

# *Preparing for Peer Observation*

*A Guidebook*

*Prepared by  
The Center for Teaching Effectiveness  
Main Building 2200  
The University of Texas at Austin*

232-1776



## Why peer evaluation and peer observation?

In a memorandum dated May 3, 1995, President Robert Berdahl asked deans and department chairs at the University of Texas at Austin for their recommendations for all changes in academic rank/status for 1996-97. An attachment to the memorandum, *Guidelines for the Preparation of Supporting Materials and the Management of Candidate Files*, included the following information on page one under the sub-heading of TEACHING:

The department should provide a separate document assessing teaching performance, with an explanation of the evaluation procedures and measures used. The department's statement should discuss both student and *peer evaluations* and describe the faculty member's principal areas of teaching, his or her willingness to teach courses for which there is a strong student demand, and, as appropriate, the balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching. [Italics added.]

Peer evaluation of teaching is therefore an essential part of a faculty member's promotion and tenure file according to the University of Texas at Austin. Peer observation is one part of the evaluation of teaching for improvement or for personnel decisions for merit, promotion, and/or tenure.

## What aspects of teaching are faculty peers most qualified to evaluate?

Cohen and McKeachie (1980) identified ten aspects of teaching that peers are most competent to evaluate

about teaching. Articles on peer evaluation of teaching suggest that all of these aspects can be used during the peer review process:

- Mastery of course content
- Selection of course content
- Course organization
- Appropriateness of course objectives
- Appropriateness of instructional materials (i.e. readings, media)
- Appropriateness of evaluative devices (i.e., exams, written assignments)
- Appropriateness of methodology used to teach specific content areas
- Commitment to teaching and concern for student learning
- Student achievement, based on performance on exams and projects
- Support of departmental instructional efforts

A review of these aspects is facilitated by a teaching portfolio prepared by the instructor and made available to peer observers. A pamphlet entitled *Preparing a Teaching Portfolio* is also available at the Center for Teaching Effectiveness. In addition, peer evaluation to improve teaching or a summative peer evaluation process can include a series of classroom observations of one instructor by faculty peers and/or administrators.

## What is peer observation?

The process of peer observation involves faculty peers that review an instructor's performance through classroom observation and examination of instructional materials and course design. Observations of classroom behavior are intended for reviewing the teaching process and its

possible relationship to learning. The focus is on verbal and nonverbal behaviors of both the instructor and the students in the classroom.

Peer observation can produce the following evidence:

- Comments on the relationship between instructor acts and student behaviors
- Comparison with methods peers consider to be good
- Specific suggestions for instructors to improve teaching

The processes of observation and evaluation require a very high degree of professional ethics and objectivity. Effective peer observation requires training in observational and analytical skills. Less subjective peer observations require time for multiple reviews.

The major strengths of peer observation are:

- Peers are familiar with college goals, priorities, values, faculty problems
- Peer observation helps faculty upgrade their own profession
- Peer observers can be chosen from instructor's content area

The major weaknesses of peer observation are:

- Data is often biased due to previous data, personal relationships, peer pressure
- Peer relationships may suffer
- Possible bias due to observer's preference for own teaching methods

All things considered, key authors on peer observation agree that peer observation of classroom teaching is one useful part of a peer evaluation process.

## What are two purposes of peer observation?

Peer observations may be used for both formative feedback, for the improvement of instruction, and summative assessment for making personnel decisions. Braskamp and Ory (1994, p. 202) stated in *Assessing Faculty Work* that:

Peer observations are particularly useful in a program of faculty self-assessment and improvement. Instructors who wish to analyze their own teaching and student learning can benefit from a colleague's observation. Such classroom observations can be flexible and informal. In contrast, observations for personnel decision making need to be more formalized and standardized to ensure fairness, reliability, and credibility. Several trained colleagues making independent visits provide more credible summative assessment information than does one untrained colleague making a single visit.

### Formative peer observation

is the process of faculty members attending and observing peers in the classroom to assist with the **improvement of teaching**. This process may be specified by the department as a part of faculty development activities or entered into by individual faculty members who want their teaching reviewed by peers.

The formative peer observation process is most important for junior faculty as a part of the teaching improvement process in the years before tenure and promotion review. This process can prepare junior faculty early for their career teaching demands. Longitudinal studies of junior faculty stress that early teaching demands often become overwhelming and can prevent the

expected devotion to quality research and service. Early intervention provides junior faculty with the tools for success in teaching as well as research and service.

**Summative peer observation** involves the **evaluation** of peer classroom behavior to provide teaching effectiveness information used for merit, promotion, and/or tenure decisions. Typically, Ad Hoc Committees on Teaching consisting of senior faculty members, junior faculty members, graduate and/or upper-level undergraduates meet individually with the instructor to be observed. The instructor and committee members review all teaching materials i.e., course materials, syllabi, exams, teaching aides, student evaluations, student advising records, and even face-to-face talks with students to obtain a complete picture of teaching **before** entering the classroom for an observation.

As indicated above, the committee approach to the observation process is somewhat different for formative and summative peer observation. Despite the differences in the processes and the objectives of the two processes, key authors believe that the development and use of an effective formative peer observation process leads naturally to a fair, objective summative peer observation process. Certainly the observation instruments developed for formative peer observation can be used for summative review in many cases. Observer skills developed in formative peer observations will be directly applicable to a summative peer evaluation process.

Although the outcomes of

formative and summative observation are different, effective formative peer observation serves as a vehicle for effective summative peer observation and evaluation at the departmental level. Most authors believe that the two processes are compatible and mutually supportive of faculty involvement in either formative or summative peer observation.

### **How do you choose or design a peer observation instrument?**

Following guidelines established by the department or school will ease many feelings of misgiving about the peer observation process. An organizational plan that includes both a set of departmental observation forms and a departmental or division Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching, helps validate the peer observation process with all faculty. The three most common ways to document or guide formative or summative peer observations are: checklists, rating scales, and written analyses.

### **Types of Instruments:**

Peer evaluations of a faculty member's classroom behavior can be based on checklists, rating scales, and/or written analyses. Each type of document has its strong and weak points as a format for peer observation.

**Checklists** focus the observer's attention during the observation and also, the instructor reviews the checklist before the classroom visit to understand observation expectations. Checklists are often viewed as too restrictive by both observers and those observed. Checklists also only

indicate that a behavior has been observed with no feedback about the effectiveness or lack of effectiveness of a specific behavior. Checklists are similar to rating scales with no scoring involved. A checklist can be created from a rating scale form by deleting the scale and asking the observers to record observed behaviors. *See pages 14-23.*

**Rating scales** also focus the attention of the observer and the instructor but add the dimension of indicating relative effectiveness of a given behavior. All rating sheets need to include behavior descriptors and an explanation of the scale points. All instruments must be clearly relevant to the classroom teaching situation. Checklists and rating sheets include specific language for instructors to react to or take action on. *See pages 14-23.*

The **written analysis** format affords an open-ended opportunity for a peer not only to select what to observe, but also, how to interpret the information and structure the evaluation. The down side to written appraisals is that peers can comment on very limited behaviors, focus only on one criteria, or reflect only the observer's personal approach to teaching. *See page 24.*

It is suggested that a combination of checklist, rating sheet, and written analysis formats be adopted and used for formative and summative observations. All observation forms should yield accurate insights into the classroom environment and obtain data typical of classroom behavior. *See pages 14-24.*

*One checklist, rating sheet, or*

*written analysis form is not likely to cover all teaching demands in any one department.* For example, one form is not likely to address teaching a large lecture class, teaching a special projects class, and teaching a laboratory class. Some of the same variables may appear in all three teaching situations, but each environment has specific teaching demands that the others do not.

### **Formative Peer Observation Process**

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

### Master Faculty Program

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

### Mentor-Mentee Relationships

Roles played by mentors include friendship for emotional and personal support, career guidance for

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

- Only a handful of new hires found useful mentoring on their own. They also tended to teach cautiously by emphasizing facts and principles over active student involvement.
- It was not necessary to pair new faculty members only with senior members from the same department. The pairing of junior faculty members and mentors from other departments was equally effective.
- Useful mentoring did not depend on pairs picking each other. Assigning mentors was equally effective. It was often necessary, however, to prompt pairs to meet regularly until meeting became habitual.
- Although mentoring was generally beneficial, many mentors were reluctant to give advice to new faculty on teaching, scholarly productivity, and time management. Thus, mentoring was not without its deficiencies.

Master Faculty and mentor-mentee programs are very similar in organization, but mentors are not necessarily designated as “master teachers” and may be chosen directly

by the mentees for reasons other than teaching expertise.

### Peer Development Triads

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

### Graduate Student Feedback

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

### Small Group Instructional Diagnosis

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

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

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

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

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

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

### Appraisal Interview

The appraisal interview is used by chairs who want to discuss a teaching problem with an instructor. First the chair needs to create a supportive environment for the interview and begins with questions about how things are going in general. The chair may share some insights from her/his classroom observations to offer encouraging

comments about the instructor's practices. Then the chair asks whether the instructor is having any difficulties. If the instructor does not mention difficulties, the chair then can refer to information taken from their own classroom observations or problems raised by students. Finally, the chair asks how she/he or the department can help the instructor solve the problem. The appraisal interview must be handled carefully and more than one meeting may be required to bring about the necessary modifications. The primary objective of any type of formative observation process is improvement of teaching.

### **Summative Peer Observation Process**

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

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

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

### **Protocol for Summative Peer Observation Committee Members**

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

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

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

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

exposure for the observer or the observed instructor.

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

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

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

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

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

and the possible effect of these factors on observation results.

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

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

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

It is recommended that peer classroom observations be used as simply one part of the larger picture with regard to evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Do not give peer observations undue weight in summative evaluations for the following reasons:

- Limited amount of time observed

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

### **What are some recommendations for institutional use of peer observations?**

Braskamp and Ory (1994, pp. 205-206) list the following suggestions for adopting peer observation:

- Training observers is highly recommended; training helps instructors focus on desired criteria and learn how to observe correctly. The Center for Teaching Effectiveness can provide such training.
- Departments may wish to rotate annually the responsibilities of peer observation among eligible faculty; however small departments will have difficulty in this regard. Alternatively, academic officers can select several observers from the list of recommended potential observers nominated by the instructor. Observations by more than one colleague are recommended, since all faculty, quite naturally, rely on their own experiences, values, and definitions of effective teaching in making assessments.
- All faculty should be informed of the observation process before implementation in order to ensure that all observations are conducted in a similar fashion. *At least*

*three* classroom observations for a given class over a single semester or quarter are recommended to ensure adequate representation; observation evidence often is suspect if only one classroom visit is made.

- Classroom visits can be both announced and unannounced, depending on local practice and policy. Unannounced visits can result in the evaluator showing up on the day of a film, exam, or field trip. One strategy is to have the instructor select six class periods for which evaluation visits would be most appropriate.
- Peer observations can be completed annually, every other year, prior to application for promotion and tenure, or on a regular, ongoing basis. Departments must consider faculty availability and willingness to observe in determining an observation policy.
- Each observer can highlight similarities and differences by writing summary reports. Descriptive reports, focusing on agreed-upon tools and behaviors and including specific examples of instructor and student behaviors are recommended. The summary is more balanced and fair if it contains both positive and negative observations. Judgments of effectiveness, as well as descriptions of the work, provide the most complete portrayal of the instructor's effectiveness.

### **If your department wants to develop peer observation as a part of peer evaluation, what should you do?**

Suggestions for developing a peer observation process as part of the peer evaluation process in your department are:

- Poll departmental faculty to ascertain their expertise with peer observation; general

attitudes toward peer observation, mentoring, and improvement of teaching; desire to participate

- Confer with in-house instructional experts and/or master teachers
- Establish a departmental Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching to begin research into peer observation for formative and summative purposes
- Talk with consultants at the Center for Teaching Effectiveness about form and process development and training for peer observers
- Inquire into peer observation activities of other departments/colleges on campus
- Inquire into peer observation activities of other departments/colleges on other campuses nationwide
- Review this pamphlet and resources listed
- Check discipline specific educational journals and texts for peer observation articles
- Develop departmental peer observation forms and a process for formative and summative observation
- Establish a departmental policy for formative and summative peer observation and evaluation
- Train faculty members prior to classroom visits
- Review the peer observation forms after preliminary trial observations, make changes, and retest the improved forms
- Establish a training schedule for peer observers on a one or two year cycle so that new or incoming faculty or administrators receive observation training

## References:

Bennett, W.E. (1987) "Small Group Instructional Diagnosis: A Dialogic Approach to Instructional Improvement for Tenured Faculty." *The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 5(3), 100-104.

Boice, Robert (1992) *The New Faculty Member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Braskamp, Larry A., Brandenburg, Dale C., and Ory, John C. (1984) *Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness: A Practical Guide*. Beverly Hills; Sage Publications, Inc.

Braskamp, Larry A. and Ory, John C. (1994) *Assessing Faculty Work: Enhancing Individual and Institutional Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cohen, P.S. and McKeachie, W.J. (1980) "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching." *Improving College and University Teaching*, 28, 147-154.

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

Katz, J. and Henry, M. (1988) *Turning Professors into Teachers: A New Approach to Faculty Development and Student Learning*. New York: Macmillan.

Millis, Barbara J. (1987) "Colleagues Helping Colleagues: A Peer Observation Program Model." *The Journal of Staff, Program, and Organization Development*, 7(1), 15-21.

Seldin, Peter (1984) *Changing Practices in Faculty Evaluation: A Critical Assessment and Recommendations for Improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

See *Bibliography on pages 26 - 28* for more extensive readings on peer observation and evaluation.

## *Appendices*

## Classroom Observation Report

Instructor evaluated \_\_\_\_\_ Course \_\_\_\_\_  
Number of students present \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Evaluator(s) \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

It is suggested that the observer(s) arrange a previsit and postvisit meeting with the instructor.

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

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

Would you recommend this instructor to students you are advising?

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

Did you have a previsit conference? \_\_\_\_\_ postvisit conference? \_\_\_\_\_

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

## Classroom Observation Worksheet

**Instructor** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_ **Observer** \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Below is a list of instructor behaviors that may occur within a given class or course. Please use it as guide to making observations, not as a list of required characteristics. When this worksheet is used for making improvements to instruction, it is recommended that the instructor highlight the areas to be focused on before the observation takes place.

Respond to each statement using the following scale:

*Not observed*

1

*More emphasis  
recommended*

2

*Accomplished  
very well*

3

Circle the number at the right that best represents your response. Use the comment space below each section to provide more feedback or suggestions.

**Content Organization**    *Not observed*    *More emphasis*    *Accomplished very well*

- |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| 1. Made clear statement of the purpose of the lesson       | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2. Defined relationship of this lesson to previous lessons | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3. Presented overview of the lesson                        | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 4. Presented topics with a logical sequence                | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 5. Paced lesson appropriately                              | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 6. Summarized major points of lesson                       | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 7. Responded to problems raised during lesson              | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 8. Related today's lesson to future lessons                | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Comments:

<b>Presentation</b>	<i>Not observed</i>	<i>More emphasis</i>	<i>Accomplished very well</i>
9. Projected voice so easily heard	1	2	3
10. Used intonation to vary emphasis	1	2	3
11. Explained ideas with clarity	1	2	3
12. Maintained eye contact with students	1	2	3
13. Listened to student questions & comments	1	2	3
14. Projected nonverbal gestures consistent with intentions	1	2	3
15. Defined unfamiliar terms, concepts, and principles	1	2	3
16. Presented examples to clarify points	1	2	3
17. Related new ideas to familiar concepts	1	2	3
18. Restated important ideas at appropriate times	1	2	3
19. Varied explanations for complex and difficult material	1	2	3
20. Used humor appropriately to strengthen retention & interest	1	2	3
21. Limited use of repetitive phrases & hanging articles	1	2	3

Comments:

<b>Instructor-Student Interactions</b>	<i>Not observed</i>	<i>More emphasis</i>	<i>Accomplished very well</i>
22. Encouraged student questions	1	2	3
23. Encouraged student discussion	1	2	3
24. Maintained student attention	1	2	3
25. Asked questions to monitor students' progress	1	2	3
26. Gave satisfactory answers to student questions	1	2	3
27. Responded to nonverbal cues of confusion, boredom, & curiosity	1	2	3
28. Paced lesson to allow time for note taking	1	2	3
29. Encouraged students to answer difficult questions	1	2	3
30. Asked probing questions when student answer was incomplete	1	2	3
31. Restated questions and answers when necessary	1	2	3
32. Suggested questions of limited interest to be handled outside of class	1	2	3

Comments:

<b>Instructional Materials and Environment</b>	<i>Not observed</i>	<i>More emphasis</i>	<i>Accomplished very well</i>
--	---------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

33. Maintained adequate classroom facilities	1	2	3
34. Prepared students for the lesson with appropriate assigned readings	1	2	3
35. Supported lesson with useful classroom discussions and exercises	1	2	3
36. Presented helpful audio-visual materials to support lesson organization & major points	1	2	3
37. Provided relevant written assignments	1	2	3

Comments:

<b>Content Knowledge and Relevance</b>	<i>Not observed</i>	<i>More emphasis</i>	<i>Accomplished very well</i>
--	---------------------	----------------------	-------------------------------

38. Presented material worth knowing	1	2	3
39. Presented material appropriate to student knowledge & background	1	2	3
40. Cited authorities to support statements	1	2	3
41. Presented material appropriate to stated purpose of the course	1	2	3
42. Made distinctions between fact & opinion	1	2	3
43. Presented divergent view-points when appropriate	1	2	3
44. Demonstrated command of subject matter	1	2	3

Comments:

45. What overall impressions do you think students left this lesson with in terms of content or style?

46. What were the instructor's major strengths as demonstrated in this observation?

47. What suggestions do you have for improving upon this instructor's skills?

Source: *A Guide for Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*, by Centra, Froh, Gray, & Lambert. Permission granted by Center for Instructional Development, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y., 1976. All rights reserved.

## Drama 301L - Feedback/Evaluation Form

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_ Meeting time: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting place: \_\_\_\_\_

Class size: #Women \_\_\_\_\_ #Men \_\_\_\_\_

General Atmosphere	Excellent						Poor
1. Discipline (students arrive on time and get down to business)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(students appear prepared for class)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(students attentive during class scene presentations)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(class begins and ends on time)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Instructor's rapport with the class is ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
_____	Very clear					Not given	
3. Objectives for the class session are...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Assignment for next class is ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
___ provided in a handout ___ on board ___ not written down							

Student Actors	Excellent						Poor
1. Preparation of environment for scene (props, mood, costumes, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Ability to perform unit changes							
— physical changes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
— emotional changes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Students' ability to make characters believable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Student focus during scene...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Lines..... - delivery	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
- memorization	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Dynamics of the scene (dramatic peaks)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

### Instructor's Critique of Scenes

1. Topics critiqued (please check those which were critiqued by the instructor)							
___ Quality of line learning	___ Use of environment	___ Facial expressions					
___ Development of character	___ Use of movement	___ Other (please list)					
_____	Excellent					Poor	
2. Instructor's use of positive feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. "Two run-through"							
— critique of lines was ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
— critique of development of character was	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. | Instructor's use of constructive criticism was...   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | Instructor's encouragement of criticism/comments by other students was...   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | Instructor's ability to include entire class in his/her comments was ... (i.e., instructor doesn't just talk to the actors) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Drama Feedback Evaluation Form -

Page2

<u>Discussion Process</u>	<u>Excellent</u>						<u>Poor</u>
1. Ability of students to critique concisely was.....	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Instructor's use of questions to prompt discussion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Instructor's ability to state questions clearly was ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Instructor's insistence on/and use of objectivity in the critiques was ...	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Diagram of Discussion Process

**Directions:** Make a “map” of the students in the class (i.e., where they are sitting) using a box or circle for each student. Identify them by a number and sex (e.g., 1-F, 2-M, 3-M, etc.). Then, whenever a student participates, place a tally mark under the coded box [1-F].

Comments:

*(This form was developed to observe and evaluate students, but the format lends itself to observation of instructor behaviors and student-instructor interactions in a classroom. )*

Form used by permission, developed by Karron G. Lewis, Center for Teaching Effectiveness and Marian Hampton and Bernie Engel, Department of Theatre & Dance at The University of Texas at Austin.

### Classroom Teaching Observation

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

**CONTENT**

Main ideas are clear and specific	1	2	3	4	5	(Excellent)
Sufficient variety in supporting information	1	2	3	4	5	
Relevancy of main ideas was clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Higher order thinking was required	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge	1	2	3	4	5	
Definitions were given for vocabulary	1	2	3	4	5	

**ORGANIZATION**

Introduction captured attention	1	2	3	4	5	(Excellent)
Introduction stated organization of lecture	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective transitions (clear w/summaries)	1	2	3	4	5	
Clear organizational plan	1	2	3	4	5	
Concluded by summarizing main ideas	1	2	3	4	5	
Reviewed by connecting to previous classes	1	2	3	4	5	
Previewed by connecting to future classes	1	2	3	4	5	

**INTERACTION**

Instructor questions at different level	1	2	3	4	5	NA (Excellent)
Sufficient wait time	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Students asked questions	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor feedback was informative	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Instructor incorporated student responses	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Good rapport with students	1	2	3	4	5	NA

**VERBAL/NON-VERBAL**

Language was understandable	1	2	3	4	5	(Excellent)
Articulation and pronunciation clear	1	2	3	4	5	
Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5	
Instructor spoke extemporaneously	1	2	3	4	5	
Accent was not distracting	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Effective voice quality	1	2	3	4	5	
Volume sufficient to be heard	1	2	3	4	5	
Rate of delivery was appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	
Effective body movement and gestures	1	2	3	4	5	
Eye contact with students	1	2	3	4	5	
Confident & enthusiastic	1	2	3	4	5	

**USE OF MEDIA**

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

Classroom Teaching Observation Form

Page 2

**SPECIAL CLASSIFICATION NOTES:**

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

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

**OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS RATING** 1 2 3 4 5

Date of Conference \_\_\_\_\_ Observer Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Form used by permission, E. Porter, D.K. Meyer & A.S. Hagen. *The Journal of Staff, Program, & Organization Development*, Vol.12, No.2, Fall 1994, pp.104-105.

## Report of Classroom Observation

**Instructor:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Course:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Number of students present:** \_\_\_\_\_ **Date:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Observer(s):** \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Several days prior to the classroom observation, the instructor should provide the observer(s) with a copy of the course syllabus containing course objectives, content, and organization. The instructor should explain to the observers(s) the instructional goals and methods of accomplishing them for the class that will be observed.

Within three days after the visit, the observer(s) should meet with the instructor to discuss observations and conclusions.

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

1. Describe the lesson taught, including the subject, objectives, and methods used.
2. Describe the instructor's teaching as it related to content mastery, breadth, and depth.
3. How well organized and clear is the presentation?
4. How appropriate were the teaching techniques used for the instructor's goals for this class?
5. Describe the level of student interest and participation.
6. What are the instructor's major strengths? Weaknesses?
7. What specific recommendations would you make to improve the instructor's classroom teaching?

## *Bibliography*

## Bibliography for Peer Observation & Evaluation

Arreola, R. A. "Defining and Evaluating the Elements of Teaching." In W. Cashin (Ed.) *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Academic Chairperson's Conference*, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, Kansas State University, Spring, 1989, 32, 3-12.

Arreola, R. A. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Co., 1995.

Baldrige, J. V., Kemerer, F., and Associates. *Assessing the Impact of Faculty Collective Bargaining*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, no. 8. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1982.

Blackburn, R. T., and Clark, M. J. "An Assessment of Faculty Performance: Some Correlates Between Administrators, Colleagues, Student, and Self-Ratings." *Sociology of Education*, 1975, 48, 242-256.

Braskamp, L. A. and Ory, J.C. *Assessing Faculty Work*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

Braxton, J. M., Bayer, A. E., and Finkelstein, M. J. "Teaching Performance Norms in Academia." *Research in Higher Education*, 1992, 33(5), 533-569.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. National Survey of Faculty, 1989. In Boyer, E. L. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Lawrenceville, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Centra, J. A. "Colleagues as Raters of Classroom Instruction." *Journal of Higher Education*, 1975, 46, 327-337.

Centra, J. A. *How Universities Evaluate Faculty Performance: A Survey of Department Heads*. GREB Research Report, no. 75-56R. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Centra, J. A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Centra, J. A., Froh, R. C., Gray, P. J., and Lambert, L. M. *A Guide to Evaluating Teaching for Promotion and Tenure*. Acton, Mass.: Copley Publishing Group, 1987.

Chickering, A. W., and Gamson, Z. (Eds). *Applying the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education*. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 47., San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991.

Clift, J. and others. "Establishing the Validity of a Set of Summative Teaching Performance Scales." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*.. 1989, 14(3), 193-206.

Cohen, P. A., and McKeachie, W. J. "The Role of Colleagues in the Evaluation of College Teaching." *Improving College and University Teaching*, 1980, 28, 147-154.

Cross, K.P. "Classroom Research: Helping Professors Learn More About Teaching and Learning." In P. Seldin and Associates (Eds.), *How Administrators Can Improve Teaching: Moving from Talk to Action in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

Diamond, R. M. *Serving on Promotion and Tenure Committees; A Faculty Guide*. Bolton, Mass.; Anker Publishing Co., 1994.

Diamond, R. M. *Preparing for Promotion and Tenure Review; A Faculty Guide*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Co., 1995.

Dilts, D. A., Haber, L. J., and Bialik, D. *Assessing What Professors Do*. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Dressel, P. L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation: Assessing Institutional Effectiveness, Student Progress, and Professional Performance for Decision Making in Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Earl, S. E. "Staff and Peer Assessment—Measuring an Individual's Contribution to Group Performance." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1986, 11 (1), 60-69.

Feldman, K. A., "Instructional Effectiveness of College Teachers as Judged by Teachers Themselves, Current and Former Students, Colleagues, Administrators and External (Neutral) Observers." *Research in Higher Education*, 1989, 30, 137-189.

Flygare, T. J. "Board of Trustees of Keene State College v. Sweeney: Implications for the Future of Peer Review in Faculty Personnel Decisions." *Journal of College and University Law*, 1980, 7, 100-110.

French-Lazovik, G. "Peer Review: Documentary Evidence in the Evaluation of Teaching." In J. Millman (Ed.), *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage, 1981, 73-89.

Higher Education Reserach Institute. *The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 1989-90 H.E.R.I. Faculty Survey*. Los Angeles: University of California, 1991.

Kremer, J. "Constant Validity of Multiple Measures in Teaching, Research, and Service and Reliability of Peer Ratings." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 1990, 82, 213-218.

Love, K. G. "Comparison of Peer Assessment Methods: Reliability, Validity, Friendship, Bias, and User Reaction." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1981, 66, 451-457.

McGaughey, R. A. "Why Research and Teaching Can Coexist." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, Aug. 5, 1992, 48 (38), A36.

Murray, H. G. "The impact of Formative and Summative Evaluation of Teaching in North American Universities." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1984, 9, 117-132.

Ory, J.C., and Parker, S.A. "Assessment Activities at Large, Research Universities." *Research in Higher Education*, 1989, 30 (4), 375-385.

Root, L. S. "Faculty Evaluation: Reliability of Peer Assessments of Research, Teaching, and Service." *Research in Higher Education*, 1987, 26, 71-84.

Seldin, P. and Associates. *Improving College Teaching*. Bolton, Mass.: Anker Publishing Co., 1995.

Tobias, S. "Peer Perspectives on the Teaching of Science." *Change*, March/April 1986, 36-41.

Webster, D. S. "Instructional Effectiveness Using Scholarly Peer Assessments as Major Criteria." *Review of Higher Education*, 1985, 9 (1), 67-82.

Weimer, M. *Improving College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

