ED 420 358   JC 980 307

AUTHOR	Agatucci, Cora; Ahern, Gloria; Mays, Ken; McCown, Jack; Sequeira, Mike
TITLE	Peer Evaluation Guidelines.
INSTITUTION	Central Oregon Community Coll., Bend.
PUB DATE	1995-10-04
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Classroom Observation Techniques; Community Colleges; Educational Quality; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Job Performance; *Lesson Observation Criteria; *Peer Evaluation; Performance Based Assessment; Teacher Student Relationship; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Central Oregon Community College

ABSTRACT

This document provides the peer evaluation guidelines for Central Oregon Community College (COCC). It begins by identifying the goals of the peer team: to maintain and strengthen the quality of instruction at COCC; establish strong collegial ties among faculty members; offer positive suggestions to them for improvement as teachers; and evaluate their performance and growth over time for purposes of rehire, tenure, and promotion. The report offers suggestions for simplifying evaluations and includes criteria for final reports. It also provides common standards for teaching performance at COCC. These include: knowledge, preparation, and understanding of subject material; instructional delivery skills and relationship with students; and course organization. One section describes unique teaching situations at COCC, including: those in labs; the library; computer sciences; film arts, fine arts, music, theater performance and studio classes; social sciences; speech courses; interdisciplinary courses and seminar classes. (Contains guidelines for classroom peer observation and course material review for peer evaluation.) (YKH)

Central Oregon Community College

Peer Evaluation Guidelines

October 4, 1995

Peer Evaluation Guidelines

Recommendations for Peer Observations from the Report of the Peer Evaluation Task Force, appointed by the Academic Affairs Policy Subcommittee: Cora Agatucci (Chair), Gloria Ahern, Ken Mays, Jack McCown, Mike Sequeira. January 27, 1995. Administrative review and revision (October 4, 1995).

Goals of Peer Team

The goals of the peer team fall into two categories based on the two roles, formative and summative, of the team. These two roles should blend together to maintain and strengthen the quality of instruction at COCC; to establish strong collegial ties among faculty members; to offer positive suggestions to faculty members for improvement as teachers; and to evaluate the faculty member's performance and growth over time for purposes of rehire, tenure, and promotion. An adversarial relationship among the faculty member, the designated evaluator, and the peer team is not productive. Great care should be taken to establish an advocacy, as well as a productively evaluative, relationship among the members of the team, the designated evaluator, and the faculty member.

The formative goals of the peer team include the development of a collegial/mentoring atmosphere, the introduction of the faculty member to the procedures and culture of COCC, the development of an environment aimed at the sharing of ideas on teaching and mutual learning, the provision of prompt and informal feedback after visitations. The faculty member should consider the members of his/her peer team as resources to consult concerning any aspects of the primary teaching assignment, procedures at the College, or other areas of concern.

The summative goals of the peer team include the evaluation of the faculty member's role in the primary teaching assignment; determining areas for growth or areas of concern; offering positive, concrete suggestions for that growth; and documenting the faculty member's development as a teacher.

The purpose of faculty summative evaluation at COCC is to maintain and strengthen the quality of COCC instruction, and to assess and evaluate a pattern of performance in the primary (teaching) assignment over time as a basis for making personnel decisions (e.g., rehire, tenure, promotions). Toward this end, it is important to identify and to document any problems or concerns as early in the evaluation process as possible so that improvement can also be identified and documented.

In the past, tenure and promotion committees have observed that constructive criticism and documentation of problem areas and growth in those areas rarely appear in peer evaluation reports. Uncritically glowing reports throw into question the value of the peer summative evaluation process. It is important to emphasize that personnel decisions based in part on peer team reports are concerned with long-term trends and that issues of concern raised early in the evaluation process offer valuable benchmarks against which to measure growth and development of the faculty member. Major concerns documented for the first time in tenure and promotion recommendations at the end of the faculty member's fourth or fifth year are threatening to the faculty member, difficult for the designated evaluator to write, and put promotion and tenure decisions in jeopardy. It is important to recognize that the purpose of the peer team is to encourage growth over time. This process must begin at the earliest stages of the faculty member's association with the College and continue throughout the years preceding key personnel decisions.

Suggestions for Simplifying Evaluation: Beyond Class Visits

Peer team members are encouraged to discuss their observations with the faculty member, to offer suggestions for alternate approaches or pedagogies, to make the faculty member aware of various support programs available on campus (e.g., formative professional development programs, PET, WAD, workshops, and other opportunities as they become available), and to suggest classes of colleagues that the faculty member might visit as an observer.

Additional methods of observation and information gathering may include conducting group and/or individual interviews with students, and reviewing the faculty member's critiques of student work and graded exams or term projects. Peer team members may wish to interview the faculty member's peers in the discipline concerning issues related to the primary teaching assignment. Other activities being pursued by the faculty member outside the classroom relevant to performance in the primary assignment should be discussed and observed by members of the peer team where appropriate. In each case, the faculty member, the peer team, and the designated evaluator should feel free to suggest such additional methods and reach mutual agreement on such procedures.

Final Reports

Formative: The members of the team shall write individual reports to be submitted to the faculty member. Peer teams should meet with the faculty member and designated evaluator to discuss their final observations. At that time, possible concerns for the summative stage of the peer evaluation process should be raised. No written report will be submitted to the faculty member's personnel file.

Summative: Peer evaluators should be prepared to write complete, detailed reports to offer positive feedback to the faculty member offering real guidance for further growth as well as documenting perceived problems and identifying goals for the development of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness over time.

The most helpful evaluations are characterized by the following qualities, identified by Stephen Brookfield in *The Skillful Teacher*:

- Clarity: evaluation criteria are specified and supported with detailed observation and examples; communication is clear and straightforward

- Immediacy: evaluative judgments are given as soon as possible after the assessment process is completed

- Regularity: comments are made regularly even when the peer team member is simply acknowledging that suggestions are being followed; major changes are monitored closely, keeping in mind that the rhythm of significant student learning may fluctuate incrementally (two steps forward, one step back)

- Accessibility: peer team members provide the faculty member with opportunities to discuss and consult regarding evaluations

- Individualized: respect for the faculty member's work is evidenced in the peer team's detailed, clearly individualized attention to the faculty member's efforts; however, constructive criticism is focused on the faculty member's actions, not her/his personality, to ensure that the faculty member does not feel that her/his whole being is under assault

- Affirming and Balanced: peer team evaluations acknowledge the faculty member's achievements and strengths before identifying weaknesses and making critical commentary; acknowledge what is good at the same time that attention is drawn to what needs work; to maintain and improve the quality of teaching, faculty members need to recognize both their strengths and weaknesses as teachers to support on going self-assessment and growth

- Future-Oriented: clear suggestions are given about specific actions the faculty member should take in the long and short run to improve or maintain teaching effectiveness

- Justifiable: constructive criticism aimed at identifying areas needing improvement should be based on clearly stated rationales with concern for the best interests of the faculty member as well as her/his students

- Educative: good evaluations are those from which the faculty member can learn; to provide such helpful guidance, peer team members should keep this question in mind: What can this person learn from my comments?

Common Standards for Teaching Performance at COCC

This description of performance expectations for successful instructors at COCC is informed by many resources, primarily from the interviews the Task Force conducted with COCC faculty, with subsequent review by members of the instructional administration.

A. Knowledge, Preparation and Understanding of Subject

1. Instructor demonstrates a strong foundation in the content and skills of the subject being taught.

2. Evidence suggests that instructor stays abreast of current knowledge and new developments in the subject matter field.

3. Evidence shows the instructor demonstrates and connects applications of the subject to real world and/or other disciplinary contexts.

4. Instructor communicates enthusiasm and passion for the subject to students.

5. Class materials are up-to-date as required by the subject matter, and well selected to meet course objectives.

6. Evidence suggests that the instructor makes effective use of appropriate library, multimedia, laboratory, technological and other resources.

7. Evidence shows instructor is willing to take risks, to implement innovations and give them fair trial, to work cooperatively with colleagues and students and to revise and refresh course content with contemporary knowledge.

8. Instructor uses appropriate discipline-specific pedagogy.

B. Instructional Delivery Skills and Relationship with Students

1. Instructor communicates energy and enthusiasm for the subject or learning activity; instructor is able to engage students in the course and hold their attention; instructor challenges students and motivates them to learn.

2. Instructor encourages meaningful student participation in the course and offers all students the means to assume active roles in the learning process; instructor encourages students to generate ideas pertinent to course goals, to link familiar to new course content, and to apply course concepts and skills to real world and cross-disciplinary contexts, and to students' life experiences where appropriate; instructor provides opportunities for students to learn by discovery and open-ended inquiry, to exercise imagination and creativity, and/or to develop their skills in higher order critical thinking, analysis, synthesis, evaluation and problem solving.

3. Communication skills--voice, level of diction, volume, pace, poise, eye contact, facial expression, movement, gesture, and other non-verbal signs--are effective, advancing rather than obstructing instructional goals; examples, explanations and directions are clear, direct, relevant, and unambiguous; instructor's expectations and evaluation criteria are clearly articulated in advance for student work to be graded, and instructor applies these criteria consistently in practice; use of teaching aids and design of class

activities (blackboard, overheads, multi-media enhancements, computer technology, handouts, group work, collaborative learning techniques, etc.) enhance communication and clarify instructional objectives.

4. Instructor displays a genuine interest in students and their progress in the course, and effective interpersonal communication skills: in particular, s/he is patient with, attentive to, and respectful of student contributions to class; invites questions, listens well and responds constructively to these questions; and recognizes students as individual human beings.

5. Instructor works with students to create a safe, constructive, and stimulating learning environment; instructor is tolerant of disagreement, open to suggestion and criticism, and encourages expression of multiple points of view, when appropriate; instructor uses classroom authority fairly and equitably, without condescension or favoritism.

6. Instructor is able to analyze her/his student audience and evaluate the success of instruction at key points in the meeting and in the term to ensure that students are learning what instructor believes s/he is teaching; instructor makes timely and frequent efforts to monitor student attention levels and student learning needs and goals (for example, through varied assessment and classroom research techniques), and to measure student progress and keep students informed of their standing in the course.

7. Instructor is flexible, able to adapt course materials and activities and/or vary the pace of the class, when warranted, to reach students of divergent backgrounds, interests, aptitudes, and skill levels; instructor can employ diverse teaching strategies effectively to accommodate different student learning styles, bring all students into the learning process and keep them engaged.

8. Instructor makes her/himself readily accessible to students needing individual attention outside class; students, in turn, are not reluctant to seek such assistance when needed.

C. Course Organization

1. Course goals and student learning outcomes are clearly defined and well articulated; course pre-requisites are appropriate predictors of the skills and knowledge entry-level students need for success in the course; course material is appropriate to the level of the course and the preparation of the students; learning outcomes are designed to provide exit-level students with solid, sequential preparation needed for success at the next level of study.

2. Creative, effective, student-centered planning is evident; course presentations, assignments, and activities are designed to address diverse student learning styles, skill levels, group dynamics, and individual learning needs and goals; course syllabus outlines a sequenced progression logically organized and reasonably paced to build students' content understanding and/or develop students' skills successfully over the duration of the term.

3. Class time is constructively managed, begins and ends promptly with respect for student time, with appropriate introduction of the day's plan and goals, and with adequate time allotted to answer questions and explain assignments and deadlines; material is presented in an orderly, planned fashion and previewed objectives are realized; instructor maintains appropriate control over the progression of the class session or activity.

4. Current lesson makes a coherent contribution to long-range or sequential course objectives and student learning outcomes, and instructor points out these connections to students with adequate frequency and clarity.

5. Class activities, assignments, exams, and other assessment strategies are well planned and sequenced, and correlate closely to course emphases and learning outcomes; students are given persuasive rationales for the value of such activities and assignments and their contribution to meeting course objectives and learning outcomes; students are given adequate time and reasonable preparation to complete these assignments and exams successfully; the instructional potential of sequential assessment is utilized: instructor provides constructive criticism of initial student performance and designs subsequent opportunities for students to apply and improve their developing skills and/or content mastery.

6. Course texts, learning aids, handouts, slides, displays, supplementary materials and co-requisites complement course objectives and effectively assist students in mastering course content and skills.

7. Record keeping and assessment practices seem consistent, fair, and responsible; students are given regular, timely feedback on their progress and performance in the course.

8

Unique Teaching Situations at COCC

While common standards for successful teaching performance do exist at COCC, they may be applied, adapted, achieved and measured in diverse ways across programs and disciplines. We developed this description of the types of unique teaching situations currently found at COCC from our interview with faculty and program heads. It is offered as a useful first step in acknowledging our instructional diversity and in providing a guide to some of the special considerations for peer observation relevant to these different teaching situations. We do not believe the list encompasses all the unique factors nor all the discipline-specific objectives and methods that need to be taken into account for individual peer evaluation assignments. Still, the description should offer a suggestive point of departure for initial discussions among faculty members, designated evaluators, and peer team members in clarifying the primary assignment and shaping the Peer Team's evaluation criteria and classroom observation methods.

1. **Labs pertain to instruction in Professional Technical Programs, Computer Science, Health and Human Performance, Reading and Science.**

   They offer a learning situation not necessarily a presentation on content. Lab activities are generally hands-on and attention is directed to problem-solving.

   Interview instructor for activities which facilitate instruction. The philosophy of the instruction needs to be determined ahead of the classroom visitation. Depending on the course there may or may not be a lecture/lab association.

   Observe individual and small group instruction.

   Look for evidence of instructor support, interaction between students and instructor, willingness of students to seek assistance from each other as well as from the instructor.

   Evaluate independence of thought by students, and the opportunity to work out solutions. Interview students in the lab setting. Review individual student files which contain results of ongoing goal setting sessions and instructional plans.

   Nursing observers of hospital clinicals need to commit a 2-3 hour time block and be willing to be exposed to the hospital environment.

2. **Library**

   Evaluate the teaching moments at the reference desk in addition to classroom visits. Work with the instructor to determine ideal times for one-on-one student observation here.

3. **Computer Science**

   Evaluate lecture/lab continuity as a whole in order to determine if materials used for class mesh the two areas.

   Look at exams for consistency.

   Survey whether the instructor uses questions to focus students on concept, ideas or procedures.

4. Film Arts

Observer will be involved in watching movies.

5. Fine Arts, Music, Theater Performance and Studio Classes

In general peer teams should understand the dual purpose of trying to provide a growth experience for performance students while producing a publicly enjoyable performance. Studio class observers should commit to 2-3 hour blocks in order to observe the whole instructional process.

Consult with instructor for specific guidelines regarding visitations to auditions, rehearsals and final performance dates. Peers need the awareness that auditions are frequently designed to weed-out performers and their impact on other performance settings.

Observe student-teacher interaction and the ability of the instructor to tailor comments to individual students.

6. Social Science

In general the formats involve lecture with some discussion, a writing component and other out-of-class elements which need to be evaluated.

Consult with the instructor to determine the differences between 100 and 200 level courses.

Distinguish special techniques: seminars, small group work, case studies and multi-media presentations require the observer to appreciate the instructor's ability to balance these elements.

7. Speech Courses

Evaluate Public Speaking as a performance course where listening skills are as important as lecturing skills.

Distinguish how much students speak, whether the class feels comfortable speaking their minds, and how the instructor reacts to the open discussion.

Evaluate observations focused on individual and small group instruction. Determine whether the Public Speaking instructor is able to perform as a public speaker with performances that are enthusiastic, well-organized and appropriate to the audience.

Evaluate Interpersonal Communication courses as an experience that may seem free form and undirected since the focus is often the student's personal experience. The instructor must be able to reframe the shared personal information within the course concepts.

8. Interdisciplinary Courses and Seminar Classes

Observer needs to be aware of the various formats utilized and consult with the instructor in advance.

Evaluate the class for supportive learning environment and the objective, non-threatening, sensitive handling of differences of opinion.

9. Other Factors

Other factors may also be significant in evaluating teaching performance, and we encourage individual faculty members and designated evaluators to identify such factors and inform peer team members of their roles in shaping the learning experience. Examples of such factors might include the size of a class; the content and/or skills development orientation; the key instructional role of assignment design; skill-building through instructor's comments on student essays or oral participation; the use of computers, multi-media, distance learning formats and/or other instructional technologies in the classroom; the course's status as required or elective; experiments with innovative delivery systems like team-teaching, linked interdisciplinary classes, or learning community concepts; collaborative and group learning techniques; tutoring principles used in individual tutoring and conferencing.

Guidelines for Classroom Peer Observation

Once again, the Peer Evaluation Task Force offers these guidelines to classroom observation as a productive first step toward instituting more consistency in our peer observation practices and evaluation criteria. Unique teaching situations and discipline-specific objectives and methods may necessitate changes and adaptations to these guidelines to be clarified in discussions among the faculty member, designated evaluator, and peer team. We have not attempted to incorporate all the considerations suggested by "Unique Teaching Situations at COCC." Nor have we chosen to impose rigid parallels between the categories used these guidelines and those used in "Common Standards for Teaching Performance at COCC," though certainly such parallels will suggest themselves. Rather, we encourage individual departments and programs to balance the goal of implementing more consistency in our evaluation practices and criteria, with the desirability of adapting such practices and criteria to specific and diverse teaching situations as they use these guidelines.

Peer Evaluator Guidelines

1. Try to arrange a sequence of consecutive visits to the same class instead of a sequence of "one shot" visits to several different classes. This enables you to see the continuity of course material and the "building" of concepts in the same way that the student sees the development of the material. If the instructional assignment includes year-long sequences and the period of the peer team assignment allows, you should make a point to visit more than just the first term course in that sequence; again visits to second and third-stage courses in the sequence allow you to monitor continuity, concept building, and student development at different stages of the year-long learning experience.

2. Visit as many different teaching/learning situations as possible.

3. Know what you are looking for. Review the "Common Standards for Teaching Performance at COCC," evaluation guidelines and responsibilities of a peer team member in advance so that you come prepared to make critical observations.

4. Know the prerequisites of the class you are visiting and the general abilities and level of students in the class.

5. Meet with chair/designated evaluator in advance to learn of discipline specific goals and methodologies that might be expected of the instructor. Are there particular problems that the designated evaluator would like you to address?

6. If possible, visit with the instructor before the class session to get a feeling for what is to be covered, the goals of the session, and how the materials used (if any) support the learning goals of the presentation.

7. Arrive early; be in class before the majority of the students arrive.

8. Be inconspicuous; you are there to observe and your presence should not detract from the normal classroom routine.

9. Seat yourself in the back of the classroom or position yourself such that you have a good vantage point from which to observe the entire room, with special attention to student behavior and interactions with each other and with the instructor.

10. Observe student behavior before class begins. (Are they talking with each other about the class, the instructor, the homework? Do they seem interested in the class? Are they collaborating on the material? Are they interested enough in the material to talk about it with one another?)

11. Stay for the entire class period.

12. Watch student reactions to the instructor; watch instructor reactions to individual students.

13. Are the students and the instructor attentive?

14. Watch inquisitiveness of the student; are the students willing to participate and are they encouraged to participate?

15. Watch inquisitiveness of the instructor; is the instructor actively seeking to clarify areas of misunderstanding?

13

Classroom Observation Guidelines

A: Structure and Organization of the Teaching/Learning Environment

___ The goals for each class session are clearly defined and clearly conveyed to the students.
___ The presentation and activities used in the presentation support the learning goals of each session.
___ The pace of presentation allows for effective use of the allotted class time.
___ A diverse number of teaching/learning aids are used to facilitate learning with a variety of different stimuli.
___ The lesson is well organized and relationships that exist between the different ideas are identified.
___ The instructor allows adequate time for student questions and (when necessary) review of a prior topic.

B: Skill of Presentation

___ The instructor is enthusiastic about the material being presented.
___ The instructor tries to motivate the students (enthusiasm, enjoyment of material/teaching, beauty, relevance to "real world," etc.)
___ Presentation is appropriate to level of the material and ability of students.
___ Presentation is clear, unambiguous, and free from instructor bias.
___ Use of teaching/learning aids is appropriate to achieving class goals and objectives.
___ General communication skills (language appropriate to level of student, body movement, gestures, eye contact, voice is easily heard throughout classroom, instructor is articulate, inflection, poise, and freedom from annoying mannerisms) encourage attentiveness and involvement.
___ Evidence that the instructor is able to re-involve students that get off task or off track.
___ Students are allowed adequate time to respond to questions; instructor is able to guide students to a response through additional and continual questioning.
___ Students are able to get on-task quickly during individual, group, or lab activities.

C: Rapport With Students

___ Instructor actively engages students.
___ Instructor encourages questions and student involvement in discussions; encouragement is done without favoritism to an individual or a group of students.
___ Instructor acknowledges the worth of all questions; answers each with same concern and enthusiasm.
___ Instructor demonstrates fair and equal concern for all students in class.
___ Students respond freely to instructor's encouragement; students are not intimidated by instructor's style, presentation, or general classroom demeanor.
___ Instructor has established an environment conducive to learning; students appear to trust that the instructor values their participation and their ideas.
___ Instructor appears open to student suggestions, ideas, and differences of opinion.

14

D: Subject Matter and Content Expertise

___ Instructor demonstrates excellent knowledge base for course content being discussed.
___ Instructor appears current in pedagogical practices of discipline.
___ Instructor demonstrates applicability of subject matter, where appropriate, to "real-world situations."
___ Instructor demonstrates knowledge of applicability of subject matter to other disciplines.

E: Compatibility with Discipline Specific Goals and Methodologies (if appropriate)

___ Structure and adherence to principles of laboratories?
___ Specific activities and instructor behaviors consistent with objectives of developmental courses?
___ Specific activities and instructor behaviors consistent with abilities of student population?
___ Appropriate use of peer collaboration and group activities?
___ Appropriate use of writing-to-learn activities?
___ Appropriate inclusion of real-world applications?
___ Activities appropriate to demonstrate use of subject matter in other disciplines?

Compilation of Humanities (*Characteristics of Good Teaching*), Business (*Instructor Evaluation Form*), Science (*Instructor Evaluation Form*), and Summary Responses to Interview Questions from this Task Force.

15

Course Material Review for Peer Evaluation

To the faculty member:

The intent of this checklist is to provide guidelines for use in peer review of your course materials. As you prepare a packet for each member of your Peer Team, consider these evaluation criteria.

To the evaluator:

The faculty member will offer a packet of material for your review. You may consider asking for any of these items from the faculty member: syllabus, required texts, representative sampling of assignments and assignment directions, handouts, visual aids, and supplemental materials, exams and evaluation criteria used to make grading judgments, class set of instructor's critiques and grades on student assignments or exams, record-keeping practices. Below you will find evaluation criteria and questions to consider in reviewing course materials.

Course Organization

_____ Students are given the course requirements in writing at the beginning of the course.
✓Does the course syllabus adequately outline the sequence of topics to be covered?

_____ Course objectives are clear.
✓ Have you considered updating the course objectives?
✓ Do you use student comments to clarify course objectives?

_____ Course materials indicate intellectual challenge for the students enrolled.
✓Does the course outline portray a challenge or a plan, or do you state generalities?
✓ How are student challenged?

_____ Course materials integrate recent developments in the field.
✓What constitutes current developments and appropriate materials in your field--
    e.g. popular writings, research, or technology?
✓Would it help to include more contemporary, interdisciplinary, or real-world
    material into the course?
    This should be discussed with the peer team members.

_____ Time given to each of the major course topics is appropriate.
✓What is most important as you balance the weight of each topic?
    This should be discussed with the peer team members.

_____ The course is an adequate prerequisite for other courses.
✓How does this course prepare for the following course?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Reading and Performance Based Assignments

_____ The reading assignments reflect the objectives of the course.
✓Are the reading assignments appropriate for the level of this course?
✓How current and appropriate are the reading assignments? Do the assignments need to be current?
✓Are students expected to read from current publications? Are copies provided?

_____ The texts used are appropriate for the course and are well selected.
✓Why was this text chosen? Is the author a known authority?

_____ The amount and type of homework and assignments are appropriate.
✓Are the assignments specifically stated in the course outline?
✓Do the assignments incorporate problem solving, creative and/or critical thinking?
✓How are the students challenged?
✓Should group or collaborative effort on assignments be encouraged?

_____ The written assignments and projects are carefully chosen to reflect course goals.
✓Are students given a reasonable amount of time to complete the assignments?
✓Are these assignments well designed and instructor expectations for grading and student learning outcomes made clear?

_____ The laboratory (performance) work relates to the course objectives.
✓Are the laboratory assignment objectives clear?
✓Are the assignments intellectually challenging to the students?
✓Are workbook, worksheets, response writings, or reading journals effectively used?
This should be discussed with the peer team members.

_____ The performance/oral proficiency assignments and projects are carefully chosen to reflect course goals. This should be discussed with the peer team members.

_____ The assignments accommodate any special needs students and are sensitive to different learning styles.

Assessment

There are varied modes of assessment, like portfolios, term papers, performance, competency verification, capstone projects or oral presentations, that may have the weight of traditional midterms and finals in some courses. **Exam** is used in this checklist to represent these various modes of assessment. Each method of assessment should be discussed with the peer team.

_____ The **exam** content is representative of the course content and objectives.
✓Are **exam** items clear and well written?
✓Are **exam** requirements made clear?
✓Are students learning by preparing for **exams** or just preparing to survive them?

17

The **exams** are graded in a fair manner.

✓How does the instructor comment on and grade representative sets of student exams?

✓Are comments on the content, organization, and style of papers and examination legible, clear, and helpful?

✓Do comments include positive as well as negative feedback?

✓Are opportunities given to act on constructive criticism in subsequent assignments?

✓Are standards used for grading communicated clearly to the students and applied consistently and fairly in evaluation?

The expectations for the lab grade or performance based/oral presentation are clear.

✓How are laboratory or performance tasks validated?

✓The standards used for grading are communicated to the students.

✓Do you provide additional lab time for students to prepare?

Assessment methods are sensitive to special needs students and different learning styles.

18

16

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title:

PEER EVALUATION GUIDELINES

Author(s): Cora Agatucci, Gloria Ahern, Ken Mays, Jack McCown, Mike Sequeira

Corporate Source:	Publication Date:
Central Oregon Community College	October 4, 1995

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→ please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title:
[signature]	Louis B. Queary, Vice President Instructio
Organization/Address: Central Oregon Community College 2600 NW College Way, Bend, OR 97701	Telephone: (541) 383-7206 — FAX: (541) 317-3071
	E-Mail Address: bqueary@cocc.edu — Date: July 28, 1998

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

ERIC 088 (Rev. 9/97)
PREVIOUS VERSIONS OF THIS FORM ARE OBSOLETE.