

## Peer Review of Teaching DMED

**Goal of Program:** Peer review is required for early career faculty to achieve promotion within the U of MN system. Peer review is also helpful, if not critical, to complete as individual instructors work to improve teaching acumen in a conscientious way. Therefore, providing assistance to faculty to improve teaching and to develop a successful P&T dossier through a system of teaching observation, reflection, and planning is the goal of this program.

### **Types of Assessment/Review – Small group or Lecture:**

*Formative* assessment of teaching style and content presentation, to improve classroom effectiveness for student assimilation and retention of material. Formative assessments create data that the faculty may keep private or incorporate into the annual plan to be shared with their department head.

*Summative* data to link to Promotion and Tenure dossier development. Peer Review of Teaching data may be related to promotion requirements as specifically defined in a departments 7.12 statement.

### **Roles of Participants:**

*Observed faculty* are those who want a review completed on their teaching performance. The observed faculty should specify areas in which they want input, and meet ahead of time to give background on the course and objectives the lesson plan(s) to be observed.

*Reviewing faculty* need to be willing to meet before and after the observation to provide feedback, and to share the rubric to be used to complete the evaluation. Reviewing faculty will primarily be reviewing teaching performance. If used for summative assessments, the reviewing faculty must understand the requirements of the 7.12 statement and to become familiar with the assessment tools.

### **General Steps for Reviews:**

1. Once a faculty member decides they want a review, they should identify and invite/have assistance to invite, the desired reviewer to work with them.
2. An initial meeting is held between the two, and specifics are discussed about the objectives for the review.
3. The classroom/small group observation takes place.
4. The two faculty meet to discuss the observation, and to discuss steps that may assist the observed faculty improve.
5. At the conclusion of the review, all materials are the property of the reviewed faculty.

### **Checklists:**

Sharing evaluation tools and procedures reduces anxiety and clarifies standards reviewed for performance. Checklists will be distributed to all faculty and training offered on completion. The completed checklists may be kept private if not used for P&T, although the fact that reviews were completed need to be reported by all parties on their annual report.



---

**Faculty Peer Observation: Print to Complete Survey (Year 2014)**

Course: **1000 UME - Faculty Peer Observation**  
Department: **UME-Duluth Office of Education**  
Faculty: **Faculty Peer Observation:**

If you have questions or comments about this survey, click [here](#) to send a message to the survey administrator.

**DMED**

**Faculty Peer Observation**

**1) Enter Date, Observer Name and DMED Department****2) Please indicate the type of session being observed (lecture, small group etc.)****3) The teaching style is clear and specific.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**4) Relevancy of main idea(s) was clear.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**5) Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**6) Instructor related materials to "why it was important for students to learn the material".**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**7) Introduction captured student attention (opening set).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**8) Introduction stated organization of lecture.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**9) Effective transitions (clear w/summaries).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**10) Lecture style had a clear and organizational plan.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**11) Lecture style concluded by summarizing main ideas.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**12) Lecture review and placement connected to previous classes.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**13) Lecture review and placement connecting to future classes.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**14) Instructor asks upper level questions.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**15) Instructor provides sufficient wait time for student reaction.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**16) Questions were asked by students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**17) Clickers or other mobile devices were used effectively.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**18) Instructor has good rapport (interaction) with students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**19) Language was understandable by students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**20) Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**21) Instructor used appropriate volume and voice quality.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**22) Rate of content delivery seemed appropriate.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**23) Amount of material seemed appropriate for the length of lecture.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**24) Instructor had effective body movement and gestures.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**25) Instructor was enthusiastic about the material.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**26) PowerPoint/presentation content style was clear and well organized.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**27) Graphs, tables and slides were easily read and are clearly labeled.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**28) Strengths Noticed: (e.g. active learning integration, metacurriculum, clinical relationships, use of comparisons and contrasts, positive feedback to students, real opportunity provided for student questions).**

**29) Areas for improvement: (e.g. Passive lecturing, discussion not targeted to objecties, etc.)**

**30) Other Comments.**

**31) Overall Effectiveness Rating.**

1    2    3    4    5

**If you have questions or comments about this survey, click here to send a message to the survey administrator.**

**Close Preview**



---

**Faculty Peer Observation: Print to Complete Survey (Year 2014)**

Course: **1000 UME - Faculty Peer Observation**  
Department: **UME-Duluth Office of Education**  
Faculty: **Faculty Peer Observation:**

If you have questions or comments about this survey, click [here](#) to send a message to the survey administrator.

**DMED**

**Faculty Peer Observation**

**1) Enter Date, Observer Name and DMED Department****2) Please indicate the type of session being observed (lecture, small group etc.)****3) The teaching style is clear and specific.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**4) Relevancy of main idea(s) was clear.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**5) Instructor related ideas to prior knowledge.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**6) Instructor related materials to "why it was important for students to learn the material".**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**7) Introduction captured student attention (opening set).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**8) Introduction stated organization of lecture.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**9) Effective transitions (clear w/summaries).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**10) Lecture style had a clear and organizational plan.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**11) Lecture style concluded by summarizing main ideas.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**12) Lecture style review and placement connected to previous classes.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**13) Lecture style review and placement connecting to future classes.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**14) Instructor asks upper level questions.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**15) Instructor provides sufficient wait time for student reaction.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**16) Questions were asked by students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**17) Clickers or other mobile device was used effectively.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**18) Instructor has good rapport (interaction) with students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**19) Language was understandable by students.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**20) Absence of verbalized pauses (er, ah, etc).**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**21) Instructor used appropriate volume and voice quality.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**22) Rate of content delivery seemed appropriate.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**23) Amount of material seemed appropriate for the length of lecture.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**24) Instructor had effective body movement and gestures.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**25) Instructor was enthusiastic about the material.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**26) PowerPoint/presentation content style was clear and well organized.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**27) Graphs, tables and slides were easily read and are clearly labeled.**

Yes  No  Sometimes

**28) Strengths Noticed: (e.g. active learning integration, metacurriculum, clinical relationships, use of comparisons and contrasts, positive feedback to students, real opportunity provided for student questions).**



**29) Areas for improvement: (e.g. Passive lecturing, discussion not targeted to objecties, etc.)**

**30) Other Comments.**

**31) Overall Effectiveness Rating.**

1    2    3    4    5

**If you have questions or comments about this survey, click here to send a message to the survey administrator.**

**Close Preview**