

The Center for Faculty Development
Peer Teaching Observation Program
Guidelines

The Peer Teaching Observation Program (PTOP) is intended for faculty members at any level and in any type of position who would like confidential, formative feedback about their teaching. Many institutions offer this kind of faculty support; it gives instructors the chance to gather suggestions and ideas to improve their teaching in a way that is informal and low stakes, and the instructor may use the assessment in any way s/he sees fit. This is not intended to replace the official observations done by departments, but rather it is intended to complement those.

The sole purpose of the Seton Hall University Peer Teaching Observation Program (PTOP) is to provide faculty members with confidential, formative feedback to improve their teaching effectiveness. Therefore, feel free to adapt any of the material below to suit the individual needs of the observer or the person being observed (i.e., the instructor). These are suggestions, not requirements.

Observers will receive a \$200 honorarium at the conclusion of the process.

Suggested PTOB Process:

1. Pre-observation meeting – about one week before the class session, the colleagues meet to:
 - a. Review the course syllabus and the course learning objectives, assignments, assessment methods, and teaching strategies. The instructor may, if s/he would like, also share examples of completed student work.
 - b. Talk about the instructor's objective(s) for the observed class session.
 - c. Highlight the types of learners in the class (e.g., majors/non-majors, year, anyone with accommodations from Disability Support Services).
 - d. Convey the expected method of instruction (e.g., lecture, exercise, case).
 - e. Discuss the instructor's goal(s) for the observation (i.e., what kind of feedback is sought).
 - f. Review the rubrics to be used for the observation.
2. Peer observation visit – the peer observer attends the class session selected by the instructor and completes the observation rubrics.
3. Instructor self-reflection – as soon as practical after the class, the instructor uses the same observation rubrics to assess her or his own performance.
4. Observer write-up – Within about a week, the observer completes the observation rubrics (see below) and writes confidential, formative feedback for the instructor. The write-up should highlight what the instructor did well, so s/he can build upon these strengths, as well as areas where improvement may be needed. Specific and constructive suggestions should be included.

5. Post observation meeting – As soon as practical, the colleagues meet to discuss the peer evaluation and the self-reflection, and to develop an action plan to improve teaching effectiveness.
6. Program Assessment – At the conclusion of the process, both parties will be asked to complete a brief survey about their experience, which will be used by the Program Coordinator to make improvements to the program as needed.

A list of faculty who have expressed an interest in doing observations is available; this was generated based on recommendations from department chairs and/or colleagues. Additions to that list are welcome.

If you would like to participate in the program, whether as an observee or observer, or if you have questions, please contact Elizabeth McCrea elizabeth.mccrea@shu.edu

Seton Hall University Peer Teaching Observation Program Rubric

(Note this is a generic template. Feel free to adapt this form based on the instructor’s goals for the observation.)

Behavior	Check all that apply.	Comments
Instructor communicated the learning objectives of the class session.	<input type="checkbox"/> explicit <input type="checkbox"/> implicit <input type="checkbox"/> not observed <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable	
Instructor used concrete examples and illustrations to clarify the material.	<input type="checkbox"/> multiple examples <input type="checkbox"/> one example <input type="checkbox"/> not observed <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable	
Instructor ensured students were engaged.	<input type="checkbox"/> active discussion <input type="checkbox"/> group/individual activities <input type="checkbox"/> other <input type="checkbox"/> not observed <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable	
Instructor checked for understanding.	<input type="checkbox"/> used an assessment tool <input type="checkbox"/> asked specific questions <input type="checkbox"/> asked “any questions?” <input type="checkbox"/> other (please	

	specify→) ___ not observed	
Instructor linked new material to previously learned concepts.	___ explicit ___ implicit ___ not observed ___ not applicable	
Instructor used technology, handouts, visual aids and other supplements effectively.	___ enriching ___ distracting ___ not observed ___ not applicable	
Uses respectful and inclusive language & examples (races, ethnicities, and genders).	___ observed ___ not observed	
Organization of class content is explicit and logical	___ well organized ___ hard to follow ___ other	
Finishes class with a review, summary, reflection or closing activity.	___ observed ___ cursory or incomplete ___ not observed	
Classroom management skills.	___ well controlled class ___ a few distractions ___ many management issues	
Time management	___ well-paced ___ rushed ___ too slow ___ started & ended on time	
Instructor rapport with students	___ relaxed ___ respectful ___ adversarial ___ distant ___ other	

* Note: These PTO materials were adapted from a number of sources, including: <http://oregonstate.edu/cla/sites/default/files/mentoring/peer-evaluation.pdf>; <https://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/peer-review-of-teaching/>; and

Julie A. Mueller – U. of Oregon Teaching Engagement Program – tep.uoregon.edu