1 1

APPENDIX B Participatory Model

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

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

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

Reference

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

reason other than teaching expertise.

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

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.

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;

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

APPENDIX D

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

S

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

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

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

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

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

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

REFERENCE

Svinicki, M., Lewis, K. (n.d.) *Preparing for peer observation: A guidebook*

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

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

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

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 ap AMCI.82 orioio

Does one group dominate discussion and hinder others' participation?

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

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

Faculty	Date o	f Observation_		
Peer Observer				
u # o y 8 observation. Each area includes prom				<u>ndbook</u> and · · ·
Are objectives for the class given verb <i>Not Demonstrated Needs Ir</i> Are specific instructional outcomes us	mprovement		Outstanding	N/A
Not Demonstrated Needs Ir Are objectives discussed at the end of	mprovement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A
Not Demonstrated Needs Ir		Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A
			0	
Do films, websites, and other audiovis Not Demonstrated Needs Ir Are handouts appropriate in number a	mprovement	•	•	N/A
Not Demonstrated Needs Ir Since the text may be p(o)3(t)-ETBTNr	mprovement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A

Does the instructor introduce topic, state goals, present material or activity effectively, summarize, and give assignment or suggest an idea to consider before next class? Needs Improvement Satisfactory Not Demonstrated Outstanding N/A Could the instructor be seen and heard? Needs Improvement Satisfactory Not Demonstrated Outstanding N/A Were key points emphasized? Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A Were explanations clear to students? Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A Were examples, metaphors, and analogies appropriate? Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A Was the lecture stimulating and thought provoking? Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

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

Not Demonstrated Needs Improvement Satisfactory Outstanding N/A

Does a student need assistar	nce for a temporary or	permanent dis	ability?		
Not Demonstrated	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A	
Are one or more students not motivated or unable to follow the class?					
Not Demonstrated	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A	
Does the instructor show favoritism?					
Not Demonstrated	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A	
Are students able to see visu	ıal aids?				
Not Demonstrated	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A	
Does one group dominate discussion and hinder others' participation?					
Not Demonstrated	Needs Improvement	Satisfactory	Outstanding	N/A	

APPENDIX I

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

Faculty Observed			Rank_		
Date of Observation			rved		
Rating scale (1 = very poor, 2 = weak, 3 = average	ge, 4 = g	ood, 5 =	excelle	nt, 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

1

2 3 4

5