

Peer Evaluation - MJF<sup>1</sup>

Instructor: Prof. Jennifer Thomas  
 Course CRN & Title: 19048 / New Women Lab  
 Number of Students Enrolled: \_\_\_\_\_

Observer: Merh Bechford  
 Location/Time/Date: C.B. Powell Bldg. Room 221 Tuesday 2:10-5:10  
 Number of Students in Attendance: # 15

SCALE: 1 = Inadequate 2 = Poor 3 = Average 4 = Good 5 = Excellent NA = Not Applicable

	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
<b>PART 1: Content and Organization (30%)</b>							
Class started & ended on time					X		
Presented overview of class content/objectives						X	
Presented Context to syllabus						X	
Presented & defined key concepts, emphasized major ideas						X	
Covered material presented in a thorough, organized fashion – well prepared						X	
Material level appropriate to the course						X	
Demonstrated command of the subject matter						X	
Made efficient use of class time / Paced presentation effectively					X		
Covered class content/objectives					X		
Distinguished between major and minor issues					X		
Recapitulated key points for the class					X		
Related new ideas to already familiar ones					X		

<sup>1</sup> This form seeks to be as qualitative in nature as possible – please utilize the opportunity to add comments whenever applicable.



**PART 5: Teaching Methods (10%)**

Used student engagement techniques (e.g. discussion, small group work, active learning strategies, etc.) effectively.								X
Incorporated technology (e.g. PowerPoint slides, course website, YouTube, blogs, videos, blackboard etc.) effectively, to enhance student learning								X
Used visuals materials effectively								X
Fostered students' ability to workshop / research independently								X
Handouts given are clear and relevant								X

**PART 6: Syllabus (15%)**

Instructor's availability specified								X
Descriptive information provided								X
Course Description and Objectives clearly stated								X
Required Text and resources listed								X
Course Requirements clarified								X
Course Grading method stipulated								X
Attendance & Tardiness policies stated								X
IU Academic Integrity & Disability policies cited								X
Clear Topical / Course Outline specified.								X
Other Issues								X

Discuss effectiveness of design & evaluation method

Strengths Observed:

Thomas is extremely organized. Students are well prepared for tasks at hand in which they help, grade, etc. She knows cell phone which was very impressive. Students know what their role are and assigned accordingly. Students also spoke about the growth they experienced in the class.

Suggestions for Improvements

Summary - comment on the quality of instruction and concern for student learning provided by the individual under review

The quality of the class appears to be of a high standard. Students know their role for the week, grade and number prepared. News stories are well handled, newsworthy, and interesting. The rapport between Thomas and the students are professional and collaborative. Students are professional.

Comments of instructor - to be given only on the FINAL PEER EVALUATION COMMITTEE SUMMARY REVIEW

CALCULATIONS FOR COMMITTEE

This REVISED version includes what was discussed in our last meeting, as per notes taken by Prof. Missouri & emailed by Prof. Ahmed

I have taken the liberty to assign the percentage I think makes sense for each section in more rounded numbers, as per importance

The following, however, is the mathematical representation of the calculation based on the number of questions remaining – totaling in 220 points

PART	POINTS	ACTUAL %	ROUNDED %
1	60	27.3	27
2	60	27.3	27
3	15	6.8	7
4	15	6.8	7
5	25	11.4	12
6	-15 (LAST question is optional, therefore not calculated)	20.4	20
Total	220 points	100%	100%

216 points