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1. Mission and Goals

Our mission is to improve the quality of students’ education and learning experiences by developing faculty teaching skills through peer observation.

In view of this, we propose the following goals for a policy on peer observation:

- Foster a culture of teaching excellence through collegial dialogue;
- Foster professionalism in teaching as in research;
- Ensure that all faculty understand and apply latest research on how students learn best;
- Ensure that courses cover material at an appropriate level; and
- Provide one among a number of components for the assessment of teaching.

2. Executive Summary

A number of UT System institutions have peer observation policies, but we observe a wide variation across and within institutions. Some policies call for detailed observation reports while others are more concise. Some policies sharply distinguish evaluation from mentoring (sometimes referred to as “summative” vs. “formative” reporting).

We prefer to emphasize the role of observation in improving teaching, holding that peer observation should play a larger role in faculty development than in teaching assessment. Peer observation can provide constructive, collegial feedback; over time it can establish a trend for improvement. When used in assessment, it should be supplemented with other instruments.

We conclude that a fairly simple instrument will suffice, but that all observations should meet a few minimum requirements (See Appendix A). We have tried to leave as much as possible to the judgment of the units involved, believing that different units should adopt different specific policies and structures appropriate to their institutional cultures and to the subjects of instruction.
3. Guiding principles

a) Observations should be focused on the professional coaching that is helpful even to the most experienced teachers. Even prize-winning teachers should be observed and can improve. (See Appendix B for a New Yorker essay by Atul Gawande, “Personal Best”).

b) To be beneficial to students, helpful to faculty, and credible to all concerned, each report should include suggestions for improvement. No one should be penalized for an item saying “needs improvement”—unless a series of observations shows no effort on the instructor’s part to improve.

c) Evaluation tends to poison collegial and coaching relationships; therefore evaluation should be a separate process, conducted by the unit’s committee on teaching, taking into account a series of observations along with other indicators (such as student evaluations, longitudinal surveys, subsequent student performance, and measures of grade inflation as appropriate). An evaluation committee should give credit for improvements that were achieved longitudinally as a result of the instructor’s actions based on peer observation as well as the other indicators.

d) Evaluation reports added to an instructor’s record should include a list of observations conducted (with course, observer, and date), but not the content of the report unless it is released by the instructor. Instructors should be asked to supply for their records a narrative covering what they have learned from the observation process.

e) Each unit (college, school, or department) should develop its own system for peer observation appropriate to the subject being taught and the course format (e.g. lecture, lab, experiential, on-line, one-on-one, studio).

f) Institutions and their units should define “peer” for their purposes. For example, whether peers may be of a lower rank and/or drawn from different departments. Observations by learning experts who are not faculty are valuable, particularly during the early stages of faculty development. However, these should supplement, not substitute for, peer observations.

g) Frequency of peer observations:
   a. Junior faculty: At least once a year.
   b. Tenured faculty: Once every three years.
   c. Entry level, non-tenure track faculty: Once a year.
   d. Senior non-tenure track faculty: Once every three years.

h) Use fairly short forms that merit careful attention. Ask questions that call for either a discursive answer or a choice among three or four responses (e.g., observed, needs improvement, not observed; or truly exemplary, done well, needs improvement, N/A).


Each peer evaluation/observation report must include:

- Number and title of course observed,
- Date of report,
• Name and signature of observer,
• Date of pre-observation meeting between observer and instructor, at which the syllabus and assignments are reviewed, special instructor concerns are addressed, and a mutually agreed class and date are specified,
• Date of classroom observation;
• An instrument that reflects methods by which instructor engages students in active learning;
• Date of post-observation meeting of observer with instructor, at which the observation was discussed;
• Instructor’s signature affirming that the discussions took place.

5. Examples of Forms in Use in the UT System

A great deal has been written about peer observation. The following documents are included as examples of policies and/or forms that may be helpful. Links are provided when online documents are available. We cite these without judgment.

• The University of Texas at Austin
  o Peer Observation for Formative Assessment of Teaching in the College of Pharmacy (Appendix C)
  o Peer Observation Form for Formative Assessment of Teaching in the College of Pharmacy (Appendix D)
• The University of Texas at Brownsville
  o Nursing Classroom Observation Checklist (Appendix E)
  o Nursing Clinical Observation Checklist (Appendix F)
  o Nursing Peer Review Evaluation of Online Teaching (Appendix G)
• The University of Texas at El Paso:
  o Peer Observation and Assessment of Teaching: A Resource Book for Faculty, Administrators, and Students who Teach
  o Department of Sociology & Anthropology: Plan for Formative Assessment and Summative Evaluation of Faculty Teaching
• The University of Texas-Pan American
  o Department of English, First Year Writing Program Peer Review (Appendix H)
  o Department of Health and Kinesiology Annual Faculty Evaluation (Appendix I)
  o College of Education Peer Classroom Observation Form (Appendix J)
• The University of Texas at San Antonio
  o Classroom Observation Rubric
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Why We Need a Policy

1. Commitment to improving teaching. For promotion, we are seeking an indication that the candidate - no matter how developed or underdeveloped a teacher at the moment - is taking teaching seriously enough to work toward improvement. A serious teacher, no matter how good in previous years, is trying to do a better job next year, taking advantage of new knowledge about how students learn, and of the appropriate use of technology that enhances student learning. So we are not looking for evidence of achievement only, but for evidence of a commitment to making progress, just as we are when we evaluate a candidate’s research potential.

2. A stimulus to the development of a culture of teaching excellence in each department. We have found that departments have more active teaching cultures if they conduct frequent peer observations, and if the observers meet with the teachers before and after observations. The same observation program will serve both for mentoring (i.e. “formative” development) and longitudinal evaluation of teaching.

3. An opportunity for the faculty observers to learn new techniques from the teachers they observe. This could provide one argument for inviting junior faculty to observe their seniors.

4. Recognition of the key elements of good teaching. Too many evaluations report only that the observed teacher had a mastery of the material and was well organized in lecturing. But (1) anyone with an advanced degree should be able to meet that standard, and (2) pure lecturing (i.e., with only passive student engagement) is widely recognized as the least effective way to teach. The key question is whether the teacher is helping the students learn. For that, all students must be engaged: they must recognize the importance of the material, and they must be using their brains actively during the class.

5. A basis for supplementing the information available from the student Course Instructor Surveys. Student surveys track student learning well for certain kinds of courses, but not others. In particular, inquiry-based courses and those that shift more responsibility to the students tend to earn lower ratings, although students are learning more.

Ultimately, development and implementation of such a policy represents a win-win opportunity in which faculty teaching is enhanced by colleague-driven faculty development, and student learning is enhanced through systematic improvement of teaching.
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Top athletes and singers have coaches. Should you?

by Atul Gawande

October 3, 2011


No matter how well trained people are, few can sustain their best performance on their own. That’s where coaching comes in.

I’ve been a surgeon for eight years. For the past couple of them, my performance in the operating room has reached a plateau. I’d like to think it’s a good thing—I’ve arrived at my professional peak. But mainly it seems as if I’ve just stopped getting better.

During the first two or three years in practice, your skills seem to improve almost daily. It’s not about hand-eye coordination—you have that down halfway through your residency. As one of my professors once explained, doing surgery is no more physically difficult than writing in cursive. Surgical mastery is about familiarity and judgment. You learn the problems that can occur during a particular procedure or with a particular condition, and you learn how to either prevent or respond to those problems.

Say you’ve got a patient who needs surgery for appendicitis. These days, surgeons will typically do a laparoscopic appendectomy. You slide a small camera—a laparoscope—into the abdomen through a quarter-inch incision near the belly button, insert a long grasper through an incision beneath the waistline, and push a device for stapling and cutting through an incision in the left lower abdomen. Use the grasper to pick up the finger-size appendix, fire the stapler across its base and across the vessels feeding it, drop the severed organ into a plastic bag, and pull it out. Close up, and you’re done. That’s how you like it to go, anyway. But often it doesn’t.

Even before you start, you need to make some judgments. Unusual anatomy, severe obesity, or internal scars from previous abdominal surgery could make it difficult to get the camera in safely; you don’t want to poke it into a loop of intestine. You have to decide which camera-insertion method to use—there’s a range of options—or whether to abandon the high-tech approach and do the operation the traditional way, with a wide-open incision that lets you see everything directly. If you do get your camera and instruments inside, you may have trouble grasping the appendix. Infection turns it into a fat, bloody, inflamed worm that sticks to everything around it—bowel, blood vessels, an ovary, the pelvic sidewall—and to free it you have to choose from a variety of tools and techniques. You can use a long cotton-tipped instrument to try to push the surrounding attachments away. You can use electrocautery, a hook, a pair of scissors, a sharp-tip dissector, a blunt-tip dissector, a right-angle dissector, or a suction device. You can adjust the operating table so that the patient’s head is down and his feet are up, allowing gravity to pull the viscera in the right direction. Or you can just grab whatever part of the appendix is visible and pull really hard.

Once you have the little organ in view, you may find that appendicitis was the wrong diagnosis. It might be a tumor of the appendix, Crohn’s disease, or an ovarian condition that happened to have inflamed the nearby appendix. Then you’d have to decide whether you need additional equipment or personnel—maybe it’s time to enlist another surgeon.

Over time, you learn how to head off problems, and, when you can’t, you arrive at solutions with less fumbling and more assurance. After eight years, I’ve performed more than two thousand operations.
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Three-quarters have involved my specialty, endocrine surgery—surgery for endocrine organs such as the thyroid, the parathyroid, and the adrenal glands. The rest have involved everything from simple biopsies to colon cancer. For my specialized cases, I’ve come to know most of the serious difficulties that could arise, and have worked out solutions. For the others, I’ve gained confidence in my ability to handle a wide range of situations, and to improvise when necessary.

As I went along, I compared my results against national data, and I began beating the averages. My rates of complications moved steadily lower and lower. And then, a couple of years ago, they didn’t. It started to seem that the only direction things could go from here was the wrong one.

Maybe this is what happens when you turn forty-five. Surgery is, at least, a relatively late-peaking career. It’s not like mathematics or baseball or pop music, where your best work is often behind you by the time you’re thirty. Jobs that involve the complexities of people or nature seem to take the longest to master: the average age at which S. & P. 500 chief executive officers are hired is fifty-two, and the age of maximum productivity for geologists, one study estimated, is around fifty-four. Surgeons apparently fall somewhere between the extremes, requiring both physical stamina and the judgment that comes with experience. Apparently, I’d arrived at that middle point.

It wouldn’t have been the first time I’d hit a plateau. I grew up in Ohio, and when I was in high school I hoped to become a serious tennis player. But I peaked at seventeen. That was the year that Danny Trevas and I climbed to the top tier for doubles in the Ohio Valley. I qualified to play singles in a couple of national tournaments, only to be smothered in the first round both times. The kids at that level were playing a different game than I was. At Stanford, where I went to college, the tennis team ranked No. 1 in the nation, and I had no chance of being picked. That meant spending the past twenty-five years trying to slow the steady decline of my game.

I still love getting out on the court on a warm summer day, swinging a racquet strung to fifty-six pounds of tension at a two-ounce felt-covered sphere, and trying for those increasingly elusive moments when my racquet feels like an extension of my arm, and my legs are putting me exactly where the ball is going to be. But I came to accept that I’d never be remotely as good as I was when I was seventeen. In the hope of not losing my game altogether, I play when I can. I often bring my racquet on trips, for instance, and look for time to squeeze in a match.

One July day a couple of years ago, when I was at a medical meeting in Nantucket, I had an afternoon free and went looking for someone to hit with. I found a local tennis club and asked if there was anyone who wanted to play. There wasn’t. I saw that there was a ball machine, and I asked the club pro if I could use it to practice ground strokes. He told me that it was for members only. But I could pay for a lesson and hit with him.

He was in his early twenties, a recent graduate who’d played on his college team. We hit back and forth for a while. He went easy on me at first, and then started running me around. I served a few points, and the tennis coach in him came out. You know, he said, you could get more power from your serve.

I was dubious. My serve had always been the best part of my game. But I listened. He had me pay attention to my feet as I served, and I gradually recognized that my legs weren’t really underneath me when I swung my racquet up into the air. My right leg dragged a few inches behind my body, reducing my power. With a few minutes of tinkering, he’d added at least ten miles an hour to my serve. I was serving harder than I ever had in my life.

Not long afterward, I watched Rafael Nadal play a tournament match on the Tennis Channel. The camera flashed to his coach, and the obvious struck me as interesting: even Rafael Nadal has a coach.
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Nearly every élite tennis player in the world does. Professional athletes use coaches to make sure they are as good as they can be.

But doctors don't. I'd paid to have a kid just out of college look at my serve. So why did I find it inconceivable to pay someone to come into my operating room and coach me on my surgical technique?

What we think of as coaching was, sports historians say, a distinctly American development. During the nineteenth century, Britain had the more avid sporting culture; its leisure classes went in for games like cricket, golf, and soccer. But the aristocratic origins produced an ethos of amateurism: you didn't want to seem to be trying too hard. For the Brits, coaching, even practicing, was, well, unsporting. In America, a more competitive and entrepreneurial spirit took hold. In 1875, Harvard and Yale played one of the nation's first American-rules football games. Yale soon employed a head coach for the team, the legendary Walter Camp. He established position coaches for individual player development, maintained detailed performance records for each player, and pre-planned every game. Harvard preferred the British approach to sports. In those first three decades, it beat Yale only four times.

The concept of a coach is slippery. Coaches are not teachers, but they teach. They're not your boss—in professional tennis, golf, and skating, the athlete hires and fires the coach—but they can be bossy. They don't even have to be good at the sport. The famous Olympic gymnastics coach Bela Karolyi couldn't do a split if his life depended on it. Mainly, they observe, they judge, and they guide.

Coaches are like editors, another slippery invention. Consider Maxwell Perkins, the great Scribner's editor, who found, nurtured, and published such writers as F. Scott Fitzgerald, Ernest Hemingway, and Thomas Wolfe. "Perkins has the intangible faculty of giving you confidence in yourself and the book you are writing," one of his writers said in a New Yorker Profile from 1944. "He never tells you what to do," another writer said. "Instead, he suggests to you, in an extraordinarily inarticulate fashion, what you want to do yourself."

The coaching model is different from the traditional conception of pedagogy, where there's a presumption that, after a certain point, the student no longer needs instruction. You graduate. You're done. You can go the rest of the way yourself. This is how élite musicians are taught. Barbara Lurie Sand's book "Teaching Genius" describes the methods of the legendary Juilliard violin instructor Dorothy DeLay. DeLay was a Perkins-like figure who trained an amazing roster of late-twentieth-century virtuosos, including Itzhak Perlman, Nigel Kennedy, Midori, and Sarah Chang. They came to the Juilliard School at a young age—usually after they'd demonstrated talent but reached the limits of what local teachers could offer. They studied with DeLay for a number of years, and then they graduated, launched like ships leaving drydock. She saw her role as preparing them to make their way without her.

Itzhak Perlman, for instance, arrived at Juilliard, in 1959, at the age of thirteen, and studied there for eight years, working with both DeLay and Ivan Galamian, another revered instructor. Among the key things he learned were discipline, a broad repertoire, and the exigencies of technique. "All DeLay's students, big or little, have to do their scales, their arpeggios, their études, their Bach, their concertos, and so on," Sand writes. "By the time they reach their teens, they are expected to be practicing a minimum of five hours a day." DeLay also taught them to try new and difficult things, to perform without fear. She expanded their sense of possibility. Perlman, disabled by polio, couldn't play the violin standing, and DeLay was one of the few who were convinced that he could have a concert career. DeLay was, her biographer observed, "basically in the business of teaching her pupils how to think, and to trust their ability to do so effectively." Musical expertise meant not needing to be coached.
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Doctors understand expertise in the same way. Knowledge of disease and the science of treatment are always evolving. We have to keep developing our capabilities and avoid falling behind. So the training inculcates an ethic of perfectionism. Expertise is thought to be not a static condition but one that doctors must build and sustain for themselves.

Coaching in pro sports proceeds from a starkly different premise: it considers the teaching model naive about our human capacity for self-perfection. It holds that, no matter how well prepared people are in their formative years, few can achieve and maintain their best performance on their own. One of these views, it seemed to me, had to be wrong. So I called Itzhak Perlman to find out what he thought.

I asked him why concert violinists didn’t have coaches, the way top athletes did. He said that he didn’t know, but that it had always seemed a mistake to him. He had enjoyed the services of a coach all along.

He had a coach? “I was very, very lucky,” Perlman said. His wife, Toby, whom he’d known at Juilliard, was a concert-level violinist, and he’d relied on her for the past forty years. “The great challenge in performing is listening to yourself,” he said. “Your physicality, the sensation that you have as you play the violin, interferes with your accuracy of listening.” What violinists perceive is often quite different from what audiences perceive.

“My wife always says that I don’t really know how I play,” he told me. “She is an extra ear.” She’d tell him if a passage was too fast or too tight or too mechanical—if there was something that needed fixing. Sometimes she had to puzzle out what might be wrong, asking another expert to describe what she heard as he played.

Her ear provided external judgment. “She is very tough, and that’s what I like about it,” Perlman says. He doesn’t always trust his response when he listens to recordings of his performances. He might think something sounds awful, and then realize he was mistaken: “There is a variation in the ability to listen, as well, I’ve found.” He didn’t know if other instrumentalists relied on coaching, but he suspected that many find help like he did. Vocalists, he pointed out, employ voice coaches throughout their careers.

The professional singers I spoke to describe their coaches in nearly identical terms. “We refer to them as our ‘outside ears,’” the great soprano Renée Fleming told me. “The voice is so mysterious and fragile. It’s mostly involuntary muscles that fuel the instrument. What we hear as we are singing is not what the audience hears.” When she’s preparing for a concert, she practices with her vocal coach for ninety minutes or so several times a week. “Our voices are very limited in the amount of time we can use them,” she explains. After they’ve put in the hours to attain professional status, she said, singers have about twenty or thirty years to achieve something near their best, and then to sustain that level. For Fleming, “outside ears” have been invaluable at every point.

So outside ears, and eyes, are important for concert-calibre musicians and Olympic-level athletes. What about regular professionals, who just want to do what they do as well as they can? I talked to Jim Knight about this. He is the director of the Kansas Coaching Project, at the University of Kansas. He teaches coaching—for schoolteachers. For decades, research has confirmed that the big factor in determining how much students learn is not class size or the extent of standardized testing but the quality of their teachers. Policymakers have pushed mostly carrot-and-stick remedies: firing underperforming teachers, giving merit pay to high performers, penalizing schools with poor student test scores. People like Jim Knight think we should push coaching.

California researchers in the early nineteen-eighties conducted a five-year study of teacher-skill development in eighty schools, and noticed something interesting. Workshops led teachers to use
new skills in the classroom only ten per cent of the time. Even when a practice session with
demonstrations and personal feedback was added, fewer than twenty per cent made the change. But
when coaching was introduced—when a colleague watched them try the new skills in their own
classroom and provided suggestions—adoption rates passed ninety per cent. A spate of small
randomized trials confirmed the effect. Coached teachers were more effective, and their students did
better on tests.

Knight experienced it himself. Two decades ago, he was trying to teach writing to students at a
community college in Toronto, and floundering. He studied techniques for teaching students how to
write coherent sentences and organize their paragraphs. But he didn’t get anywhere until a colleague
came into the classroom and coached him through the changes he was trying to make. He won an
award for innovation in teaching, and eventually wrote a Ph.D. dissertation at the University of
Kansas on measures to improve pedagogy. Then he got funding to train coaches for every school in
Topeka, and he has been expanding his program ever since. Coaching programs have now spread to
hundreds of school districts across the country.

There have been encouraging early results, but the data haven’t yet been analyzed on a large scale.
One thing that seems clear, though, is that not all coaches are effective. I asked Knight to show me
what makes for good coaching.

We met early one May morning at Leslie H. Walton Middle School, in Albemarle County, Virginia. In
2009, the Albemarle County public schools created an instructional-coaching program, based in part
on Knight’s methods. It recruited twenty-four teacher coaches for the twenty-seven schools in the
semi-rural district. (Charlottesville is the county seat, but it runs a separate school district.) Many
teacher-coaching programs concentrate on newer teachers, and this one is no exception. All teachers
in their first two years are required to accept a coach, but the program also offers coaching to any
teacher who wants it.

Not everyone has. Researchers from the University of Virginia found that many teachers see no need
for coaching. Others hate the idea of being observed in the classroom, or fear that using a coach
makes them look incompetent, or are convinced, despite assurances, that the coaches are reporting
their evaluations to the principal. And some are skeptical that the school’s particular coaches would
be of any use.

To find its coaches, the program took applications from any teachers in the system who were willing
to cross over to the back of the classroom for a couple of years and teach colleagues instead of
students. They were selected for their skills with people, and they studied the methods developed by
Knight and others. But they did not necessarily have any special expertise in a content area, like math
or science. The coaches assigned to Walton Middle School were John Hobson, a bushy-bearded high-
school history teacher who was just thirty-three years old when he started but had been a successful
baseball and tennis coach, and Diane Harding, a teacher who had two decades of experience but had
spent the previous seven years out of the classroom, serving as a technology specialist.

Nonetheless, many veteran teachers—including some of the best—signed up to let the outsiders in.
Jennie Critzer, an eighth-grade math teacher, was one of those teachers, and we descended on her
first-period algebra class as a small troupe—Jim Knight, me, and both coaches. (The school seemed
eager to have me see what both do.)

After the students found their seats—some had to search a little, because Critzer had scrambled the
assigned seating, as she often does, to “keep things fresh”—she got to work. She had been a math
teacher at Walton Middle School for ten years. She taught three ninety-minute classes a day with
anywhere from twenty to thirty students. And she had every class structured down to the minute.
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Today, she said, they would be learning how to simplify radicals. She had already put a “Do Now” problem on the whiteboard: “Simplify $\sqrt{36}$ and $\sqrt{32}.$” She gave the kids three minutes to get as far as they could, and walked the rows of desks with a white egg timer in her hand as the students went at it. With her blond pigtails, purple striped sack dress, flip-flops, and painted toenails, each a different color, she looked like a graduate student headed to a beach party. But she carried herself with an air of easy command. The timer sounded.

For thirty seconds, she had the students compare their results with those of the partner next to them. Then she called on a student at random for the first problem, the simplified form of $\sqrt{36}$. “Six,” the girl said.

“Stand up if you got six,” Critzer said. Everyone stood up.

She turned to the harder problem of simplifying $\sqrt{32}$. No one got the answer, $4 \sqrt{2}$. It was a middle-level algebra class; the kids didn’t have a lot of confidence when it came to math. Yet her job was to hold their attention and get them to grasp and apply three highly abstract concepts—the concepts of radicals, of perfect squares, and of factoring. In the course of one class, she did just that.

She set a clear goal, announcing that by the end of class the students would know how to write numbers like $\sqrt{32}$ in a simplified form without using a decimal or a fraction. Then she broke the task into steps. She had the students punch $\sqrt{32}$ into their calculators and see what number they got (5.66). She had them try explaining to their partner how whole numbers differed from decimals. (“Thirty seconds, everyone.”) She had them write down other numbers whose square root was a whole number. She made them visualize, verbalize, and write the idea. Soon, they’d figured out how to find the factors of the number under the radical sign, and then how to move factors from under the radical sign to outside the radical sign.

Toward the end, she had her students try simplifying $\sqrt{20}$. They had one minute. One of the boys who’d looked alternately baffled and distracted for the first half of class hunched over his notebook scratching out an answer with his pencil. “This is so easy now,” he announced.

I told the coaches that I didn’t see how Critzer could have done better. They said that every teacher has something to work on. It could involve student behavior, or class preparation, or time management, or any number of other things. The coaches let the teachers choose the direction for coaching. They usually know better than anyone what their difficulties are.

Critzer’s concern for the last quarter of the school year was whether her students were effectively engaged and learning the material they needed for the state tests. So that’s what her coaches focussed on. Knight teaches coaches to observe a few specifics: whether the teacher has an effective plan for instruction; how many students are engaged in the material; whether they interact respectfully; whether they engage in high-level conversations; whether they understand how they are progressing, or failing to progress.

Novice teachers often struggle with the basic behavioral issues. Hobson told me of one such teacher, whose students included a hugely disruptive boy. Hobson took her to observe the boy in another teacher’s classroom, where he behaved like a prince. Only then did the teacher see that her style was the problem. She let students speak—and shout, and interrupt—without raising their hands, and go to the bathroom without asking. Then she got angry when things got out of control.

Jennie Critzer had no trouble maintaining classroom discipline, and she skillfully used a variety of what teachers call “learning structures”—lecturing, problem-solving, cooperative learning, discussion. But the coaches weren’t convinced that she was getting the best results. Of twenty kids, they noticed, at least four seemed at sea.
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Good coaches know how to break down performance into its critical individual components. In sports, coaches focus on mechanics, conditioning, and strategy, and have ways to break each of those down, in turn. The U.C.L.A. basketball coach John Wooden, at the first squad meeting each season, even had his players practice putting their socks on. He demonstrated just how to do it: he carefully rolled each sock over his toes, up his foot, around the heel, and pulled it up snug, then went back to his toes and smoothed out the material along the sock's length, making sure there were no wrinkles or creases. He had two purposes in doing this. First, wrinkles cause blisters. Blisters cost games. Second, he wanted his players to learn how crucial seemingly trivial details could be. "Details create success" was the creed of a coach who won ten N.C.A.A. men's basketball championships.

At Walton Middle School, Hobson and Harding thought that Critzer should pay close attention to the details of how she used cooperative learning. When she paired the kids off, they observed, most struggled with having a "math conversation." The worst pairs had a girl with a boy. One boy-girl pair had been unable to talk at all.

Elite performers, researchers say, must engage in "deliberate practice"—sustained, mindful efforts to develop the full range of abilities that success requires. You have to work at what you're not good at. In theory, people can do this themselves. But most people do not know where to start or how to proceed. Expertise, as the formula goes, requires going from unconscious incompetence to conscious incompetence to conscious competence and finally to unconscious competence. The coach provides the outside eyes and ears, and makes you aware of where you're falling short. This is tricky. Human beings resist exposure and critique; our brains are well defended. So coaches use a variety of approaches—showing what other, respected colleagues do, for instance, or reviewing videos of the subject's performance. The most common, however, is just conversation.

At lunchtime, Critzer and her coaches sat down at a table in the empty school library. Hobson took the lead. "What worked?" he asked.

Critzer said she had been trying to increase the time that students spend on independent practice during classes, and she thought she was doing a good job. She was also trying to "break the plane" more—get out from in front of the whiteboard and walk among the students—and that was working nicely. But she knew the next question, and posed it herself: "So what didn't go well?" She noticed one girl who "clearly wasn't getting it." But at the time she hadn't been sure what to do.

"How could you help her?" Hobson asked.

She thought for a moment. "I would need to break the concept down for her more," she said. "I'll bring her in during the fifth block."

"What else did you notice?"

"My second class has thirty kids but was more forthcoming. It was actually easier to teach than the first class. This group is less verbal." Her answer gave the coaches the opening they wanted. They mentioned the trouble students had with their math conversations, and the girl-boy pair who didn't talk at all. "How could you help them be more verbal?"

Critzer was stumped. Everyone was. The table fell silent. Then Harding had an idea. "How about putting key math words on the board for them to use—like 'factoring,' 'perfect square,' 'radical?'" she said. "They could even record the math words they used in their discussion." Critzer liked the suggestion. It was something to try.

For half an hour, they worked through the fine points of the observation and formulated plans for what she could practice next. Critzer sat at a short end of the table chatting, the coaches at the long
end beside her, Harding leaning toward her on an elbow, Hobson fingerling his beard. They looked like three colleagues on a lunch break—which, Knight later explained, was part of what made the two coaches effective.

He had seen enough coaching to break even their performance down into its components. Good coaches, he said, speak with credibility, make a personal connection, and focus little on themselves. Hobson and Harding "listened more than they talked," Knight said. "They were one hundred per cent present in the conversation." They also parceled out their observations carefully. "It's not a normal way of communicating—watching what your words are doing," he said. They had discomfiting information to convey, and they did it directly but respectfully.

I asked Critzer if she liked the coaching. "I do," she said. "It works with my personality. I'm very self-critical. So I grabbed a coach from the beginning." She had been concerned for a while about how to do a better job engaging her kids. "So many things have to come together. I'd exhausted everything I knew to improve."

She told me that she had begun to burn out. "I felt really isolated, too," she said. Coaching had changed that. "My stress level is a lot less now." That might have been the best news for the students. They kept a great teacher, and saw her get better. "The coaching has definitely changed how satisfying teaching is," she said.

I decided to try a coach. I called Robert Osteen, a retired general surgeon, whom I trained under during my residency, to see if he might consider the idea. He's one of the surgeons I most hoped to emulate in my career. His operations were swift without seeming hurried and elegant without seeming showy. He was calm. I never once saw him lose his temper. He had a plan for every circumstance. He had impeccable judgment. And his patients had unusually few complications.

He specialized in surgery for tumors of the pancreas, liver, stomach, esophagus, colon, breast, and other organs. One test of a cancer surgeon is knowing when surgery is pointless and when to forge ahead. Osteen never hemmed or hawed, or pushed too far. "Can't be done," he'd say upon getting a patient's abdomen open and discovering a tumor to be more invasive than expected. And, without a pause for lament, he'd begin closing up again.

Year after year, the senior residents chose him for their annual teaching award. He was an unusual teacher. He never quite told you what to do. As an intern, I did my first splenectomy with him. He did not draw the skin incision to be made with the sterile marking pen the way the other professors did. He just stood there, waiting. Finally, I took the pen, put the felt tip on the skin somewhere, and looked up at him to see if I could make out a glimmer of approval or disapproval. He gave me nothing. I drew a line down the patient's middle, from just below the sternum to just above the navel.

"Is that really where you want it?" he said. Osteen's voice was a low, car-engine growl, tinged with the accent of his boyhood in Savannah, Georgia, and it took me a couple of years to realize that it was not his voice that scared me but his questions. He was invariably trying to get residents to think—to think like surgeons—and his questions exposed how much we had to learn.

"Yes," I answered. We proceeded with the operation. Ten minutes into the case, it became obvious that I'd made the incision too small to expose the spleen. "I should have taken the incision down below the navel, huh?" He grunted in the affirmative, and we stopped to extend the incision.

I reached Osteen at his summer home, on Buzzards Bay. He was enjoying retirement. He spent time with his grandchildren and travelled, and, having been an avid sailor all his life, he had just finished writing a book on nineteenth-century naval mapmaking. He didn't miss operating, but one day a
week he held a teaching conference for residents and medical students. When I explained the experiment I wanted to try, he was game.

He came to my operating room one morning and stood silently observing from a step stool set back a few feet from the table. He scribbled in a notepad and changed position once in a while, looking over the anesthesia drape or watching from behind me. I was initially self-conscious about being observed by my former teacher. But I was doing an operation—a thyroidectomy for a patient with a cancerous nodule—that I had done around a thousand times, more times than I’ve been to the movies. I was quickly absorbed in the flow of it—the symphony of coordinated movement between me and my surgical assistant, a senior resident, across the table from me, and the surgical technician to my side.

The case went beautifully. The cancer had not spread beyond the thyroid, and, in eighty-six minutes, we removed the fleshy, butterfly-shaped organ, carefully detaching it from the trachea and from the nerves to the vocal cords. Osteen had rarely done this operation when he was practicing, and I wondered whether he would find anything useful to tell me.

We sat in the surgeons’ lounge afterward. He saw only small things, he said, but, if I were trying to keep a problem from happening even once in my next hundred operations, it’s the small things I had to worry about. He noticed that I’d positioned and draped the patient perfectly for me, standing on his left side, but not for anyone else. The draping hemmed in the surgical assistant across the table on the patient’s right side, restricting his left arm, and hampering his ability to pull the wound upward. At one point in the operation, we found ourselves struggling to see up high enough in the neck on that side. The draping also pushed the medical student off to the surgical assistant’s right, where he couldn’t help at all. I should have made more room to the left, which would have allowed the student to hold the retractor and freed the surgical assistant’s left hand.

Osteen also asked me to pay more attention to my elbows. At various points during the operation, he observed, my right elbow rose to the level of my shoulder, on occasion higher. “You cannot achieve precision with your elbow in the air,” he said. A surgeon’s elbows should be loose and down by his sides. “When you are tempted to raise your elbow, that means you need to either move your feet”—because you’re standing in the wrong position—“or choose a different instrument.”

He had a whole list of observations like this. His notepad was dense with small print. I operate with magnifying loupes and wasn’t aware how much this restricted my peripheral vision. I never noticed, for example, that at one point the patient had blood-pressure problems, which the anesthesiologist was monitoring. Nor did I realize that, for about half an hour, the operating light drifted out of the wound; I was operating with light from reflected surfaces. Osteen pointed out that the instruments I’d chosen for holding the incision open had got tangled up, wasting time.

That one twenty-minute discussion gave me more to consider and work on than I’d had in the past five years. It had been strange and more than a little awkward having to explain to the surgical team why Osteen was spending the morning with us. “He’s here to coach me,” I’d said. Yet the stranger thing, it occurred to me, was that no senior colleague had come to observe me in the eight years since I’d established my surgical practice. Like most work, medical practice is largely unseen by anyone who might raise one’s sights. I’d had no outside ears and eyes.

Osteen has continued to coach me in the months since that experiment. I take his observations, work on them for a few weeks, and then get together with him again. The mechanics of the interaction are still evolving. Surgical performance begins well before the operating room, with the choice made in the clinic of whether to operate in the first place. Osteen and I have spent time examining the way I plan before surgery. I’ve also begun taking time to do something I’d rarely done before—watch other colleagues operate in order to gather ideas about what I could do.
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A former colleague at my hospital, the cancer surgeon Caprice Greenberg, has become a pioneer in using video in the operating room. She had the idea that routine, high-quality video recordings of operations could enable us to figure out why some patients fare better than others. If we learned what techniques made the difference, we could even try to coach for them. The work is still in its early stages. So far, a handful of surgeons have had their operations taped, and begun reviewing them with a colleague.

I was one of the surgeons who got to try it. It was like going over a game tape. One rainy afternoon, I brought my laptop to Osteen's kitchen, and we watched a recording of another thyroidectomy I'd performed. Three video pictures of the operation streamed on the screen—one from a camera in the operating light, one from a wide-angle room camera, and one with the feed from the anesthesia monitor. A boom microphone picked up the sound.

Osteen liked how I'd changed the patient's positioning and draping. "See? Right there!" He pointed at the screen. "The assistant is able to help you now." At one point, the light drifted out of the wound and we watched to see how long it took me to realize I'd lost direct illumination: four minutes, instead of half an hour.

"Good," he said. "You're paying more attention."

He had new pointers for me. He wanted me to let the residents struggle thirty seconds more when I asked them to help with a task. I tended to give them precise instructions as soon as progress slowed. "No, use the DeBakey forceps," I'd say, or "Move the retractor first." Osteen's advice: "Get them to think." It's the only way people learn.

And together we identified a critical step in a thyroidectomy to work on: finding and preserving the parathyroid glands—four fatty glands the size of a yellow split pea that sit on the surface of the thyroid gland and are crucial for regulating a person's calcium levels. The rate at which my patients suffered permanent injury to those little organs had been hovering at two per cent. He wanted me to try lowering the risk further by finding the glands earlier in the operation.

Since I have taken on a coach, my complication rate has gone down. It's too soon to know for sure whether that's not random, but it seems real. I know that I'm learning again. I can't say that every surgeon needs a coach to do his or her best work, but I've discovered that I do.

Coaching has become a fad in recent years. There are leadership coaches, executive coaches, life coaches, and college-application coaches. Search the Internet, and you'll find that there's even Twitter coaching. ("Would you like to learn how to get new customers/clients, make valuable business contacts, and increase your revenue using Twitter? Then this Twitter coaching package is perfect for you"—at about eight hundred dollars for a few hour-long Skype sessions and some e-mail consultation.) Self-improvement has always found a ready market, and most of what's on offer is simply one-on-one instruction to get amateurs through the essentials. It's teaching with a trendier name. Coaching aimed at improving the performance of people who are already professionals is less usual. It's also riskier: bad coaching can make people worse.

The world-famous high jumper Dick Fosbury, for instance, developed his revolutionary technique—known as the Fosbury Flop—in defiance of his coaches. They wanted him to stick to the time-honored straddle method of going over the high bar leg first, face down. He instinctively wanted to go over head first, back down. It was only by perfecting his odd technique on his own that Fosbury won the gold medal at the 1968 Mexico City Olympics, setting a new record on worldwide television, and reinventing high-jumping overnight.
Renée Fleming told me that when her original voice coach died, ten years ago, she was nervous about replacing her. She wanted outside ears, but they couldn’t be just anybody’s. “At my stage, when you’re at my level, you don’t really want to go to a new person who might mess things up,” she said. “Somebody might say, ‘You know, you’ve been singing that way for a long time, but why don’t you try this?’ If you lose your path, sometimes you can’t find your way back, and then you lose your confidence onstage and it really is just downhill.”

The sort of coaching that fosters effective innovation and judgment, not merely the replication of technique, may not be so easy to cultivate. Yet modern society increasingly depends on ordinary people taking responsibility for doing extraordinary things: operating inside people’s bodies, teaching eighth graders algebraic concepts that Euclid would have struggled with, building a highway through a mountain, constructing a wireless computer network across a state, running a factory, reducing a city’s crime rate. In the absence of guidance, how many people can do such complex tasks at the level we require? With a diploma, a few will achieve sustained mastery; with a good coach, many could. We treat guidance for professionals as a luxury—you can guess what gets cut first when school-district budgets are slashed. But coaching may prove essential to the success of modern society.

There was a moment in sports when employing a coach was unimaginable—and then came a time when not doing so was unimaginable. We care about results in sports, and if we care half as much about results in schools and in hospitals we may reach the same conclusion. Local health systems may need to go the way of the Albemarle school district. We could create coaching programs not only for surgeons but for other doctors, too—internists aiming to sharpen their diagnostic skills, cardiologists aiming to improve their heart-attack outcomes, and all of us who have to figure out ways to use our resources more efficiently. In the past year, I’ve thought nothing of asking my hospital to spend some hundred thousand dollars to upgrade the surgical equipment I use, in the vague hope of giving me finer precision and reducing complications. Avoiding just one major complication saves, on average, fourteen thousand dollars in medical costs—not to mention harm to a human being. So it seems worth it. But the three or four hours I’ve spent with Osteen each month have almost certainly added more to my capabilities than any of this.

Talk about medical progress, and people think about technology. We await every new cancer drug as if it will be our salvation. We dream of personalized genomics, vaccines against heart disease, and the unathomed efficiencies from information technology. I would never deny the potential value of such breakthroughs. My teen-age son was spared high-risk aortic surgery a couple of years ago by a brief stent procedure that didn’t exist when he was born. But the capabilities of doctors matter every bit as much as the technology. This is true of all professions. What ultimately makes the difference is how well people use technology. We have devoted disastrously little attention to fostering those abilities.

A determined effort to introduce coaching could change this. Making sure that the benefits exceed the cost will take work, to be sure. So will finding coaches—though, with the growing pool of retirees, we may already have a ready reserve of accumulated experience and know-how. The greatest difficulty, though, may simply be a profession’s willingness to accept the idea. The prospect of coaching forces awkward questions about how we regard failure. I thought about this after another case of mine that Bob Osteen came to observe. It didn’t go so well.

The patient was a woman with a large tumor in the adrenal gland atop her right kidney, and I had decided to remove it using a laparoscope. Some surgeons might have questioned this decision. When adrenal tumors get to be a certain size, they can’t be removed laparoscopically—you have to do a traditional, open operation and get your hands inside. I persisted, though, and soon had cause for regret. Working my way around this tumor with a ten-millimetre camera on the end of a foot-and-a-half-long wand was like trying to find my way around a mountain with a penlight. I continued with my folly too long, and caused bleeding in a blind spot. The team had to give her a blood transfusion while I opened her belly wide and did the traditional operation.
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Osteen watched, silent and blank-faced the entire time, taking notes. My cheeks burned; I was mortified. I wished I’d never asked him along. I tried to be rational about the situation—the patient did fine. But I had let Osteen see my judgment fail; I’d let him see that I may not be who I want to be.

This is why it will never be easy to submit to coaching, especially for those who are well along in their career. I’m ostensibly an expert. I’d finished long ago with the days of being tested and observed. I am supposed to be past needing such things. Why should I expose myself to scrutiny and fault-finding?

I have spoken to other surgeons about the idea. “Oh, I can think of a few people who could use some coaching” has been a common reaction. Not many say, “Man, could I use a coach!” Once, I wouldn’t have, either.

Osteen and I sat together after the operation and broke the case down, weighing the decisions I’d made at various points. He focussed on what I thought went well and what I thought didn’t. He wasn’t sure what I ought to have done differently, he said. But he asked me to think harder about the anatomy of the attachments holding the tumor in.

“You seemed to have trouble keeping the tissue on tension,” he said. He was right. You can’t free a tumor unless you can lift and hold taut the tissue planes you need to dissect through. Early on, when it had become apparent that I couldn’t see the planes clearly, I could have switched to the open procedure before my poking around caused bleeding. Thinking back, however, I also realized that there was another maneuver I could have tried that might have let me hold the key attachments on tension, and maybe even freed the tumor.

“Most surgery is done in your head,” Osteen likes to say. Your performance is not determined by where you stand or where your elbow goes. It’s determined by where you decide to stand, where you decide to put your elbow. I knew that he could drive me to make smarter decisions, but that afternoon I recognized the price: exposure.

For society, too, there are uncomfortable difficulties: we may not be ready to accept—or pay for—a cadre of people who identify the flaws in the professionals upon whom we rely, and yet hold in confidence what they see. Coaching done well may be the most effective intervention designed for human performance. Yet the allegiance of coaches is to the people they work with; their success depends on it. And the existence of a coach requires an acknowledgment that even expert practitioners have significant room for improvement. Are we ready to confront this fact when we’re in their care?

“Who’s that?” a patient asked me as she awaited anesthesia and noticed Osteen standing off to the side of the operating room, notebook in hand.

I was flummoxed for a moment. He wasn’t a student or a visiting professor. Calling him “an observer” didn’t sound quite right, either.

“He’s a colleague,” I said. “I asked him along to observe and see if he saw things I could improve.”

The patient gave me a look that was somewhere between puzzlement and alarm.

“He’s like a coach,” I finally said.

She did not seem reassured. ♦
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**Policy Statement**

This policy was developed to create within the College a structured process for peer assessment of teaching, first and foremost as a mechanism for supporting faculty development (at all ranks), but also to provide one mechanism to satisfy College and University requirements for peer review of teaching for promotion and post-tenure review.\(^1\) The proposal originated with the College’s “Teaching Conversations” group in Fall-04 as a structured mechanism for both formative and summative peer assessment of teaching,\(^2\) and as a substantial policy change on peer assessment for the College, was

---

\(^1\) Note: This version was revised 6/13/11 based on a vote of the Executive Committee to require that all peer reviews conducted be included when formal evaluations of teaching are done, consistent with University policy (“Related UT Policy” link above). Other narrative/editorial changes were made to make this policy consistent with the College’s adopted Teaching Evaluation Policy.


\(^3\) The term ‘formative’ is used in this proposal to represent collegial input with the intent of helping faculty improve his/her teaching through the iterative process of peer observation and feedback, reflection on that feedback, and implementation of improved teaching strategies or methods. The term ‘summative’ assessment, *which is not the*
reviewed and revised by the Faculty Development Committee and implemented as a voluntary process for peer review in May, 2005. One year after implementation (May, 2006), the Executive Committee approved making this the College policy for mandatory peer evaluations.

Guidelines and Procedure

"Peer Observation Team" for Teaching Assessment – The Peer Observation Team will consist of a panel of faculty volunteers (tenure track, non-tenure track, any rank) who are willing to serve in teaching assessment of their colleagues. Formative feedback for any faculty member could be provided by one or two team members, as the faculty member being evaluated desires. The availability of this committed Team as a College resource to help faculty improve teaching in no way precludes any faculty member from using other methods they feel appropriate for obtaining formative feedback on their teaching. This Team simply represents one option for faculty to choose. The Peer Observation Team would be coordinated by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs to select appropriate faculty for the reviews and to ensure equitable distribution of workload within the team. The faculty member being evaluated will be provided a list of members on the Peer Observation Team, and will work with the Coordinator in determining the final member(s) to conduct the formative assessment.

Criteria for the Team – Faculty members who are willing to participate as a team member would be expected to commit to the following:

1. CTL training workshop on peer assessment of teaching.
2. Willingness to evaluate teaching when called upon, and willingness to have their teaching evaluated by the same process.
3. Willing to use a standardized form for assessment.
4. Willing to provide the candidate a written report and verbal review of the assessment.

Components of the Review – While the majority of 'peer evaluation' literature (including the CTE document "Preparing for Peer Observation" that we relied on) focuses on didactic teaching (lecturing), it is recognized that a variety of teaching modalities are utilized in the College within the professional curriculum and graduate instruction (e.g., lectures, facilitated case-based laboratories, practice laboratories, etc.). While precepting students and individualized supervision of graduate students are clearly important components of College's teaching mission, peer assessment in these types of environments was considered to be outside the scope of this proposal and should be addressed separately.

Thus, although the term 'lecture/lab' is used below, it is expected that the assessment components listed would be modified to provide the most appropriate review of the teaching approach being evaluated. Components for the review might include (but are not limited to):

1. The peer evaluator’s attendance/review of lecture/lab.
2. Evaluation of lecture(s) using the Colleges standardized form for lectures; evaluation mechanisms for other types of teaching (e.g., labs) will need to be determined by the parties involved.
3. Review of handouts/notes related to the lecture/lab coverage.
4. Review of the objectives related to the lecture/lab coverage.
5. Review of exam questions related to the lecture/lab coverage.
6. Review of exam stats and student performance related to lecture/lab coverage.
7. Review of the faculty member’s understanding of their lecture/lab “in context” of the rest of the course (i.e., what came before; what comes after).

*intent of this proposal, implies a capstone assessment of the faculty member’s teaching, and would thus be expected to reflect improved teaching through use of the formative process.

* Center for Teaching and Learning (formerly the Division of Instructional Innovation and Assessment, DIIA).
8. Review of support materials provided students for the lecture/lab (Blackboard®, tutorials, problem sets, etc).

In addition, the faculty member may want to ask the Team to review other components of their teaching efforts, including (but not limited to):

9. The faculty member's current teaching philosophy statement and how it has evolved based on his/her experiences, as well as student and peer feedback.
10. Previous student evaluations.
11. Previous peer evaluations.
12. A list of peer classes faculty have attended to explore the approaches used by his/her colleagues. Junior faculty members are encouraged to attend other faculty members' lectures/labs, not only to improve their own teaching by observing their colleagues, but to participate in the peer review process (see #16 below).
13. Evaluation of course packet(s) or handouts including course (or lecture) objectives.
14. Program evaluations relating to the course.
15. Other efforts by the faculty member to improve his/her teaching (e.g., attendance at workshops, conferences, self-assessment and reflection, including peer feedback from presentations);
16. Efforts by the faculty member to help improve the teaching of colleagues (e.g., serving as a member on the peer assessment team, CTL presentations at the New Faculty and at the Experienced Faculty Annual Workshops, etc.).

For a formative assessment, a minimum of a single lecture and any of the associated components described above may be sufficient (by agreement with the faculty member involved). Note that the University guidelines for promotion and tenure require a teaching portfolio of all faculty members being considered for promotion. Review of that portfolio by the College’s Executive Committee is an essential part of the review process. That portfolio could be improved by inclusion of a number of the components above.

In addition to the process outlined herein, faculty members should avail themselves of the extensive services provided by the Center for Teaching & Learning (CTL), including in-class assessment, for formative teaching observation and feedback. Faculty should feel free to secure any additional feedback from colleagues, including informal feedback, to help improve their teaching.

**Frequency and Rank Requirements for Peer Assessments** - As specified in the Colleges comprehensive Teaching Evaluation Policy, Assistant Professor (tenure and non-tenure track or equivalent) should have a minimum of one peer evaluation per year (every year) utilizing this process on formative peer assessment, with the 2-person peer review team for the first year to include a member of the Center for Teaching and Learning, as well as for the peer review immediately prior to promotion considerations. Associate Professors (tenured and non-tenure track or equivalent) should have a minimum of one peer evaluation every two years, and Full Professors (tenured and non-tenure track or equivalent) should have a minimum of one peer evaluation every post-tenure review period.

**Reports** - For the formative peer assessment, the evaluator(s) is (are) expected to provide the faculty member the completed standardized form and conduct a 'completion interview'. All peer evaluations conducted in rank must be included in any evaluation of teaching (e.g., annual merit reviews, promotion considerations, post-tenure review). All members of the Peer Observation Team are required to maintain confidentiality of their findings.

**Use of This Process for Summative Reviews** - As stated above, members of the Peer Observation Team are volunteering their time to conduct formative, collegial evaluations of teaching for the purpose of faculty development. That effort mandates candid, constructive feedback. By following the policies above regarding frequency of assessment, the faculty member should have a longitudinal series of peer reviews documenting progressive improvement in teaching that should serve as a summative assessment of teaching (e.g., at promotion consideration).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Member Observed</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Observation</td>
<td>Course Observed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## CONTENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Done Well</th>
<th>Truly Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Presented main ideas clearly</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provided variety of supporting information</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Clearly addressed relevancy of main ideas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Required higher order thinking of students</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Related ideas to students' prior knowledge</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Provided definitions for new terms/concepts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ORGANIZATION

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Connected introduction to previous classes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Stated organization/objectives</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Used clear, effective transitions with summaries</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Had a clear and organized plan</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Concluded by summarizing main ideas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Connected to future classes/courses/expectations</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## INTERACTION

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Questioned students at different learning levels</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Provided sufficient wait time after asking questions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Encouraged student questions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Gave informative responses to student questions</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Had a good rapport/engagement with students</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## VERBAL/NONVERBAL

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Was confident and enthusiastic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Used clear articulation and pronunciation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Avoided verbalized pauses (e.g. er, ah, um, etc.)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Spoke extemporaneously</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Minimized any distracting accent/language</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Projected voice to be easily heard</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Used appropriate pace of delivery</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Made adequate eye contact with students</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## USE OF MEDIA

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Used classroom technology proficiently</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Made visual aids easy to read</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Provided effective outline/handouts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>DW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## OVERALL RATING

Overall, this instructor was

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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NARRATIVE RESPONSES

STRENGTHS [e.g. apparent knowledge of curriculum preceding and following the presented material, positive feedback to students, opportunity provided for student questions, pharmacy-relevant examples]:

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT [e.g. inability to answer student questions, deficiencies in content knowledge, absence of examples/irrelevant examples, difficulties with student rapport, etc.]:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BEYOND THE LECTURE [e.g. correlation between exam questions and learning objectives, reflection on and incorporation of previous review and suggestions for improvement in teaching, etc.]:

OVERALL:

Date of Conference __________________________ Observer Signature ___________________________
Observer Name (Print) ___________________________
Observer Title ___________________________

Classroom Observation Checklist

Faculty Name__________________________________________ Date____________________

Class Observed ________________________________________ Time____________________

Observer ______________________________________________ Department_____________

All items marked Not observed must be explained in Comments

Class Structure
1. Reviews previous days class content ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
2. Gives overview of day's course content ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
3. Summarizes course content covered ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
4. Directs student preparation for next class ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Methods
1. Provides well designed materials ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
2. Employs non lecture learning activities ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
3. Invites class discussion ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
4. Employs other tools/instructional aids (technology, computer, power point) ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
5. Delivers well planned lecture ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Teacher-Student Interaction
1. Solicits student input ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
2. Involves a variety of students ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
3. Demonstrates awareness of individual student learning needs. ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
4. Fosters an effective learning environment ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Content
1. Appears knowledgeable ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
2. Appears well organized ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
3. Explains concepts clearly ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
4. Relates concepts to students' experience ○ ○ ○ ○ ○
5. Selects learning experiences appropriate to level of learning ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Comments

Observer Signature __________________________ Date____________________
Clinical Observation Checklist

Faculty Name ___________________________ Date ________________

Clinical Observed ______________________ Time ________________

Observer ______________________________ Facility ______________________

All items marked Not observed must be explained in Comments

### Clinical Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could Improve</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Schedules space that fosters conference discussion</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Structures Pre Conference</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Guides, paces and stimulates effective interaction in pre/post conference</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Starts clinical on time</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Encourages students to participate in clinical</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could Improve</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Utilizes learning experiences as they occur</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Provides timely feedback after observation and evaluation of clinical experience</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Checks all medications (if applicable)</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Applies content to clinical situations</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Communicates interest and enthusiasm</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Relates clinical to theory</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher-Student Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could Improve</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Answers questions clearly and concisely</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Available to work with students as situations arise</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supervises all new procedures according to resource protocol</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Fosters an effective learning environment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Could Improve</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Not observed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Models the role of the professional in the clinical setting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assists students in developing critical thinking and problems solving tools</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

 Observer Signature ___________________________ Date ________________
PEER REVIEW EVALUATION OF ONLINE TEACHING

FACULTY NAME: ___________________________ DATE: ________________

COURSE: ___________________________

DIRECTIONS: A. Review online course for standards met (Not met= 1, Met= 2, Exceeded= 3)
B. Enter overall peer evaluation in the Summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. Course Overview &amp; Introduction</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall course design, navigational information, instructor and student information are made transparent to the student at the beginning of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. Learning Objectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives are clearly defined and explained. They assist the student to focus learning activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III. Assessment &amp; Measurement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment strategies use established ways to measure effective learning, assess student progress by reference to stated learning objectives, and are designed as essential to the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. Resources &amp; Materials</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional materials are designed to be sufficiently comprehensive to achieve announced objectives and learning outcomes and are prepared by qualified persons competent in their field.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. Learner Interaction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The effective design of instructor-student interaction, meaningful student cooperation, and student-content interaction is essential to student motivation, intellectual commitment and personal development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary:

Faculty Reviewer:

Adapted from FIPSE Grant funded Quality Matters Rubric (MarylandOnline, 2006)
To: English Department  
From: English Department  
Date:  
Re: Annual Teaching Observations  

Philosophy | One of the most important ways we learn is by reflecting on our experiences—thinking through the choices we make, learning from our mistakes as well as our successes, and getting feedback from others who can sometimes see what we can't. Teaching observations are a great tool for that kind of reflection, a way to build and sustain a culture of teaching. We should never be afraid to share what we're doing in the classroom with other teachers, even if what we do on a given day doesn't work as well as we'd like it to. If we're thinking about what we're doing and continuing to learn about our discipline, our students, and ourselves, then we're doing work we can be proud of.

This teaching observation document was designed to facilitate this kind of reflection and learning. When you look it over, you'll see sections for you to fill out before your observation as well as sections for your observer to fill out based on what s/he sees during the class observation, your responses to the student projects, and your answers to the reflective questions. The purpose of the observation is not to give you more work, nor is it merely to evaluate your teaching, though the chair and the Dean’s Office have asked that all lecturers and adjuncts have a yearly teaching observation on file to aid in hiring decisions. What we hope most is that this process allows you time and space to consider what you're doing and why as well as how you might be able to learn from one another.

Logistics | This is a time-consuming process as area coordinators usually handle the bulk of these observations (with help from very generous colleagues). However, if you have another faculty member you’d like to ask to observe your class (maybe someone who observed you last year and you’d like a follow-up visit from the same person to get a longer-term perspective or maybe you’ve already been talking with a particular faculty member in your or another area/discipline about your teaching, etc.), please just let us know. What matters most is that you have an observation on file. Please email ________@utpa.edu or ________@utpa.edu to sign up at your earliest convenience; you will need to give us a couple of options for times to visit in case there are time conflicts. If you ask another faculty member to visit your class, please send an email letting us know.

After the observation, you should feel free to make an appointment with your observer to reflect on the experience (or have an email conversation), but this is not required. The observer will fill out the second half of this document and provide you with a copy to keep for your files. The English department will need to keep a copy of the document and your supporting materials (see below for specifics), as well. If you participate in annual review/merit, you can include this document in your folder as evidence of your teaching
effectiveness, and if you're ever in need of a letter of recommendation, this observation should provide your observer a wealth of information to use.

Having said that, we don’t want you to feel you must “perform” on the day you're observed, so please don't feel the need to coach your students or do something you don’t regularly do when we visit. We want to see that you are an engaged, reflective teacher who is working on his/her teaching, and you can learn a lot about a teacher from seeing how s/he reacts to a bad class day. You will not be punished for having one bad class; what happens that day is only part of what this document focuses on.

The English department greatly appreciates your quality teaching and we look forward to seeing and/or reading about your classes and hearing what you think about your students and your work. If you have any questions at any point in this process, please don't hesitate to e-mail the department chair pla66f5@utpa.edu and/or the coordinator for your discipline area. (E.g.: Freshman Writing Program = jcharlton@utpa.edu; Developmental Reading/Writing Program = ccharlton@utpa.edu; literature = mitchell@utpa.edu; linguistics/language/ESL = heckler@utpa.edu; creative writing = jskinner@utpa.edu; English education = wjbroz@utpa.edu; rhet/comp = immccracken@utpa.edu).

At least 24 hours before your observation, we’d like you to:

- Fill out Sections A, B, & C below and e-mail this document to your observer.
- Provide your observer with:
  - a copy of any handouts/materials you may be distributing during class on the day of your observation,
  - a copy of your syllabus (or the relevant section indicated from the online syllabus),
  - copies of any major assignments you've given your students so far (at least one),
  - a copy of at least one student project/paper with your written feedback on it. You don’t have to include all their drafts unless you want to. Please black out your students' names, so their privacy is ensured. If you feel more comfortable asking your students' permission before including their work, please feel free to do so. You can assure them this is not an evaluation of them, that you're using it to help you reflect on your teaching.

In an effort to save paper and file cabinet space, please send electronic copies of as many of these documents as you can.
A. Teacher and Course Information (to be completed by teacher being observed)

Name of Teacher:
Name of Observer:
Course:
Time/Classroom:
Date:

B. Reflection on Course Goals and Response Strategies (to be completed by teacher being observed)

1. What are your overall course goals? If you had to name the 2 most important, what would they be?

2. What was driving your feedback on the students' project(s) you turned in? For instance, was there a particular SLO that sparked your feedback? Was there a particular concern that had emerged in this class that you were addressing? Was there a concern you had about this particular student you were trying to address? There are no right answers; we are just looking for some detailed reflection about how and why you're giving feedback to your students.

C. Course Planning Information (to be completed by teacher being observed)

1. What do you hope your students learn on the day you're observed? How does that fit into your larger class goals and program SLOs?

2. How will you use class time the day you're observed?

3. What factors did you take into account as you were planning this class? (For example, do your students seem to respond better to some kinds of activities than others?)

4. Are there specific aspects of your teaching that you would like feedback on?

D) Observer's Comments on Class Visit (to be completed by the observing teacher)

1. Purpose (What was the purpose of the class meeting as you observed it? Was the purpose clear? How were the class activities related to that purpose and to one another?)

2. Content of Class (What did students do and learn during this class meeting? How well did the content of the class connect to disciplinary expectations and/or one or more of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for the program?)
3. **Use of Class Time** *(How was class time structured? Did the teacher include opportunities for active learning? Was enough time given to each activity? How were the transitions from one activity to the next handled? How did the instructor cope with the unexpected? Did the class activities offer evidence of creative planning?)*

4. **Interaction** *(How does the teacher facilitate student participation? How do the students engage in active learning? Are there opportunities for the students to ask the teacher questions? What kind of dynamic seems to govern the class? How does the teacher establish and/or manage the dynamics of the class?)*

**E) Comments on Instructor Strengths** *(to be completed by observing teacher)*

**F) Comments on Syllabus and Instructor Feedback** *(to be completed by observing teacher)*

**G) Overall Suggestions for Professional Growth** *(to be completed by the observing teacher)*

**H) Additional comments related to teaching effectiveness** *(to be completed by the observing teacher)*
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND KINESIOLOGY ANNUAL FACULTY EVALUATION

Health and Kinesiology
Annual Faculty Evaluation

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING

Directions: Please indicate the Professional Teaching you rendered as a result of your employment at UTPA the past year. Write in the blanks the information requested and quantify it if possible. Use additional sheet(s) as needed. Supportive evidence should be in a separate folder unless otherwise specified. Your teaching is being evaluated in four areas: a) content expertise, b) instructional delivery, c) instructional design, and d) course management. Each area will receive a rating from 1 to 4 (1.0 – does not meet job performance criteria, 1.5, 2.0 – meets job performance criteria, 2.5, 3.0 – exceeds job performance criteria, 3.5, 4.0 – exemplary job performance) from each evaluating member.

Total annual faculty evaluation chosen in teaching = _____%

1. Content expertise: (30% evaluation) is defined as “...body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area...”
   A. Highest earned degree and year
      ____________________________/_______
      Major and Minor
      ____________________________/_______
   B. Member professional organizations

   C. Attendance at professional meetings

   D. Courses taught during year
      List: ____________________________
      Fall: ________ Spring: ________ Summer: ________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      ____________________________
      Total semester hrs taught: ________ ________ ________
      Total enrollment: ________ ________ ________
   E. Graduate faculty: yes no
   F. Theses committee(s) served on and role

   G. New course(s) developed and describe

   H. Teaching award

   I. Independent study (gratia)
2. **Instructional delivery**: (30% evaluation) is defined as “...those human interactive skills and characteristics which make for clear communication of information and promote learning...” A. Student evaluation questions 11, 15, 16, and 17. Summarize numerically on scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being excellent, 4 being good, etc. Summarize 6 hours during each fall and spring semester. Q11= Rating as instructor, Q15=Clarity of communications, Q16=Encourages students to ask questions, Q17=Encourages students to express ideas...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>Q15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attach student evaluation summary sheets**

B. Classroom teaching observed (optional) 

C. Use of media in teaching 

D. Other 

3. **Instructional design**: (20% evaluation) is defined as “...those technical skills in designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which induce student learning...” Include the same 6 hours each fall and spring semester done in #2 above.

A. Class syllabi

**Attach class syllabi**

B. Grades

**Attach grade distribution sheet**

C. Tests

**Attach sample tests**

D. Handouts
Attach sample handouts
E. Other

4. Course management: (20% evaluation) is defined as “... those bureaucratic skills in operating and managing a course...”

A. List office hours    Fall ___________________ Spring ___________________
B. A. Student evaluation questions 13 and 14. Summarize numerically on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being excellent, 4 being good, etc. Include the same 6 hours during each fall and spring semester done in #2 above. Q13=Instructor outside availability, Q14=Availability during office hours.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>Q14</td>
<td>Q13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other ________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of four areas must equal 100% (predetermined)
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PEER CLASSROOM OBSERVATION FORM

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION PEER EVALUATION FORM

Instructor: ___________________________ Observer: ___________________________
Class/Activity: ___________________________ Date of Observation: __________
Observation: ___announced ___unannounced Length of Observation: __________

Directions to Observer: Use the scale below to mark your evaluations.
NO = Not Observed
N/A = Not Applicable
BA = Below Average (not acceptable)
A = Average (acceptable)
AA = Above Average (acceptable)

Note: For items 1, 2, and 7, the observer must circle one of the boldfaced indicators for each item and may use the line spaces next to a sub-item as a checklist.

1. Opening activities were well planned.
   Did the instructor...
   ... review by connecting to previous classes/knowledge? ___Yes ___No
   ... ask for questions concerning previously-covered material? ___Yes ___No
   ... provide the class objectives? ___Yes ___No
   (other): ___________________________

   Comments: ___________________________

2. Teaching techniques represent sound principles of learning.
   Did the instructor...
   ... present main ideas clearly? ___Yes ___No
   ... use a variety of supporting information? ___Yes ___No
   ... require higher order thinking? ___Yes ___No
   ... wait an appropriate amount of time for responses? ___Yes ___No
   ... demonstrate rapport with students? ___Yes ___No
   ... pace instruction well? ___Yes ___No
   ... effectively use student feedback? ___Yes ___No
   ... use media appropriately? ___Yes ___No
   (other): ___________________________

   Comments: ___________________________
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3. The instructor is knowledgeable concerning course subject matter.  NO  N/A  BA  A  AA
Comments: ________________________________________________________________

4. Class activities relate to instructional objectives.  NO  N/A  BA  A  AA
Comments: ________________________________________________________________

5. The classroom is well managed.  NO  N/A  BA  A  AA
Comments: ________________________________________________________________

6. Meaningful learning takes place.  NO  N/A  BA  A  AA
Comments: ________________________________________________________________

7. Closing activities are clear.  NO  N/A  BA  A  AA
   Did the instructor...
   ...summarize main ideas?  ___Yes  ___No
   ...present a preview for future learning?  ___Yes  ___No
   ...mention assignments?  ___Yes  ___No
   (other): ________________________________________________________________
Comments: ________________________________________________________________

Additional comments may be written on the back of these pages or on a separate page.

Observer  Date  Instructor  Date
(Note: The instructor's signature indicates receipt of the observation report; it does not necessarily indicate agreement.)