

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