

Peer Evaluation - MJF¹

Instructor: Jennifer Thomas

Observer: Judi Moore Latta

Course CRN & Title: MJF 460-01Capstone:Newsvision Lab

Location/Time/Date: CBP 221; Thurs 4/26/2018 2:00pm

Number of Students Enrolled:

Number of Students in Attendance: 8

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

	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Comments
PART 1: Content and Organization (30%)							
Class started & ended on time						X	
Presented overview of class content/objectives						X	Set up student presentations by pointing to course objectives
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	

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

PART 2: Communication and Delivery Style (25%)							
Spoke audibly and clearly							X
Demonstrated ability to simplify complex subject matters & speak at students' level.							X
Held students' interest							X
Demonstrated enthusiasm							X
Encouraged students' questions							X
Answered questions appropriately							X
Recognized and responded to instances when students weren't responsive / didn't understand	X						
Clarified points students found challenging	X						
Responded to students' unanticipated solutions / to students view point that differs from own							X
Gave constructive feedback to student presentation							X
Ensured an environment conducive to discussion and learning							X
Made direct eye contact							X
PART 3: Critical Thinking Skills (10%)							
Asked probing questions							X
Used problem solving examples							X
Guided students towards application of material to the larger picture – in terms of syllabus / real life.							X
PART 4: Rapport with Students (10%)							
Responded appropriately to a range of student class behaviors							X
Ensured that students interacted civilly/respectfully with each other							X
Listened carefully and respectfully to students' questions							X

N.A.

N.A.

Provided exceptional critiques of each e-portfolio

Was able to maintain students' enthusiasm while encouraging introspection

PART 5: Teaching Methods (10%)							
Used student engagement techniques (e.g. discussion, small group work, active learning strategies, etc.) effectively.						X	Encouraged panel of professors to engage students
Incorporated technology (e.g. PowerPoint slides, course website, YouTube, blogs, videos, blackboard etc.) effectively, to enhance student learning.						X	Student e-portfolios were incredible. Each was individually designed.
Used visuals materials effectively						X	
Fostered students' ability to workshop / research independently.						X	Created an effective evaluation matrix.
Handouts given are clear and relevant							
PART 6: Syllabus (15%)							
							Discuss effectiveness of design & evaluation method
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	
HU Academic Integrity & Disability policies cited.						X	
Clear Topical / Course Outline specified.						X	
Other Issues							

Strengths Observed:

Prof. Thomas has an uncanny way of wrapping professional expectations into the course requirements. As a result, her students reflect (and mirror) her high level of professionalism. The individual e-portfolio presentations -- reflecting a semester of work -- were extraordinary. Thomas' individualized feedback to each student gave personalized attention to the work completed.

Suggestions for Improvements:

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

The Department of MJFC is fortunate to have such a veteran professional who is not only passionate about the University and the work she does, but who cares deeply for the students. She is committed to bringing them from wherever they begin to the level of highest performance. Watching her in action was a reminder of the value of good teaching.

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

CULCULATIONS 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	45 (LAST question is optional, therefore not calculated)	20.4	20
Total	220 points	100%	100%