4 Online learning objectives match learning							

Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

objectives in face-to-face courses over the same material							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**III. ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS AND COURSE**

**General Review Standard:** Assessment strategies are established ways to measure effective learning, assess learner progress by reference to stated objectives, and are designed as essential to the learning process.

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
III.1 Multiple methods of assessment measure the achievement of stated course outcomes and learning objectives.							
III.2 The grading policy is easy to locate and understand.							
III.3 Assessment and measurement strategies provide appropriate feedback to the learner.							
III.4 The types of assessments selected are appropriate for the learning environment.							
III.5 The gradebook tool or alternative communication method is utilized so that students may monitor their course progress.							
III.6 The methods used for submitting assessments are appropriate and ensure the privacy of student grading.							
III.7 Opportunity presented for students to evaluate course							
III.8 Formative assessment used to enhance course							
III.9 Grading criteria, rubrics, or work samples provided to students							
III.10 Clear policy on late work, illness, or missed work							
III.11 Work paced appropriately							

Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

throughout course							
-------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

**IV. RESOURCES AND MATERIALS**

**General Review Standard:** Instructional materials are designed to be sufficiently comprehensive to achieve announced objectives and learning outcomes and are prepared by qualified persons competent in their fields. (Materials, other than standard textbooks are produced by recognized publishers, are prepared by the instructor or distance educators skilled in preparing materials for distance learning.)

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
IV.1 The instructional materials have sufficient depth in content and are sufficiently comprehensive for the student to learn the subject.							
IV.2 Resources and materials are easily accessible to and usable by the learners including provision of ISBN numbers where appropriate.							
IV.3 The elements of the course-learning content, instructional methods, technologies, and course materials complement each other.							
IV.4 All instructional materials are presented in a format appropriate to the online environment.							
IV.5 All instructional materials are professional in appearance and error-free.							

**V. LEARNER INTERACTION**

**General Review Standard:** The effective design of instructor-learner interaction and meaningful learner cooperation is essential to learner motivation, intellectual commitment, and personal development.

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
V.1 The course design provides learning activities to foster instructor-student, content-student, and if appropriate, student-student interaction.							
V.2 The student requirements for course interaction are clearly articulated.							
V.3 Clear standards are set for instructor response and availability (e-office hours, turn-around time for email, grades posted, etc.)							
V.4 The course design provides a variety of opportunities for interaction between instructor and learner.							
V.5 Directions for contacting instructor are clear and specific (all contact information is clear and complete).							

**VI. COURSE TECHNOLOGY**

**General Review Standard:** To enhance student learning, course technology should enrich instruction and foster learner interactivity.

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
VI.1 The selection and use of tools and media supports the course outcomes and is integrated with texts and lesson assignments.							
VI.2 The selection and use of tools and media enhances learner interactivity and guides							

Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

	the student to become a more active learner.							
VI.3	The course includes a description of minimal technology needed by the student and contains links to any additional requirements such as browser plug-ins, media players or additional software.							
VI.4	The course technologies are economical and efficient.							
VI.5	Instructions for accessing course-required resources at a distance (Library, websites, etc.) are clear and easy to follow.							
VI.6	File sizes are appropriate and download times are worth the wait							
VI.7	All links are current							

**VII. ADA AND COPYRIGHT COMPLIANCE**

**General Review Standard:** Access to course resources is in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and U.S. copyright laws are followed.

<b>Specific Review Standards</b>	5	4	3	2	1	N/A	Notes/Recommendations
VIII.1 There is evidence of effort to recognize the importance of ADA requirements (such as equivalent alternatives to auditory and visual content, Web page links that are self-describing and meaningful, and information conveyed on Web pages in color is also available without color).							
VIII.2 No apparent violations of copyright law exist within the course content or related materials.							

Addendum 1: Peer Review on Online / Hybrid Courses

VIII.3 Campus Disability statement and link provided							
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

## Appendices

## Peer Review of Teaching — Evaluation Form

### I. General Information

**A. Course number and Title**

**B. Instructor**

**C. Reviewer**

**D. Specific Data on Course:**

1. Level (undergraduate, graduate, approved graduate credit)
2. Semester and Year
3. Average Student Enrollment
4. Course Type: Lecture, Laboratory
5. Is the course required?

### II. Evaluation of Course Content and Preparation

(see information provided by Instructor)

**A. Course Syllabus**

1. Are objectives and coverage clearly indicated?
2. Are topics, exam dates, etc., well defined?
3. Are course requirements clear (reading assignments, projects, etc.)?

**B. Examinations**

1. Type of exam (multiple choice, essay, short answer)
2. Is exam format appropriate to course materials, objectives, class size?
3. How rigorous are exams (average grades)?
4. Are exams fair (do questions cover main topics)?

**C. Teaching Materials**

1. Organization of handouts
2. Appropriateness and quality of visual aids
3. Computer programs
4. Other (special demonstrations or aids)

**D. Subject Matter of Course**

1. Does instructor present important information and concepts?
2. Are lectures and handout materials current?
  - a) **What percent of course is updated each time it is taught?**
3. Instructor's knowledge of subject matter and ability to explain material
4. Do lectures match course level and student ability?
5. Is the rigor and effort required of students appropriate to the course level?
6. Is the work required educational or "busy work"?

**E. Class Administration**

1. Are deadlines clearly defined
2. Does instructor grade and return exams or other assignments promptly?
3. Are students given the opportunity to discuss exam results or other assignments with the instructor?
4. Are course grading criteria clearly stated in the syllabus or other handouts?

**F. Special Class Projects (if required)**

1. Is there a clear description of each project?
  - a) **Are Objectives and the purpose clearly stated?**
2. Does the project enhance the lecture/lab learning experience?
3. What criteria are used for project evaluation?

#### **G. Other**

1. Use of guest lectures
  - a) **Are lectures appropriate?**
2. How does the instructor utilize and interact with the TA?
  - a) **Does the TA receive teaching experience?**
  - b) **Is the experience meaningful?**
3. Availability of Instructor for consultation with students
  - a) **Office Hours, time set aside before or after class, etc.**
  - b) **Does the instructor set up study or review sessions for students?**

#### **H. Evaluation of Laboratory Class Content and Materials**

1. Type of lab — demonstration or student exercises
2. Quality of handouts or lab manual
3. Are the materials, set up, and organization of the lab appropriate to the content?
4. Are the exercises of the appropriate length?
5. Are the exercises “cookbook” in nature?
6. Do the labs “work”?

### **III. Classroom Performance**

#### **A. Lecture Class Performance**

1. Are Lectures well organized and presented clearly?
  - a) **Is the purpose stated at the beginning?**
  - b) **Are topics presented in a logical fashion?**
  - c) **Are relevant examples used?**
  - d) **Are topics summarized and important points occasionally restated?**
2. Communication Skills (behavior, manner, etc.)
  - a) **Does instructor lecture at an appropriate rate?**
  - b) **Annoying mannerisms or speech fillers (“okay”, “um”, repeated gestures or phrases)**
  - c) **Nonverbal communication — what sort of image does the instructor project?**
  - d) **Does instructor present too casual or too formal an appearance?**
  - e) **How well does instructor react to students during lecture?**
3. Is instructor enthusiastic, stimulating, challenging?
4. Are visual aids (blackboard, slides, overhead transparencies, digital animations, etc.) well used and appropriately integrated into presentations?
  - a) **What types of visual aids are used and are they suitable?**
  - b) **Could improvements be made using other media?**
5. Does instructor handle questions well?

- a) **Are questions encouraged?**
  - b) **Does instructor limit questions when necessary (because of time, to prevent side-tracking, etc.)?**
  - 6. Does instructor interact well with students and encourage participation?
    - a) **Do students respond well to instructor?**
  - 7. Does instructor use alternate approaches to learning (other than lecture), e.g., demonstrations, participatory exercises, small discussion groups?
- B. Laboratory Class Performance**
- 1. Are opening remarks and instructions clearly presented?
    - a) **Are objectives and the significance of the lab clearly stated?**
    - b) **Is the approach to the lab enthusiastic and stimulating?**
  - 2. Are procedures suitable for the stated objectives?
  - 3. Are the labs properly supervised (by instructor or by TA)?
    - a) **Are students encouraged to put forth needed effort?**
  - 4. Is proper attention paid to safety matters?
  - 5. Are lab exercises and objectives integrated with course content and tied back to lecture presentations where appropriate?



*Department of Instruction and Teacher Education*  
**Peer Review of Teaching: Guidelines and Instrumentation**

**Faculty Data**

**Faculty Member Being Reviewed:**

**Peer Reviewer:**

**Date & Time of Observation(s):**

**Course Number & Title:**

**Class Size & Student Description:**

**Part 1: GUIDELINES for PEER TEACHING REVIEW**

Each of the categories listed below (Organization, Presentation, Student Engagement, Climate/Rapport, and Content) is to be addressed in the report of the peer review of teaching. The performances listed within each should be helpful in judging the quality of instruction and teaching evidenced by the instructor under review. The reviewer should comment on all relevant performances and others that support conclusions about the quality of teaching. The report on the PEER TEACHING REVIEW should be prepared using word processing software to allow the reviewer to comment at whatever length is appropriate. The instructor under review should provide the reviewer with any materials he/she believes demonstrate teaching behaviors in the categories described below or other important aspects of teaching, recognizing that the reviewer will gain most from in-class observations of the instructor and interactions with class members.

**Organization**

- Begins class on time
- Appears well-prepared for class
- States clearly the aims/objectives/activities of the class session
- Engages in a variety of organizational and preparation activities aimed at maximizing time available for instruction and facilitating student learning (*e.g., materials/props readily available, prior class review, provision of internal summaries & transitions, preview of session content & activities, etc.*)

## **Presentation**

- Speaks audibly and clearly, and without distracting speech characteristics
- Selects teaching methods appropriate to course content
- Communicates a sense of enthusiasm toward and interest in course content
- Incorporates various instructional supports (*e.g., video, slides, etc.*) effectively
- Recognizes and responds effectively to changes in student attentiveness
- Uses a variety of appropriate techniques to maintain student interest and attentiveness (*e.g., maintenance of eye contact, etc.*)

*Comments concerning instructor's organization & presentation:*

## **Student Engagement and Interaction**

- Explains clearly directions, procedures, and intended activity outcomes
- Allows sufficient opportunity for student input, discussion, questioning, and interaction with instructor
- Provides individuals constructive feedback
- Properly paces instruction, allowing sufficient time for activity completion
- Provides clear modeling and demonstration to all students
- Engages in a variety of teaching techniques aimed at engaging students (*e.g., providing sufficient session time & "wait time" during questioning, answers student questions clearly and directly, encourages & cues student response, etc.*)

## **Climate and Rapport**

- Knows students' names and responds to them as individuals
- Responds to student wrong answers/misunderstandings constructively
- Demonstrates effective listening behaviors
- Encourages student thought, participation, feedback, & student-to-student collaborative interaction
- Treats class members equitably and respectfully
- Admits error and/or insufficient knowledge
- Uses humor constructively

*Comments concerning instructor's ability to engage students & establish a positive learning environment:*

## **Content**

- Selects examples and illustrations clearly related to course content and student experiences
- Makes course content relevant by using authentic, real-world applications
- Explains new/difficult terms and concepts clearly and in multiple ways
- Integrates text and other course resource material into class session

- Establishes clear context for instruction (*e.g., provides necessary conceptual background; relates session content to prior & future content covered, to course projects/assignments, & to other views and fields of study*)

Comments concerning instructor's communication of course content:

## **Part 2: GUIDELINES for COURSE MATERIALS REVIEW**

The categories listed below should be helpful in judging the instructional materials you are reviewing. Each instructor under review should provide the peer reviewer a copy of the course syllabus, examples of instruments or techniques used to assess student performance, and examples of supplemental materials (print or electronic) used in the course. The reviewer should comment on all relevant performances that support conclusions about the quality of teaching. The report on the COURSE MATERIALS REVIEW should be prepared using word processing software to allow the reviewer to comment at whatever length is appropriate.

Besides the course syllabus, none of the other categories below are required in the COURSE MATERIALS REVIEW. The reviewer should consider the extent to which students use a variety of appropriate materials to support learning in the course, but should not assume that any specific type of materials is required. Different courses and content may require varying approaches to assess student learning. If tests (or examinations) are used, samples of the test should be provided to the evaluator. If assignments or performance assessments are used in lieu of traditional tests, the description of these tasks (as it would be given to students) should be provided. In both cases, sample student products and/or summaries of student performance would be useful evidence in the evaluation.

### **Course Syllabus**

The course syllabus should be professional in appearance and provided to students at the beginning of the course. Availability online is encouraged. Each of the areas listed below should be addressed.

#### **Descriptive Information**

- Contains accurate information about the course
- Contains information about the faculty member, e.g. name, office address, office hours, phone number, e-mail address

#### **Course Goals and Objectives**

- Includes a statement or description of course objectives
- Goals and objectives are appropriate, clear, and reasonable.

#### **Textbook or Required Resources**

- Identifies instructional resources like books, films and guest speakers

- Are clearly related to course objectives
- Are appropriate to course level

#### Course Requirements

- Assignments and due dates are listed
- Descriptions for all assignments are clear and well thought out.

#### Evaluation

- Describes evaluation procedures
- Provides clear and unambiguous explanation of how final grade will be assigned

#### Topics

- Outlines the sequence of topics to be covered
- Includes a class or activity schedule or calendar

#### Supplementary Reading Lists

- Contains relevant and current material
- Supplements course content

Comments concerning course syllabus:

### **Assessment of Students**

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 of unreasonable length

Examination(s)

- Address course objectives
- Appropriately assess course content
- Are of reasonable length

Comments concerning the assessment of students:

## Supplemental Materials

### Handouts

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

### Visual Materials (as in prepared transparencies or electronic presentations)

- Illustrate aspects of the content that are enhanced by visual representation
- Are clear and “graphically” illustrate the content
- Can be seen and read with ease everywhere in the classroom

### Use of Technology

- Makes appropriate use of technology
- Models effective practice

### Use of *Blackboard*

- Discussions are appropriate and include comments from professor
- Course documents are provided
- External links are included and relevant to course

Comments concerning supplemental materials:

## **Part 3: OVERALL CONCLUSIONS of the PEER REVIEW OF TEACHING & COURSE MATERIALS**

Considering both the classroom observation and the review of course materials, as well as any other information gathered including interviews or discussions with students, comment on the quality of instruction provided by the individual under review.

Comments:

## Classroom Observation Form Open Ended – (Form A)

Faculty \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Observation \_\_\_\_\_  
Peer Observer \_\_\_\_\_

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

### 1. Development of learning objectives:

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

### 2. Selection and use of instructional materials:

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

### 3. Educational climate for learning:

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

### 4. Variety of instructional activities:

- Does timing of classroom activities consider attention spans?
- Does instructor involve students in deciding what issues to discuss?

### 5. Preparation for class session:

- Provide examples that show preparation by instructor.
- Do students know what preparation (reading or other assignments) they should have completed prior to class?

### 6. Instructional methods:

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

- Were examples, metaphors, and analogies appropriate?
  - Was the lecture stimulating and thought provoking?
- 7. Opportunity for student participation:**
- List *students'* activities.
  - Does instructor encourage students to summarize and add to other' summaries?
  - Does instructor help quieter students interact with others?
- 8. Individualization of instruction:**
- Are the emotional, physical, and intellectual needs of students met?
  - Does the instructor prompt awareness of students' prior learning and experiences?
  - Does the instructor offer "real world" application?
  - Is the instructor available before or after class?
  - Does the instructor relate class to course goals, students' personal goals, or societal concerns?
- 9. Responsiveness to student feedback:**
- Is the instructor paying attention to cues of boredom and confusion?
  - Does the instructor encourage or discourage questions (dissension)?
  - Does the instructor provide students opportunity to mention problems/concerns with the class, either verbally or in writing?
- 10. Learning difficulties:**
- Does a student need assistance for a temporary or permanent disability?
  - Are one or more students not motivated or unable to follow the class?
  - Does the instructor show favoritism?
  - Are students able to see visual aids?
  - Does one group dominate discussion and hinder others' participation?

Taken from: [http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/peer\\_review/Clstrm\\_obs\\_A.pdf](http://www1.umn.edu/ohr/teachlearn/peer_review/Clstrm_obs_A.pdf)

**ILTE Peer Review Request Form**

**Requestor Information:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

School: \_\_\_\_\_

Course to be reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Day / time taught: \_\_\_\_\_

Location: \_\_\_\_\_

General Education Course:

\_\_\_\_\_ NA \_\_\_\_\_ Category I \_\_\_\_\_ Category II \_\_\_\_\_ Category III

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Review:**

\_\_\_\_\_ General Formative \_\_\_\_\_ Summative

\_\_\_\_\_ Topical Formative

Topic to be reviewed \_\_\_\_\_

**Additional comments or information you would like to provide:**

(Helpful information to include are things like if this is for third-year, FACET or required school review)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Mail to:**

Katy Wigley

ILTE

Library 219

---

**FOR ILTE USE ONLY**

Semester assigned \_\_\_\_\_ Semester to be completed \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer Assigned: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Entered \_\_\_\_\_

## **FACET/ILTE Peer Review Report**

Peer Reviewer:

Faculty Member Reviewed:

Dates of Classroom Observations:

Narrative:

Review of course goals and student learning objectives as outlined by faculty member. Be mindful of assessment mechanisms and grading rubrics.

If applicable, provide general education details (category, assessment mechanism, etc.)

Review of course materials provided to peer reviewer by faculty member.

Description of the first observation conducted by the peer reviewer.

Summary of feedback session to faculty member and what steps the faculty member planned on the basis of this feedback.

Description of the second observation conducted.

Summary of feedback session to faculty member and what steps the faculty member planned on the basis of this feedback.

Summary:

In this section, the peer reviewer should pull together the entire process. Interpretation is okay here but should be used sparingly.

Recommendations:

Based upon the entire process, what additional changes could the faculty member make?

Ranking:

For summative reviews only, provide a ranking of Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. This ranking should be consistent with the discipline specific criteria of the instructor.

## FACET/ILTE Student Focus Group Report

Peer Reviewer:

Course and Faculty Member Reviewed:

Date of Student Focus Group:

Narrative:

Review of course goals and objectives as outlined by faculty member.

Review of course materials provided to peer reviewer by faculty member.

Listing of the questions asked of the students.

Description of the interview process and the student reactions to the interview process.

Summary of student comments. No interpretation of student comments should occur in this section.

Summary:

In this section, the peer reviewer should pull together the student comments with their own impressions of the course materials. Interpretation is okay here but should be used sparingly.

Recommendations:

Based upon student comments and the peer reviewer's review of course materials, what possible changes could the faculty member make?

Ranking:

For summative reviews only, provide a ranking of Excellent, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. This ranking should be consistent with the discipline specific criteria of the instructor.