

Guidelines for Peer Observation of Teaching

Department of Architecture

March 24, 2014 (*Revised* November 21, 2015)

Preliminary Note: The following guidelines are supplemental to UT System "Guidelines for Faculty Peer Review of Teaching" and the UTSA Provost's "Guidelines for Faculty Peer Observation of Teaching." These guidelines pertain to System-mandated peer observations required for inclusion in all tenure and promotion reports. These guidelines do not pertain to peer observations for purposes of annual merit evaluation and/or the improvement of teaching outside of the tenure and promotion processes.

The Department of Architecture Peer Observation process is intended to improve teaching and student learning and should serve primarily as a tool for mentoring and professional development. The peer observation process should foster a culture of teaching excellence through collegial dialogue. Thus, the outcome of the faculty peer observation process should be a reflective summary describing any steps taken or changes made towards the enhancement of teaching and improvement of student learning.

The Peer Observation process will pertain to all course types taught within the Department of Architecture including studios, seminar, lecture, lecture + labs, online and hybrid courses. The review process and forms are designed to best measure and provide effective feedback for each kind of course, distinctly.

Who is Observed / and When?

All tenured and tenure-track faculty are required to have peer observation of teaching prior to application for tenure and promotion. Documentation of the review process must be included in the application package (See Documentation below). Non-Tenure Track (NTT) faculty may also be subject peer observation at the discretion of the Department Chair. Further, it is advised that tenure-track faculty be reviewed prior to the mandatory third year review process.

Who can serve as a peer observer?

Faculty undergoing observation will work in consultation with the Department Chair to choose their peer observer. The reviewer should be at equal or higher rank. Reviewers should be chosen so as to provide the most useful feedback and should have experience with the type of instruction under review. NTT faculty should be reviewed by tenured or tenure-track faculty.

Review Process:

All reviews will consist of the following:

1. Review of Course Materials (syllabus, project statements, assignments, exams, etc.)
2. Observation (on date agreed to by faculty under observation)
3. PEER OBSERVER report by OBSERVER (Must be submitted with T & P documents)
4. Meeting
5. Post Observation/Meeting FACULTY REPORT (Must be submitted with T & P documents)

1. Review of Course Materials

All peer observations must include a review of course materials prepared for the delivery of the course. This includes the review of the syllabus for completeness and clarity and an overall appraisal of the course design as related to curricular intent. Additional materials, such as exams,

project statements, and handouts, should also be reviewed. In addition, the observer and faculty member may also agree to review previous course preparation and results, including written student comments, grade distributions, and completed student work. Faculty member being reviewed will be required to produce a course teaching portfolio or p (See Appendix A for Form)

2. Observation

All peer observation processes will include at least one direct observation session of the course during a class or class-related events (with the exception of online courses). If in consultation between observer and faculty member determines the need for more than one observation, no more than two sessions will be required. Date will be agreed to prior to observation session(s).

For Studios:

Observation will consist of an interview between Peer Observer and students in conjunction with students completing a focused questionnaire. (See Appendix B for Form) Observer may also participate in Studio Review (if available) as well.

For Lecture / Seminar Courses:

Observation will occur during any lecture or seminar session. (See Appendix C for Form)

For Lecture + Lab Courses:

Observation will occur during one lecture and one lab session. (See Appendix D for Form)

For Hybrid Courses:

Observation will take place during one or two regularly scheduled (See Appendix E for Form)

3. Report - PEER OBSERVER Written Report

Consists of completed Forms A along with B, C, D, or E depending on type of course under observation. Also, Form F should be used for an overall evaluation. (See Appendix F for Form)

4. Meeting

After the conclusion of the observation session, the observer and faculty member are required to meet to discuss the results of the Instructional Materials review and Observation.

5. Post Observation/Meeting - FACULTY REPORT

The peer observation process is completed when the faculty member under observation completes a Post Observation Narrative (See Appendix G for Form). This document must contain: Name and signature of Faculty Member and Peer Observer, name and course number of observed class, dates of pre-observation meeting, observation(s), and post-observation meeting, and a narrative written by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development (See Appendix F for Form).

Instructional Materials Review - Form

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Name (Peer Observer): _____

Course Observed: _____ Date(s): _____

Comments:

Criteria	N/A	Needs Improvement	Good	Excellent
1. Syllabus (overall completeness)				
1a. Clarity & Organization				
1b. Schedule				
1c. Learning Objectives				
1d. Grading Schema				
2. Project Statement / Assignments				
2a. Related to Course Content?				
2b. Clarity				
3. Handouts and other Resources				
3a. Clarity				
3b. Completeness				
4. Exams / Quizzes				
4a. Well designed?				
4b. Fair & Appropriate?				
General Questions:				
5. Instructional materials support curricular goals of course?				
6. Instructional materials suitable relative to course objectives?				
7. How well do evaluation methods reflect stated course goals?				
8. How clearly are performance standards communicated?				
9. Is the grade distribution appropriate to the level of the course and the type of student enrolled?				

Other General & Specific Comments / Advice: (please describe):

Student Focused Evaluation of Studio - Review Form

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Course: _____ Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: *This form is intended to provide useful feedback for you instructor to aid in the improvement of their future studio instruction. This is meant to be a constructive process that is administered by a peer of your instructor who will use the information you provide to discuss what works and what can be improved, so please be as clear as you can.*

Please use the following questions to evaluate your course

Comments:

Criteria	N/A	Needs Improvement	Good	Excellent
1. Studio Environment - Faculty Management				
2. Studio Environment – Collaborative				
3. Studio Environment – Physical Quality				
4. Quality of Course Design				
5. Projects (overall)				
5a. Length				
5b. Topics				
6. Grading (Overall)				
6a. Grading (Timely)				
6b. Grading (Helpful)				
7. Syllabus (Overall)				
7a. Clarity				
7b. Completeness				
7. Use of Studio Time / Productive				
8. Preparedness for class				
9. Instructor Engagement				
10. Project Reviews (Overall)				
10a. Structure / Organization				
10b. Helpfulness				
11. Studio meeting expectations				
12. Overall Quality of Studio				

Best Aspect of Studio (please describe): _____

Aspect of Studio that needs the Most Improvement (please describe):

Lecture / Seminar Course Observation Review - Form

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Name (Peer Observer): _____

Course Observed: _____ Date(s): _____

Comments:

Criteria	N/A	Needs Imprvmt	Good	Excellent
Presented main ideas clearly				
Called for critical thinking of students				
Related ideas to students' prior knowledge				
Provided definitions for new terms/concepts				
Referred students to other sources				
Was prepared for class				
Connected content to previous classes				
Stated organization / objectives				
Used clear, effective transitions with summaries				
Used instructional time well				
Facilitated students' active Engagement				
Used and responded to questions effectively				
Had a good rapport/engagement with students				
Was responsive to feedback from students				
Treated students with respect				
Was confident and enthusiastic				
Made adequate eye contact with students				
Used clear articulation and pronunciation				
Avoided distracting mannerisms and language				
Used classroom technology proficiently				
Websites, video clips, & other visuals used well				
Provided effective outline/handouts				
Used appropriate pace of delivery				
Projected voice to be easily heard				

Most Effective Strategies (please describe):

Least Effective Strategies (please describe):

Hybrid Course Review - Form

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Name (Peer Observer): _____

Course Observed: _____ Date(s): _____

Not yet applicable. Department has no hybrid courses.

OBSERVER - Post Observation Report Summary

Name (Peer Observer): _____

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Course Observed: _____ Date(s): _____

Comments:

Quality of instruction (overall):

Strengths and innovations:

Areas for improvement:

FACULTY - Post Observation / Meeting REPORT Form

Name (Faculty Member): _____

Name (Peer Observer): _____

Course Observed: _____ Date(s): _____

Meeting Dates (Pre-observation): _____ ; (Post-observation): _____

Narrative (by the faculty member describing what the faculty member has learned from the peer observation process and any plans for improvement or development):